Faculty Senate Minutes

University of North Carolina at Wilmington

Tuesday, 9 September 1997
Volume 98
Number 1

President Richard Veit called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

Roll Call:

Absent were: Adams, S. (Evaluation Committee), Brown (Mathematics), Gaudet (Earth Sciences), Manock (Research Committee), Rohler (Library Committee), Sawyer (Accounting), Schell (University Advancement Committee), Tyndall (Education)

Special Order of the day:

Election of Vice President, Secretary and Steering Committee members. The results are as follows:

- Vice President: Bruce McKinney
- Secretary: Raymond Burt
- Steering Committee: Ann Crawford

John Myers has volunteered to serve as Parliamentarian. The ten new senators were introduced and welcomed.

Individual Reports:

Chancellor James Leutze reported as follows:

- Faculty raises will be in the range of 4%, based on merit. They will not be allocated until the October paycheck but will be retroactive to July.
- We got a new building, which will be an office/classroom space similar to Morton Hall. UNCW got 1/10 of all money allocated to the UNC system for construction. Our next priority will be a School of Education building.
- The legislature also approved equity funding at a level of $2.6 million per year for UNCW. On the local level, there have been extensive discussions at UNCW as to how the equity funding should be distributed. Academic areas will get some money, but many ancillary services have been seriously underfunded (Public Service, Student Affairs, etc.). Administration looked at the total picture and allocated funds in a way they feel is fair and reasonable.
- UNCW got an additional 300 FTE, which translates to about 18.4 new faculty positions. We are fortunate, as some schools in the UNC system had to cut faculty positions in the examination of redistributing resources. Also, overhead receipts will be ours to keep starting next year, and the 2% reversion of the budget has been reduced to 1%.

Other issues of current interest include the following:

- Our freshman SAT scores are up 20 points. We are the fifth leading university in the system as far as SAT
scores go. Our retention rate is up to 80% from 78%. Our minority population rate is up, as is our graduation rate. In light of this information and our continuing growth, it is surprising and disappointing that the recent ratings of USA Today and Newsweek have placed us so low. It simply isn't clear why we aren't rated higher, and we are sending someone to talk to them about it.

- Another issues of concern is our reliance on part-time faculty. There is no reason to believe that part-time instructors are not quality teachers, but there are problems of office space where they can meet and counsel students. We are looking for ways to reduce our reliance on part-time faculty.
- There are still some concerns about parking, but they seem to have lessened. We have opened the new parking lot and have the shuttle service running. Two new residence halls are being built; in October we break ground for the new Marine Science Center, and in the winter we will break ground on the new Campus Recreation Center.

In responding to a question from the floor about Randall Drive/Parkway, the Chancellor replied that discussion between UNCW and the city are ongoing. There is a real quandary about where to put the road, and there are as many opinions as there are options. The administration is trying to find a way to accommodate some of the needs as long as it doesn't destroy the ambience of the campus and does not leave us with a piece of unusable property. Chancellor Leutze reported that he has been convinced that the traffic problem is severe and that UNCW contributes to it; thus it seems reasonable to be conciliatory and work with the city. A final question from the floor focussed on why faculty and staff have to pay for parking. The Chancellor responded that he emotionally agrees, but it is necessary to pay the cost of building and maintaining a parking lot. We do not get state funds for building parking lots, so they must come out of fees.

**President of the Senate Richard Veit** made the following report:

- A welcome was made again to new senators and to new visitors: Kevin Jacques, Vice Chancellor for Advancement, and Helen Saulny, Director of Minority Affairs.
- The Senate Steering Committee met in August with new UNC President Molly Broad and were quite impressed. The [faculty handbook](file:///Z|/minutes/1997_1998/Sept97.htm) is now on line at the Senate home page.
- Post-Tenure Review is quite possibly the most important issue we will face this year. We all know there is a misconception about tenure. We know it is difficult to obtain, there are stringent requirements, and it guarantees academic freedom. There is also the public perception that we are not evaluated, when in fact we are the most evaluated creatures on earth. It is important that we understand the issue fully and that we proceed carefully in establishing UNCW's guidelines. President Veit has been asked by the Provost to chair the committee to establish a post-tenure policy for this campus, and he is asking for recommendations of faculty who would be good members. All divisions and disciplines will be represented. Senators are urged to send names to Dick Veit or the Steering Committee. The timeline for the work of the committee is as follows:
  - Initial report to Faculty Senate February 1998
  - Revised report to Faculty Senate March 1998
  - Send to Provost after March meeting
  - Return to Senate with Provost recommendations April 1998
  - Send to General Administration May 1998

**Bruce McKinney** reported on the Mediation Program:
UNCW has joined with Cape Fear Mediation Center in providing free mediation for faculty and staff. It can be a useful way to resolve disputes, from workplace issues to grade disagreements. It is mediation, not arbitration, so no outside decision is imposed. Both parties have to agree to it.

**Committee Reports:**

1. Buildings and Grounds Committee representative Dan Noland reported:
UNCW is hiring a landscape architect to create a master arboretum plan. There will be faculty input into the filling of this position. Also, we are a growth campus with potential for a huge population explosion. The committee is concerned about this and about the impact it has on the campus environment. There is also concern with the rapid commercial growth in the vicinity of the campus. The committee wants to be more involved in planning, particularly
with the new building.

2. The Faculty Senate Steering Committee offered the following motion:

   That each standing committee of the Senate be directed to review the statement of its duties and
   membership in the Faculty Handbook and to suggest any revisions it deems appropriate. Regarding
   membership, it should review whether the number and distribution of faculty members is optimum,
   whether the appropriate ex-officio members are assigned to the committee, and whether three-year
   terms would be preferable to two-year terms to insure continuity. Each committee chair should
   send responses to the Senate President no later than October 31.

   (Motion 98-1-1)

Motion passed with no dissension.

Old Business:

New Business:

Motion 98-1-2 from the Department of Foreign languages and Literature was withdrawn.

Announcements:

Patty Turrisi, Director of the Center for Teaching Excellence, announced that the Carolina Colloquy sponsored a
workshop over the summer involving the issue of peer review. She has the handbook from that workshop available
and would be glad to share it with any interested parties.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.
Submitted by: Kemille S. Moore
President Richard Veit called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

Roll Call

Absent were: Adams (Nursing), Berkeley (History), Brunson (Comm. Studies), Conser (P & R), Galbraith (Mgt. & Mktg.), Hackney (Biology), Heller (Fin. Aid Comm.), Lundeen (Biology), Macie (Art & Theatre), McNamee (Soc. & Anth.), Parnell (Library), Rohler (Library Committee), Roscher (Accounting), Sawyer (Accounting), Sayigh (Research Comm.), Walker (Admissions Comm.)

Approval of Minutes

The minutes were approved with the correction of a typing error.

Individual Reports:

1. Chancellor James Leutze reported as follows:
   - He is supportive of a pedestrian campus. We are seeking federal funds for establishing a bike path system. It will be several years before we will have fully integrated bike paths on campus, and thus we may have to consider interim measures to insure safety.
   - He has supported an integrated approach to distance learning and instructional technology. He is calling a meeting on campus to decide how to use the new technologies and what role UNCW should play in distance learning. The state's contract with the university system's current partner, Bell South, will expire in a few months. Where will we go from here? We have worked with local schools and community colleges; perhaps we could help in the future with college prep courses or foreign language courses not offered there. The long range plan calls for us to service 1500 students at off-campus locations by the year 2005. He invites ideas about this university's role in these areas.
   - We will approach General Administration seeking a new building for the School of Education. It would be the only building in the UNC system constructed from the ground up to address the needs of the education curriculum. We can become a leader in teacher education and can play a large role in the reform of education in this state. Currently if we do not have the best School of Education in the state, it is certainly one of the best, and we need to promote this strength and develop it to its full potential.
   - Some new parking lots are planned for the periphery of campus. Parking decks are prohibitively expensive; one would cost at least $8 million and would raise the cost of a parking sticker by $100. The shuttle bus has not been as successful as hoped, due in part to student perceptions.
   - We are talking to the county commissioners about alternatives regarding Randall Parkway. He is opposed to having Randall Drive connect to Hooker Road. At the last meeting he informed the trustees, based on the motion which came before the Senate today, how the faculty view the issue. This project is not funded and is not on the priority list, but the city has recently asked that it be shifted to a priority. He has written a letter to protest this move. The faculty will be given time to comment on any plan before it is agreed to. The road is at least 15 years away.
2. **Provost Marvin Moss** made the following report on the Phased Retirement Program:
   - The program will begin next year and will last five years. Academic Affairs consulted with the Faculty Welfare Committee in finalizing its recommendations. The purpose of the plan is to provide an orderly transition from full-time employment to retirement. The program is available to full-time tenured faculty nearing retirement with at least five years of service at UNCW. There is a scale of eligibility; for example at age 50, one must have 20 years of service; and at age 60, one must have 5 years of service. The decision to apply for the program is made solely by the eligible faculty member. If approved, that person would receive all normal retirement benefits and would be allowed to continue at 50% workload for a set number of years while receiving a salary at 50% of his/her previous income. For the faculty member this is a financial incentive, as it might mean an overall increase in yearly compensation, while working only 50% time. It is also a way to ease into retirement. This program is advantageous for the university in that the 50% salary savings of senior faculty may be sufficient to hire a new faculty member, while retaining for a designated period of time the services of the retiring faculty member. Some caveats:
     - programmatic considerations may override a faculty member's decision to participate, and
     - financial considerations could rule against a department allowing faculty to participate.
   - The recommendations from the Welfare Committee that have been adopted are as follows:
     - the length of the program will be 3 years for all participants (although faculty may drop out sooner if they wish);
     - the participant's work plan will be determined at the department level; and
     - the university will cap participation at 10% of all faculty and no more than 20% of any one department.
   - Questions from the floor:
     - Q: Could one larger department possibly take more than its fair share of the university's 10% cap?
       A: Possibly. However, the cap can be waived by the Provost.
     - Q: Could the department replace the person who chooses phased retirement?
       A: Yes, one half of the salary could fund a lectureship, if not a junior faculty position.
   - The Provost invited additional input and will put the UNCW draft on the web.

3. **President of the Senate Richard Veit** made the following report:
   - The Steering Committee forwarded recommendations for the Post-Tenure Review Committee, and the Provost's office has appointed the following members:
     - Chair, Richard Veit (English)
     - Sheila Adams (Evaluation Committee)
     - Ann Conner (Art & Theatre)
     - Craig Galbraith (Management and Marketing)
     - Courtney Hackney (Biology)
     - Andy Jackson (Psychology)
     - Melton McLaurin (Academic Affairs)
     - Ken Spackman (RPT Committee)
     - Marcee Steele (Curricular Studies)
   - The charge of the committee is to provide a draft document for review at the February Faculty Senate Meeting.

**Committee Reports:**

1. **Joe Wilson, chair of the Computer Services Committee,** reported as follows:
   - The Committee asked the Director of Management Information Systems if the university monitored the use of the internet by individual faculty members. The Director stated that his office has not allocated resources for this type of surveillance, although any use of the internet or other campus resources is restricted to business purposes only. In discussion, it was asked whether uses of faculty computers that might serve to enhance morale (for example, the forwarding of humorous e-mail to departmental colleagues) might technically be in violation of the policy. This constitutes a gray area, and the committee was charged by the Senate to review the policy so that such acts are not deemed violations.
The following motion from the committee passed with no dissent:

- **Whereas Management Information Systems conducts computing activities that have implications for faculty and students and whereas such activities will expand considerably in the near future, the Senate recommends that the committee's oversight be expanded to include present and future Management Information Systems computing activities that affect students and faculty--for example, SIS Plus.** (Motion 98-2-3, carried)

Discussion: The current charge of the Committee in the Bylaws states that the Committee aids Academic Computing Services in formulation of policies; however, computing has been reorganized. There are two distinct units: the Office of Information Technology (OIT) and Management Information Systems (MIS). Both report directly to the Provost. This motion will expand the oversight of the Committee from only OIT to both OIT and MIS.

2. **Buildings and Grounds Committee representative Dan Noland** reported:
   - The committee is becoming proactive in its oversight function.
   - The following motion from the committee passed with no dissent:
     - **It is the sense of the Faculty Senate that the Senate, the Chancellor, and Board of Trustees should remain steadfast in their opposition to any extension of Randall parkway being built on any part (developed, paved, or wooded) of the UNCW campus.** (Motion 98-2-4; carried)

   - The following motion from the committee was revised as follows and sent back to the committee for review:
     - **That, to promote a pedestrian campus and an integrated campus development plan,**
       1. parking be considered an integral part of all new construction and all proposed facilities plans include a plan for the corresponding parking;
       2. the parking and traffic plan be carefully integrated into the recently approved facilities plan and land use plan as well as the corresponding campus arboretum plan; and
       3. a moratorium on all new parking construction be in effect until an overall analysis of the parking and traffic flow plan is completed;
       4. bike lanes be constructed on both sides of all new roads on campus and every effort be made to build bike lanes on existing campus roads. (Motion 98-2-5; returned to committee)

**Old Business: none**

**New Business: none**

**Announcements: none**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.
Submitted by: Raymond L. Burt
President Richard Veit called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

Roll Call

Absent were: Applefield (Curricular Studies), Buttino (Univ. Advance. Cmte.), Canel (Prod. & Dec. Sciences), Heller (Fin. Aid Cmte.), McLaurin (Math), Morden (Financial Aid Cmte.), Smith (Specialty Studies), Wadman (Admissions Cmte.)

Approval of Minutes

The minutes were approved.

Individual Reports:

President of the Senate Richard Veit made the following report:

1. Chairs of Senate committee have been requested to review the statement of duties and membership of their committees in the Bylaws and to send responses to the Senate President by October 31 (motion 98-1-1). A motion to approve revisions to the Bylaws will be presented at a later meeting.
2. The question was raised as to why current faculty salary information is not posted on the web. In fact it was posted by Institutional Research but incorrectly linked. That has been corrected, and 1997 salary information can be accessed through the UNCW home page, or directly at: www.uncwil.edu/local/oir/salary_analysis.html
3. The Phased Retirement Policy proposed by UNCW and awaiting approval from General Administration is accessible online through the Senate website, or directly at: www.uncwil.edu/facsen/documents/phased.htm
4. The Senate website also provides the minutes and the agendas. See the Senate website at: www.uncwil.edu/facsen
5. The Post-Tenure Review Committee is meeting every Thursday at 11:00 a.m. in DeLoach 113. There is a web page for this committee accessible from the Senate website, or directly at: www.uncwil.edu/facsen/ptr

Committee Reports:

1. The following motions by the Steering Committee were considered:

   a. The designation of new academic prefixes for courses not offered through a college/school shall be subject to approval by the Faculty Senate upon recommendation by the University Curriculum Committee. (98-3-6, carried)

      Discussion: Current examples of such prefixes are HON for honors, INT for international courses and UNI for university (freshman seminar).

   b. The Senate delegates authority to the University Curriculum Committee to approve individual
c. That the copy in Addendum A of the Agenda ("Technology College") be added to the Undergraduate Catalogue under "Enrichment Courses and Programs," conditional upon approval of the TEC designation and the TEC 101 course.

A motion from the floor to table did not carry. Objections from the floor concerned the use of the term "College." It was argued that the term does not accurately represent this enrichment program and could be confusing. Any such program might like to be designated "College," and thus it might set a precedent. An amendment was passed to change the name from "Technology College" to "Technology Program." With the change in text, the motion then passed as follows:

That the copy in Addendum A of the Agenda (revised as "Technology Program") be added to the Undergraduate Catalogue under "Enrichment Courses and Programs," conditional upon approval of the TEC designation and the TEC 101 course. (98-3-8, carried)

2. The following motion by the Academic Standards Committee was approved:

That a new grading symbol of "In Progress" (IP), conferring 0 quality points, be instituted for departmental honors projects (499) in semesters other than their final semester. Upon successful completion of the entire project, IP grades from previous semesters are converted to letter grades and quality points are retroactively awarded. (Currently all credit is given only in the final semester.) (98-3-9, carried)

Discussion: Currently the grade of "I" is listed in the first semester, but this is misleading. An Incomplete is an indication that a student was unable to complete a course in a timely fashion. That is not the case for honors projects, and it is not fair to the student. The change is supported by the Director of Honors, the Registrar, and the Academic Standards Committee. A question from the floor brought up the application of this new grading symbol to certain Directed Individual Study courses. This has not been considered by the ASC since none of the DIS courses are listed as multi-semester courses in the catalogue.

Old Business: none

New Business:

1. A motion by Professor Gurganus to suspend Senate rules to allow consideration of a motion that would amend Senate motion 97-7-30 was approved. The motion itself was then approved after lengthy discussion and numerous amendments as to wording. The italicized sentence in part a below represents an addition to previously approved wording.

   a. The catalogue section "Requirements for a Double Major or a Double Degree" should read as follows:

   A student may elect to major in two separate disciplines with the permission of the chair of each of the departments and on the condition that the student meet all requirements for each major. A student who completes 124 hours and all requirements for more than one major in the same baccalaureate program will have only one degree conferred, but all majors will be printed on the diploma. A student who completes 124 credit hours and meets all requirements for majors in different baccalaureate programs may have both degrees conferred. A student may not simultaneously receive two different baccalaureate
degrees within the same major (e.g., a B.S. and a B.A. degree), except by permission of the department chair. The policy will apply to returning UNCW students as well as to continuing students.

b. The Academic Standards Committee shall study the wording of the catalogue entry and return it to the Senate in the Spring for consideration. (98-3-10, carried)

Discussion: The motion is intended to clarify the intention of Senate motion 97-7-30, which has been misinterpreted by some to allow the awarding of both the B.A. and the B.S. degrees within the same major. The intention of the Senate is not to award a second degree when both involve substantially similar course work. Nevertheless, the issue is a complex one and must take into consideration the variety of degree programs offered. The motion was intended as a stopgap to provide guidance for December 1997 graduation decisions, with the understanding that additional study will provide unambiguous wording for the policy.

Announcements: none

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.
Submitted by: Raymond L. Burt
President Richard Veit called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

Roll Call

Absent were: Brookshire (Nursing), Christophe (Econ. & Finance), Galbraith (Mgt. & Mktg.), Gray (Nursing), Heller (Financial Aid Cmte.), MacKain (Psychology), Moss (Provost), Rockness (Business Admin.), Wadman (Econ. & Finance), Walker (Admissions Cmte.), and Wilson (Computer Serv. Cmte.).

Approval of Minutes

The minutes were approved.

Special Order of the Day

1. Richard Veit (English) was re-elected to serve as Senate President for the 1998-99 academic year.
2. The following were nominated as candidates for Faculty Assembly delegate:
   - Ken Gurganus (Mathematical Sciences)
   - Elizabeth Ervin (English)

Individual Reports:

1. Chancellor James Leutze reported as follows:
   - The university recently met on campus with the Advisory Budget Commission. The overall discussion was positive. The meeting had three functions: 1) to thank them for their financial support, 2) to demonstrate to them how well we have spent funds allocated to us, and 3) to seek the continuation of the current expansion funds. UNCW is expecting an increase of 150 first year students and the administration will also seek a salary increase for faculty. UNCW has a capital need to build a new School of Education building.
   - Recently President Broad issued a letter asking the universities to review their policies in admissions and financial aid in regard to affirmative action. It is a prudent move to check our procedures in terms of their legality. UNCW remains committed to a fair and equitable policy which will insure a campus community which reflects the larger community which we serve. It is by no means the intention of the Chancellor or the Trustees to change the university's commitment to affirmative action. It is important that university policies be fair and reasonable.
   - The Chancellor asked the Senate to work with him on the issue of the Technology College. The Senate had rejected the designation "college." The Chancellor outlined the importance of highlighting our strengths in an increasingly competitive market. Whereas the term "college" may not be entirely accurate, the Senate's substitution with the word "program" will not bring about the goal of focusing positive attention what we have to offer. He suggests that an appropriate Senate committee discuss this issue and work with him on a way to emphasize our technologically oriented courses.
The Chancellor commented briefly about the Seahawk debate. He suspects that there is a misapprehension by the students on this issue. This is not about censorship of the student newspaper by the faculty. It is hoped that the student newspaper will reflect well on the life and atmosphere of this campus, but the academic community does not believe in censorship. He has followed the e-mail discussion among members of the faculty senate and does not interpret it to be aimed at censorship.

2. President of the Senate Richard Veit made the following report:
   - The Senate held a virtual meeting and approved the awarding of an honorary degree at the December Commencement.
   - On the "Technology College" issue: We can take pride that the administration of this university respects the faculty's role in shared governance. The Faculty Governance Document gives faculty "responsibility and authority, both primary and shared, for ... establishing curricula; reviewing existing programs, including auxiliary academic programs (e.g., continuing education); deleting programs; developing and reviewing proposed new programs...." The Steering Committee will seek an accommodation between the Senate's desire for semantic rigor and the desire for a title with appropriate connotations. It will bring a proposal before the Senate.
   - The President reminded the Senate that four of the five motions before us today are "sense of the Senate" motions, calling on the body to express a collective opinion. Debate within an academic community adheres to high standards; discussion should be focused on issues and not people.

3. Faculty Assembly delegate Ken Gurganus, in lieu of a formal report, provided background for motions 98-4-11 (funding formula) and 98-4-13 (affirmative action).

Committee Reports:

1. The following motion by the Steering Committee carried following discussion, which included reports by both Assistant to the Chancellor Robert Fry and Faculty Assembly Delegate Ken Gurganus:

   Whereas, the UNCW Faculty Senate is gravely concerned that proposed changes in the formula by which UNC institutions are funded will severely harm institutions whose primary mission is undergraduate teaching, and that adverse consequences will include increased student-faculty ratios, larger class sizes, and a reduction in the quality of education that undergraduate students receive,
   Therefore, the Senate strongly urges the Board of Governors to delay action on this proposal, allowing time for further study so that its impact can be fully known and alternatives fully explored by the faculties and administrations of the University of North Carolina system.  **(98-4-11, carried without dissent)**

2. The following motion offered by the University Curriculum Committee carried:

   That the following courses be approved for Basic Studies credit under "Humanities: Language":
   - FRH 301: Conversation
   - JPN 201, JPN 202: Intermediate Japanese  **(98-4-12, carried without dissent)**

3. Student Media Board Chair Lou Buttino reported on the activities of the Board in order to gain faculty support and to mediate the current conflict concerning the Seahawk. The Board is two and a half years old and oversees three student media operations: The Seahawk, Atlantis, and WLOZ. The Board charter is currently undergoing revision. One concern is the lack of academic course support for the student media operations. There are no courses on radio as a media and only two courses on journalism. He urged that a faculty member with a journalism specialty be hired. Other items included the following:
   - Student media have suffered from inadequate technology. Recently the Chancellor has allocated funds to upgrade the equipment and the campus will soon notice the difference in the format and presentation of the Seahawk.
   - The Board has urged the university counsel to arrange for ethics workshops for media and to develop guidelines related to liability, slander, obscenity and related media/legal concerns.
   - The Board has urged that faculty media advisors be paid. Currently only the advisor to the Seahawk
receives a stipend.
- The Board has organized and urged implementation of a print and broadcast journalism minor.
- The Office of Student Affairs is seeking a full-time Student Media Advisory position; an advisor should be in place by mid-spring.

Old Business:
None

New Business

1. The following motion by Ken Gurganus (Mathematical Sciences) carried following discussion:

   The Faculty Senate of the University of North Carolina at Wilmington commends President Molly Broad for her commitment to the following principles and urges that they be official policy and governing principles of the University of North Carolina:

   - That the University of North Carolina continue its long-standing efforts to overcome the effects of past racial segregation in our public system of higher education;
   - That the University of North Carolina continue a policy of affirmative outreach to achieve substantial minority enrollments, consistent with established legal mandates;
   - That the University of North Carolina not retreat from its long-standing policy of welcoming applicants on a nondiscriminatory basis and striving to achieve broadly diverse enrollments but, on the contrary, that it seek to extend those accomplishments;
   - That the University of North Carolina continue its adherence to the above-mentioned policies and thereby avoid the discord and polarization that have recently occurred in other states.

   (98-4-13, carried without dissent)

2. The following motion by Rick Roscher (Accountancy & Business Law) was defeated following discussion:

   Whereas, Section IV-D (entitled "Student Publications") of the Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students (appearing as Appendix A to the 1997-1998 Student Handbook and Code of Student Life) states that "...the editorial freedom of student editors and managers entails corollary responsibilities to be governed by the canons of responsible journalism, such as the avoidance of ... indecency," and

   Whereas, the UNCW Seahawk newspaper, in a one-half-page article entitled "Sexual Horoscopes" on page ten of the November 5, 1997 issue, chose to publish material which could best be described as tasteless, offensive, crude, and vulgar,

   Therefore, let it be known that the UNCW Faculty Senate deplores the publication of this material and recommends that the Student Media Board take appropriate action to discourage the publication of such material in the future. (98-4-14, defeated)

3. Mike Adams (Sociology/Anthropology) withdrew his motion:

   Let it be known that the UNCW Faculty Senate deplores censorship and recommends that the term "indecency" be removed from line seven of the second paragraph on p. 113 of the 1997-1998 Student Handbook and Code of Student Life. (98-4-15, withdrawn)

Announcements

None

The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m.
Submitted by: Raymond L. Burt
President Richard Veit called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

Roll Call

Absent were: Adams (Soc. & Anthro.), Baker (Budget Cmte.), Brown (Math), Brunson (Comm. Studies), Buttino (Univ. Advance. Cmte.), Canel (Prod. & Dec. Sciences), Combs (HPER), Crawford (Specialty Studies), Galbraith (Mgt. & Mktg.), Heller (Fin. Aid Cmte.), Howell (Econ. & Fin.), Jones (Chemistry), Leutze (Chancellor), Lundeen (Biology), McGee (Library), Roscher (Accounting), Sawyer (Accounting), Sayigh (Research Ctme.), Seaton (Chemistry), Tyndall (Dean, Education), Wadman (Econ. & Finance), Walker (Admissions Cmte.)

Approval of Minutes

The minutes were approved.

Individual Reports:

1. Faculty Assembly Chair Laura N. Gasaway, UNC-CH, provided greetings as following:

   - The Faculty Assembly now has an active presence on the World Wide Web. The agenda and minutes are available on line. One section of the site allows for input from faculty on Issues and Concerns. Issues this Spring include:
     - the Tuition Task Force with faculty representatives Bruce Lawson (UNC-Asheville) and Laura Gasaway (UNC-Chapel Hill).
     - The Presidential Inauguration on April 29th at NCSU. Part of this celebration will include the Board of Governors Teaching Awards ceremony at North Carolina Central University. The inauguration will be televised and the Assembly will be helping campuses sponsor related events.

2. Provost Marvin Moss made the following report:

   - Chancellor Leutze is in Thailand seeking cooperative agreements and exchange programs in Asia.
   - He recognized the hard work by the faculty committee in developing the Post-Tenure Review Policy draft.
   - Phased-Retirement Policy: Our draft has returned from Chapel Hill with some minor changes requested. This should not be difficult, although the waiting period will be delayed this first round. All eligible faculty will receive a letter about this opportunity.
   - The Board of Governors approved three new graduate programs: Master of Arts in Liberal Studies, Master of Science in Educational Technology, Master of Science in Nursing. We are also planning graduate programs in Economics and in Marine Sciences.
   - Formula funding is still in the forefront. There has not been much change in the format. The draft may soon go to the Board of Governors for discussion. The formula applies only to the increase in enrollment which averages....
0.02% of a university's budget. However, the current plan will cost UNCW more than any other university in the system. For example: next year we project an increase in 19-20 new faculty based on enrollment. Under the formula we would only receive funding for 15-16 faculty. We are concerned about this plan and will work hard to make our position clear at every opportunity for feedback. Over time this funding formula would necessitate increasingly larger class sizes at undergraduate institutions.

- As you know a new building has been approved and funded at $8.4 million. The plans for this building are underway. Soon a faculty committee will be formed to offer input. There are four constraints we face in the planning:
  1. The Department of Communication Studies must be relocated.
  2. We must make space in the Social & Behavior Science building.
  3. We must make space in Morton Hall. English faculty now have offices all over campus.
  4. We must remove faculty from offices in the library which were originally designed for student use.

- We have a new Director of Admissions, James Walters. He comes to us from Chapel Hill where he served as Associate Vice Chancellor for Planning and, before that, as Director of Admissions.
- We are establishing an Office of Government Operations in Washington, D.C.
- The Office of Development and the Division of Academic Affairs are sharing some of the equity monies in more career counselors and development staff.

3. **Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Patricia Leonard** reported on the following aspects of our student body:

  - student profile
  - pre-college characteristics
  - college behavior and performance

**Committee Reports:**

1. The following motion by the **University Curriculum Committee** carried:

   That the following changes be made to courses approved to fulfill Basic Studies requirements:

   - CSC 111 (Introduction to Computer Programming Using FORTRAN) be dropped.
   - BIO 234 (Humans and Ecology) (1) be added
   - GLYL 120 (Environmental Geology Laboratory) (1) be added.
   - HST 271 (The Sea in History) (3) be added. *(98-5-16, carried without dissent)*

2. The following motion by the **Post-Tenure-Review Committee** carried:

   That the "Policy on Post-Tenure Review" be adopted (see Agenda for text). *(98-5-17, carried)*

   The discussion included questions about the following:

   - oversight of departmental procedures
   - feasibility of outside evaluators
   - reporting deficiency ratings from peer reviewers directly to the dean
   - awards for exemplary ratings
   - use of existing annual evaluations in lieu of a separate additional evaluation
   - relationship of the post-tenure review to merit considerations
   - relationship of the judgements deficient/satisfactory/exemplary to the categories of teaching/research/service.

   Prior to the vote, the secretary was called to determine if the Senate had a voting quorum. A quorum was present.

3. The **Steering Committee** withdrew its motion on "Technology College" for discussion at a later date. *(98-5-18, Carried)*
Announcements

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.
Submitted by: Raymond L. Burt
President Richard Veit called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

Roll Call

Absent were: Applefield (Curricular Studies), Bartolome (Curricular Studies), Buttino (Univ. Advance. Cmte.), Conser (P & R), Ellis (English), Geller (Biology), Gray (Nursing), Heller (Fin. Aid Cmte.), Howell (Econ. & Fin.), Macie (Art & Theater), McGee (Library), Morden (Fin. Aid Cmte.), Rack (Music), Rockness (Dean, Bus. Admin.), Sawyer (Accounting), Sayigh (Research Cmte.), Seaton (Chemistry), Smith (Specialty Studies), Wadman (Econ. & Finance), and Walker (Admissions Cmte.)

Approval of Minutes

The minutes were approved.

Individual Reports:

1. Chancellor James Leutze reported on Technology and the University:

   a. UNCW has a strong history in involvement with technology and distance learning. We participated in the pilot project Vision Carolina in an experiment with fiber optics and full-motion video. UNCW was the first university to sign up for the North Carolina Information Highway. The Chancellor chaired the first statewide committee on distance learning. UNCW currently has an active distance learning program; for example, we have a vibrant program in Onslow County where we offer classes in nursing and education. We also participate with the School of Math and Science in Durham in bringing courses to high schools in Duplin County using the internet. Thus, until recently, one could speak of our pioneering leadership in distance learning and educational technology. However, there have been some recent changes which force us to reconsider our strategies and goals:

      - President Molly Broad has placed distance learning as one of the top priorities for the UNC system. She has been very active in promoting distance learning. President Broad is the only representative from North Carolina serving on the national committee responsible for developing the Internet II.
      - A recent change in system policy allows any university to offer courses in our service area. They only have to inform us that they are offering these courses and do not need our approval. We have already been informed that 130 courses are being offered this Spring in our service area.
      - The new funding formula which is in the process of being approved includes summer school and extension students in calculating budgets.

   Why is it important that UNCW utilize technology in classes?
It is a part of our mission. As a regional university we have a responsibility to students educate them to be as technologically sophisticated as possible.

The market for education is growing. The demand is increasing and technology will aid us in meeting the demand.

UNCW should be at the cutting edge of educational methodology. We wish to continue to attract top-notch students and faculty.

We will be offering a series of grants to assist faculty in developing technologically enhanced courses. We will examine the feasibility of requiring students to own computers. The Provost will study the experiences at Chapel Hill and other universities which require students to purchase computers.

b. The Chancellor will discuss promotion and tenure at the next faculty senate meeting.

**President of the Senate Richard Veit** reported as follows:

a. Elections were held in most departments for the senators for the next academic year. All departments have reported with the exception of Production and Decision Sciences.

b. Concerning distance learning: Technology is a valuable adjunct to teaching, but he expressed some misgivings about some visions of the future. Every decision should be based on data and empirical reality. We must ask the following questions:
   1. Is it educationally effective?
   2. Is it cost effective?
   3. What are the consequences for existing resources?
   4. What is the actual demand?
   5. Are we using the right metaphors ("delivery of instruction" and "a race")?

**Dance Marathon Chair Nate Stansfield** requested faculty help for the marathon scheduled for April 24th/25th. Faculty wishing more information may call the Student Government Association at extension 3553.

**Committee Reports:**

1. The **Steering Committee** amendments to the Post-Tenure Review Policy passed by the Senate at its January meeting CARRIED as revised:
   a. That the following statements be amended as follows [deletion, addition]:

   i. **Timetable**
   Faculty of whom PTR is required must undergo a review no later than the fifth academic year following the most recent of these "review events":
   - award of tenure at UNCW
   - departmental recommendation for promotion
   - prior post-tenure review
   - other equivalent comprehensive review of performance at UNCW
   - return to faculty status following administrative service of two years or more

   2. **Procedures**
   The period for which performance is to be reviewed shall not exceed the preceding five years. Performance shall be reviewed for the period since the prior review event or for the preceding five years, whichever period is less.

   b. That the following footnote be appended to the statement "No faculty member shall be compelled to undergo PTR as described in this policy earlier than as required by this timetable":

   This restriction applies to post-tenure review and does not limit other currently-existing forms of evaluation; for example, the Policies of Academic Freedom and Tenure states, "When circumstances warrant, an evaluation may be initiated by the department chairperson, the
appropriate dean, the provost and vice chancellor for Academic Affairs, or the chancellor"
(Faculty Handbook, Appendix A: IV.D.4).

3. That the Senate Steering Committee appoint an ad hoc committee of faculty to recommend wording that makes explicit the circumstances, procedures, and protections associated with an evaluation of a faculty member initiated under the provisions of Section IV.D.4 of Appendix A of the Faculty Handbook. The committee shall report its recommendations to the Senate no later than April 1998. (Motion 98-6-19, carried without dissent)

2. The following motion from the Steering Committee CARRIED:

   Whereas UNCW now has an established graduate program and an established graduate faculty; and
   Whereas the Graduate Council is currently composed of the deans and faculty members appointed by the deans; and
   Whereas the responsibilities of the Graduate Council as stated in the Graduate Faculty Bylaws parallel the duties assigned to the faculty by the Faculty Governance Document;
   Therefore, be it resolved that the Graduate Council should be composed of representatives elected by the graduate faculty; and, to achieve this end,
   That the Steering Committee appoint an ad hoc committee of graduate faculty to review the existing Graduate Faculty Bylaws, consult with appropriate interested parties, and propose to the Senate such amendments to those Bylaws as they deem proper to effect the direct election of the Graduate Council by the graduate faculty; and
   That such recommendations as the Senate shall approve be subsequently submitted according to the procedure established for amending those Bylaws. (Motion 98-6-20, carried without dissent)

- The following motion from the Academic Standards Committee CARRIED:

   That the following policy, previously revised by the Senate in April 1997 and November 1997, be further amended as follows [deletion, addition]:

   **Requirements for a Double Major or a Double Degree**
   A student may elect to major in two separate disciplines with the permission of the chair of each of the departments and on the condition that the student meet all requirements for each major. A student who completes 124 hours and all requirements for more than one major in the same baccalaureate program will have only one degree conferred, but all majors will be printed on the diploma. A student who completes 124 credit hours and meets all requirements for majors in different baccalaureate programs may have both degrees conferred. A student may not simultaneously receive two different baccalaureate degrees within the same major department (e.g., a B.S. and a B.A. degree), except by permission of the department chair. The policy will apply to returning UNCW students as well as to continuing students. A student may not normally receive a second baccalaureate degree in a department in which a degree has been earned previously. An exception may be made only when a department has an established policy regarding the circumstances in which a second degree may be awarded. (Motion 98-6-21, carried)

**Old Business**

1. The following motion of the Steering Committee CARRIED:
a. The designation "College of X" at UNCW shall be reserved exclusively for undergraduate divisions of the university that offer courses and grant degrees in particular fields; for example, the College of Arts and Sciences.

b. The designation "X College" may be used, in rare instances and subject to the approval of the faculty, for significant programmatic entities that offer a systematic course of study.

c. The Faculty Senate approves the designation "Technology College" for that program. **(Motion 98-5-18, carried)**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.
Submitted by: Raymond L. Burt
Minutes: March 17, 1998
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President Richard Veit called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

Roll Call

Absent were: Adams (Soc. & Anthro.), Baker (Budget Ctme.), Berkeley (History), Buttino (Univ. Advance. Ctme.), Heller (Fin. Aid Ctme.), Howell (Econ. & Fin.), Sawyer (Accounting), Sayigh (Research Ctme.), Tyndall (Dean, Education), Wadman (Econ. & Finance), and Walker (Admissions Ctme.)

Approval of Minutes

The February minutes were approved.

Individual Reports

1. Chancellor James Leutze reported as follows:

   - The Chancellor and representatives from the Business Office met with representatives from General Administration about the new funding formula. UNCW was not happy with the new formula but would live with it and would adjust. He requested that they review the formula in the future and allow us to request changes. This is a pragmatic stance, since the General Administration has confidence in the accuracy of the formula in determining the costs of teaching and will implement it. Their response to our objection that the formula will in effect mean a reduction in the anticipated budget of $150,000, was to state that the new allocation is an accurate reflection of our costs. One way for us to adjust is to find ways to reduce the average undergraduate class size.

   - On the issue of technology, a committee has been appointed which will choose the summer stipends for distance-learning course development. On Thursday they will approve a Request for Proposals form. Shortly thereafter the Request for Proposals will be sent to faculty. The amount of the stipend will be on a sliding scale in relationship to the technological component proposed for the course, with a maximum awarded of $7,500. Recipients will also receive assistance in developing courses incorporating technology. One issue yet to be decided: What type of courses should we support with this stipend: any course, core courses, courses which supplement those offered by the Technology College, or only those in our licensing fields? A strategy will be developed aimed at advancing the interests of the university.

   - Promotion and tenure:

     - Hiring and decisions on promotion and tenure are the most serious responsibilities we engage in. We set the tenor of the university by these decisions. The awarding of tenure and the post-tenure review processes are extremely important. Public interest in tenure is high and the right of tenure is at risk; thus our procedures and review processes must be solid in order to promote the health of the university. Consequently he feels that the awarding of tenure and the promotion to the rank of associate professor should be linked. To award tenure to a faculty member and then to refuse to promote that member to the associate level seems contradictory. It may result in the alienation of a colleague. If you don't want to promote them, then you should not tenure them.

     - The motion under consideration today (98-7-28) contains revisions to guidelines which are part of the Criteria for Reappointment, Promotion and Award of Tenure approved by the Senate in March.
1982 and revised in April 1985 (Appendix C of the Faculty Handbook). He read from the introduction of the document to show that it is broad and general in its understanding of what factors are to be considered in the tenure process. The guidelines presented in the agenda are prescriptive and less flexible. The document seems to be incongruent. The focus of tenure should be on the professional competency of the individual and on the contributions that person offers to the institution's needs and resources. Based on the broader intent of the document, you can promote and tenure an excellent teacher paying less regard to a strong pattern of research. He recommends that the RPT documents be referred back to committee for further consideration.

Questions and comments from the floor expressed concern about:
- the practice of promotion and tenure of faculty who are not strong in research,
- the confusion to junior faculty who face a less prescriptive guideline,
- the possibility of increasing the ambiguity of the process, and
- the accuracy of instruments for evaluating teaching.

In response to a question, the Chancellor acknowledged that he is not making a policy but is requesting the Senate to consider changing the current policy so as to:
- link promotion and tenure,
- counter a perception that research is of greater value than teaching
- bring the guidelines into more congruence with the broader intent of the Criteria document.

2. President of the Senate Richard Veit reported as follows:
- Regarding RPT, he stressed that that criteria must be determined by faculty and clear to all faculty. Probationary faculty should know from the first the criteria on which they are to be judged; it is highly disruptive when criteria are perceived to shift dramatically.
- He charged the Committee on Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure with reviewing the RPT document to determine if there are inconsistencies and reporting back to the Senate at a future date.
- A series of concerts is scheduled for the Commons on Thursdays during class hours. In the past some outdoor concerts have drawn complaints about the noise level. Student Affairs will monitor these concerts for noise level. Faculty reporting a problem should contact Cathy Birmingham, Associate Director of the Union (x3043).

3. Faculty Assembly Representative Ken Gurganus reported as follows:
- The Faculty Assembly urged the General Administration to resist the sole use of quantitative measures in their evaluations, and to address the issue of quality.
- The inauguration of President Broad is scheduled for April 29. All faculty are invited to attend the ceremonies.
- The Assembly resolved that faculty members be elected to serve as non-voting members of Board of Trustees' committees, and that Faculty Senate presidents be invited to participate in Board of Trustees' meetings without voting privileges.
- Copies of the new funding model are available through department chairs or college deans.

Committee Reports

1. The following motions by the Steering Committee carried following discussion:

   a. Whereas, smaller classes are, in general, beneficial to student learning; and
   Therefore, be it resolved, that the UNCW Faculty Senate recommends to the Chancellor, the Provost, and the deans that UNCW take coordinated steps to reduce its average class size to 25 or less. (Motion 98-7-22, carried)

   b. That Section IV of the Senate Bylaws be amended as follows [deletion, addition] and take effect upon the next vacancy among the UNCW Faculty Assembly delegation:
IV. Faculty Assembly Delegates

A. Three delegates shall be elected by the faculty to represent UNCW. The president of the Faculty Senate and two other delegates elected by the faculty shall represent UNCW as members of the Faculty Assembly of the UNC system.

B. Nominations for elected delegates shall be made by the Senate at the December meeting. Nominees may be members of the Senate or the general faculty; the Senate shall nominate no more than four (and no fewer than two) candidates for each delegate position.

C. A ballot which lists the nominees shall be distributed to the voting members of the faculty; faculty members shall be instructed to vote for one candidate; the candidate receiving the highest number of votes shall be the delegate.

D. Each elected delegate shall serve a term of three years; terms of the three elected delegates shall be staggered.

E. Delegates who are not members of the Senate shall attend meetings of the Senate to be informed of its actions, to receive its advice, and to report to it concerning the Faculty Assembly.

F. Alternates to the Faculty Assembly shall be selected from the pool of previous delegates by the president of the Faculty Senate on an as-needed basis. (Motion 98-7-23, carried without dissent)

2. The following motion by the Academic Standards Committee carried as amended below:

That the following statement be placed in the Undergraduate Catalogue at the beginning of the "Grades and Reports" section (page 73) and at the end of the "Transcripts" section (page 84):

Unless modified in accordance with established procedures, each grade assigned by faculty (including a grade of W or a grade in a course that has been repeated) is permanent and cannot be removed from a student's official record or transcript. (Motion 98-7-24, carried without dissent)

3. The following motions University Curriculum Committee were acted upon as follows:

a. That PLS 401 (Senior Seminar) be added to courses that fulfill the oral-communication competency requirement (Undergraduate Catalogue pp. 106, 139). (Motion 98-7-25, carried without dissent)

b. That the "supplemental foreign language credit" policy on pp. 70 and 126 of the Undergraduate Catalogue be amended as follows [deletion, addition]:

Students who complete, with a grade of "C" or better, a French, German, Latin, or Spanish course numbered 201 or higher (excluding 209, 210, 211, and 212) and who have received no AP credit, no transfer credit, and no 100-level prior credit at UNCW in that language shall be granted three hours of supplemental elective credit as follows:

- For completion of a 200-level course, the student shall receive three credit hours for the prior course in the sequence.
- For completion of a 300-level course, the student shall receive six credit hours for 201 and 202.

This credit shall not apply toward may be used to fulfill Basic Studies requirements. (Motion 98-7-26, carried)

c. That computer competency be a graduation requirement and that the following be inserted into the Undergraduate Catalogue immediately before the Required Oral Communication Competency (p. 106).
REQUIRED COMPUTER COMPETENCY
The University requires all students to be competent in basic computer skills, including knowledge of campus computer regulations, familiarity with standard applications, and awareness of legal and ethical issues. Competency is certified by the Office of Information Technology by means of testing and workshops. Completion of this requirement is denoted on the student's transcript by credit (0 hours) for Technology 100, Computer Essentials. Students are encouraged to demonstrate computer competency as early as possible in their academic careers. (Motion 98-7-27, Sent back to Committee)

Discussion of this motion questioned the availability of resources to implement the policy. The motion was referred back to the committee for further study.

Old Business: None

New Business

1. The following motion offered by the Office of Academic Affairs and the Committee on Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure was postponed until a future date.

That the revised instructions for RPT recommendations (Attachment A see agenda) and the revised RPT reporting format (Attachment B see agenda) be adopted to replace the existing instructions (p. 230 of the Faculty Handbook) and format (pp. 228, 228A, and 229 of the Handbook). (Motion 98-7-28, no action)

A motion was offered from the floor to amend 98-7-28 by removing all references to Question 16 of the SPOT evaluations. This motion will appear in the next agenda.

- The following motion offered by the Department of History was postponed until the next meeting:

Existing Basic Studies courses that are being recast as web-based (distance) courses are new courses, which require submission of appropriate course action forms to the University Curriculum Committee and approval by the Faculty Senate. (Motion 98-7-29, no action)

Announcements: none

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Submitted by: Raymond L. Burt
President Richard Veit called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

Roll Call

Absent were: Baker (Budget Ctme.), Berkeley (History), Brunson (Comm. Studies), Buttino (Univ. Advancement Ctme.), Canel (Prod. & Dec. Sciences), Gaudet (Earth Sciences), Hackney (Biology), Heller (Fin. Aid Ctme.), Howell (Econ. & Fin.), Leutze (Chancellor), Macie (Art & Theater), S. McLaurin (Mathematics), Moss (Provost), Ragon (HPER), Roscher (Accounting), Sawyer (Accounting), Sayigh (Research Ctme.), Smith (Earth Sciences), Thomas (FLL), and Wadman (Econ. & Finance)

Approval of Minutes

The February minutes were approved with the following corrections offered by Ken Spackman:

The first bulleted paragraph on page two of the March minutes contains factual errors and misstates the Chancellor's request of the Senate. Contrary to the minutes, Motion 98-7-28 does not contain revisions to RPT guidelines or criteria nor does it address the issue of linking promotion to tenure. That motion deals solely with revisions in the format and instructions for RPT recommendations. The statement "The guidelines presented in the agenda are prescriptive and less flexible" is erroneous since no revisions to RPT guidelines were presented in the agenda. Finally the Chancellor did not recommend that "the RPT documents be referred back to committee for further consideration." Instead, he asked that a committee be charged with examining the guidelines and criteria for promotion and tenure to determine if there are inconsistencies, and to recommend improvements.

Individual Reports

1. President of the Senate Richard Veit reported as follows:

   • He welcomed Jim Walters as the new Director of Admissions.
   • On Friday, 24 April, fifty trees will be planted in honor of UNCW's fiftieth anniversary.
   • Motions 98-7-24, 98-7-25, and 98-7-26 were approved by the Chancellor and Provost and will appear in the next supplement of the catalogue.

2. Faculty Assembly Representative Ken Gurganus made a special announcement:

   • UNCW's Dan Noland has been elected vice-chair of the Faculty Assembly for next year.

3. Faculty Assembly Representative Dan Noland made the following report:

   • The Assembly requested that President Broad reconsider the 150-day academic calendar. She responded that this may be reconsidered at some future date.
President Broad has met with various student-body presidents who have indicated that, of the three forms of advising (academic, career and faculty mentoring), students are most interested in faculty mentoring.

**Old Businesss**

1. The following motion by the Office of Academic Affairs and the Committee on Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure carried after debate:

   That the revised instructions for RPT recommendations (see Attachment A of the March agenda) and the revised RPT reporting format (see Attachment B of the March agenda) be adopted to replace the existing instructions (p. 230 of the Faculty Handbook) and format (pp. 228, 228A, and 229 of the Handbook). **(Motion 98-7-28)**

   The following amendment by Keith Newlin of the English Department was defeated:

   That the proposed RPT Instructions and Form in **Motion 98-7-28** be amended by deleting the following references to Question 16 as indicated:

   1. Instructions: II.A.4. "Report of SPOT Question 16 by semester"
   2. Instructions: II.B.2.a.i.1. all of the candidate's SPOT summaries--the printouts summarizing results of all 16 evaluation questions--over the most recent two-and-one-half years, as well as copies of the Question 16 Section Summaries and frequency graphs over the same period. All SPOT results should be organized in reverse chronological order.
   3. Form: IV.A.3. This must include a "Report of SPOT Question 16 by semester," prepared in a standard format by the Office of Institutional Research.

   In discussion, Newlin indicated that the amendment was intended to begin the process of "de-emphasizing" Question 16 over the other questions in SPOT. Question 16 seems to focus on the popularity of professors, asking students to compare them with all others from whom they have taken courses.

   Ken Spackman of the Committee on Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure spoke against the amendment. He gave a presentation on the background of the new form "Report of SPOT Question 16 by semester." A 1995 Senate study had revealed strong evidence that Question 16 was a valid measure of students' perceptions of teaching. The Senate adopted Appendix J in the Faculty Handbook with the intention of placing the results of Question 16 into proper context for evaluators. The amendment on the floor would increase the danger that Question 16 would be misinterpreted or overemphasized by evaluators.

   After the discussion the motion for the amendment was defeated. **Motion 98-7-28** carried without dissent.

2. The following motion was offered by the Department of History:

   Existing Basic Studies courses that are being recast as web-based (distance) courses are new courses, which require submission of appropriate course action forms to the University Curriculum Committee and approval by the Faculty Senate.

   The discussion revolved around the question as to whether courses taught over the web are "substantially new" courses or whether the web is merely a delivery mechanism for courses already approved by the Curriculum Committee. After discussion, this motion was replaced by a substitute motion offered from the floor, which then carried:

   Distance-learning courses shall be subject to the same departmental quality control and other
standard departmental procedures as any other courses offered by that department. They shall be offered and scheduled only by the academic department from which course credit shall be awarded.  
*(Motion 98-7-29, carried without dissent)*

### Committee Reports

1. The following motion of the **Academic Standards Committee** carried without dissent:

   That the following sentence be added at the end of the first paragraph of the section "Withdrawal Policy for Undergraduate Students" (page 84 of the current *Undergraduate Catalogue*):

   If a student is suspended after the deadline for withdrawal with a "W", each instructor shall assign a grade of "WF" or "W" based upon the student's academic performance prior to the suspension.

   To facilitate this process, a grade-assignment form should be developed and sent to each faculty member who teaches the suspended student. This form should then be sent to the Registrar with a copy to the Dean of the College or School.  
*(Motion 98-8-30, carried without dissent)*

- The ad hoc **Committee on the Direct Election of UNCW's Graduate Council**'s motion carried without dissent:

   That the Senate recommend to the Graduate Council the following changes (see Attachment C of the April agenda) to Articles V and VII of the *Bylaws of the Graduate Faculty* so that a ballot to amend the *Bylaws* may be sent to the Graduate Faculty during the Fall 1998 semester.  
*(Motion 98-8-31, carried without dissent)*

- The following motion by the ad hoc **Committee on Evaluation of Faculty** was postponed:

   That no change be made to Section IV.D.4. of Appendix A of the Faculty Handbook, which reads:

   When circumstances warrant, an evaluation may be initiated by the department chairperson, the appropriate dean, the provost and vice chancellor for Academic Affairs, or the chancellor.

   but that a separate appendix, entitled "Policy on Implementation of Appendix A, Section IV.D.4." (see March agenda Attachment D), be added to the Handbook.  
*(Motion 98-8-32, postponed)*

Melton McLaurin of the Provost's Office asked that this motion be delayed until the next Senate meeting. The delay is necessary to give the university counsel time to study some possible technical problems in the wording of this motion. The Senate voted to postpone the motion until the first meeting in the Fall.

- The following motion by the **University Curriculum Committee** carried after discussion:

  a. That the Basic Studies requirement for Group F, Social and Behavioral Sciences, be changed from a minimum of 3 and a maximum 9 hours to a minimum of 6 and a maximum of 12 hours with no more than 6 hours from any one discipline.

  b. That the Basic Studies requirement for Group E, Natural and Mathematical Sciences, be changed from a minimum of 10 and a maximum of 15 hours to a minimum of 10 and a maximum of 16 hours.  
*(Motion 98-8-33, carried)*

### New Business

1. Chris Halkides of the Chemistry Department offered the following motion for consideration at the September
Whereas, the faculty and staff of UNC Wilmington have the right to a civil and professional working environment,

Whereas, students who use the SPOT forum to engage in personal attacks or to indulge in boorish or otherwise unacceptable behavior, by violating the codes of civil behavior, have forfeited the privilege of taking part in the evaluation of the faculty and staff,

Be it resolved by the faculty senate that SPOT forms be screened for their content prior to their use in numerical evaluation. Those that are judged vulgar, obscene, or which contain personal attacks as opposed to constructive criticism will not be used in evaluating instructors, nor will the instructors be given these forms, unless they so choose. (Motion 98-8-34)

Announcements

1. The Carolina Colloquia is having a conference on teaching in July on the topic: Issues and Challenges for Experienced Faculty. CTE has some limited funds for participants. Applications have been distributed to the departments.

2. Ballots for the Spring elections will be sent out next week (April 27). Be sure to send them in.

3. Teresa Krebs, a Spanish and French major, has been awarded a Fulbright grant. There will be a workshop on April 29 in the Library Auditorium for undergraduates and graduates interested in applying next year.

4. The North Carolina Fulbright Alumni Association is holding its yearly cultural event and forum at UNCW this weekend. Faculty were invited to attend.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Submitted by: Raymond L. Burt
President Richard Veit called the meeting to order at 2:30.

Roll Call

Absent were: Applefield (Curricular Studies), Appleton (Accounting & Business Law) Bartl (Biology), Combs (Univ. Curriculum Comm.), Earney (Accounting & Business Law), Evans (Sociology & Anthropology), Galbraith (Management & Marketing), Howell (Economics & Finance), Kasala (Mathematics), Macie (Library Comm.), Moore (Public Service Comm.), Rockness (Dean, Business Admin.) Sayigh (Research Comm.), Seaton (Chemistry), Thomas (Bookstore Comm.), Walker (Admissions Comm.), Wray (Production & Design).

Approval of Minutes: The April minutes were approved.

Special Order of the day

Bruce McKinney was reelected as Vice President. Raymond Burt was reelected as Secretary. Other members of the Steering Committee are Ann Crawford, Ken Gurganus, Steve McNamee, and John Williams.

Individual Reports:

1. Chancellor's Report
   - Hurricane Bonnie caused $700,000 damage to the university, including roof damage and leaks in some buildings. Forty trees were lost. The university is covered by insurance and is also seeking repair monies from General Administration. Provost Moss has issued a schedule to make up lost days, including small alterations to the exam schedule. Exams will end at the same date.
   - The Provost Search Committee will be headed by Jim McNab, Director of International Programs. This committee should meet as quickly as possible. The ad will include a statement about sensitivity to use of technology. This will be a national search and on-campus candidates are welcome as well. We hope to bring candidates on campus by late January. We expect 100-120 applicants. If we do not find an acceptable candidate, the Chancellor will ask Provost Moss to continue until we do. Of the 14 members, approximately half will come from faculty ranks. Others will include the student body president and representatives from the staff, alumni, Student Affairs, Business Affairs, Public Service, and Trustees.
   - He called on Denis Carter, Associate Provost for Enrollment Affairs, who reported that a record number of new first-year students, 1,716, and 894 new transfer students enrolled this fall. The number of first-year students enrolling was higher than the trend analysis projected due to a higher than expected “show rate.” In spite of the increased enrollment the quality indicators continued to rise – average high school GPA and average SAT’s were higher by about .02 and 2 points, respectively. UNCW’s total enrollment is now about 9,600 students (headcount) or approximately 3% above budgeted FTE. While there were improvements in most areas, fewer African American
first-year students enrolled this fall. Total African American enrollment declined from 559 a year ago to 521 this fall. At the same time, African American first-year student retention rose to an all-time high of about 86%. Chancellor Leutze mentioned that President Broad had shown concern for the impact that legislation and court action in California, Texas and Maryland may have on the enrollment of African Americans at UNC institutions.

- The report from the Chancellor's Steering Committee on Information Technology is almost complete. They have seven major recommendations. It will call for some reorganization of the way we handle technology and in the role of the Technology College.
- Currently there are 332 students in 70 Technology College Courses and distance courses on the Web.
- We have finalized our agreement with the Japanese and will be offering a course in Nursing. We may also be offering courses in France, Germany, and Israel.
- Schwartz Hall has opened a 24-hour computer lab.
- Patton McDowell has been asked to serve as interim Vice Chancellor for Development. The Chancellor has appointed fund-raising officers for each college and school. Please identify possible donors to your dean. We had a record year in our fund raising last year and closed out our $25 million campaign last year. The sale of a water system owned by the Dobo brothers will include a significant trust-fund gift to the university.
- The legislature is still in session, and the salary increase is in limbo. This may delay the starting date of the salary raises. Both houses have agreed to help fund the new Education Building, although nothing is official yet.
- The 1898 Symposium hosted by UNCW will be held October 23-24. The Website is drawing national attention: [http://www.uncwil.edu/dpsee/1898/](http://www.uncwil.edu/dpsee/1898/)
- A Board of Visitors has been appointed as a way of identifying prospective students and donors. Names of board members will soon be public.
- He seeks responses to a new five-year plan. The web site is: [http://www.uncwil.edu/oir/Planning_Folder/General_public_comments.html](http://www.uncwil.edu/oir/Planning_Folder/General_public_comments.html).

2. President of the Senate Richard Veit announced that motions approved by the Senate in April have been approved. He also gave a brief orientation to Senate procedures.

**Committee Reports:** None

**Old Business**

1. The following motion by the ad hoc Committee on Evaluation of Faculty carried:

   That no change be made to Section IV.D.4. of Appendix A of the Faculty Handbook, which reads:

   When circumstances warrant, an evaluation may be initiated by the department chairperson, the appropriate dean, the provost and vice chancellor for Academic Affairs, or the chancellor.

   but that a separate appendix, entitled "Policy on Implementation of Appendix A, Section IV.D.4" be added to the Handbook (see Attachment A below). **(Motion 98-8-32, carried)**

   The following motion by Chris Halkides of the Chemistry Department was defeated:

   Whereas, the faculty and staff of UNCW have the right to a civil and professional working environment,

   Whereas, students who use the SPOT forum to engage in personal attacks or to indulge in boorish or otherwise unacceptable behavior, by violating the codes of civil behavior, have forfeited the privilege of taking part in the evaluation of the faculty and staff,

   Be it resolved by the Faculty Senate that SPOT forms be screened for their content prior to their use in numerical evaluation. Those that are judged vulgar, obscene, or which contain personal attacks as opposed to constructive criticism will not be used in evaluating instructors, nor will the
instructors be given these forms, unless they so choose.  **(Motion 98-8-34, defeated)**

**New Business**

1. The following motion by Lindsay Aegerter and Barbara Waxman of the English Department carried as amended:

   Whereas, the UNCW faculty includes numerous highly productive scholars who are deserving of recognition, and
   Whereas, the forms of scholarship produced in different academic disciplines vary widely and cannot easily be compared, and
   Whereas, UNCW offers many awards to faculty to recognize teaching but only one award to recognize scholarship; therefore,
   The Faculty Senate proposes that at least three awards for faculty scholarship/artistic achievement be presented each academic year.  **(Motion 99-1-1, carried)**

**Announcements**

- Richard Veit and Melton Maclaurin will hold a presentation to the faculty on the Post Tenure Review policy on September 9th at 3:00 p.m.
- The Fall Faculty meeting will be in Cameron Hall on Thursday at 4:00 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Submitted by: Raymond L. Burt

**Attachment A : "Policy on Implementation of Appendix A, Section IV.D.4"**

(Amendments are shown as follows: additions, deletions)

An evaluation of a faculty member may be initiated by the department chairperson*, the academic dean, the provost and vice chancellor for academic affairs, or the chancellor, when three conditions are met:

a. the administrator believes that compelling circumstances exist to justify the evaluation, and
b. neither the next scheduled annual evaluation nor the next scheduled post-tenure review is sufficiently timely or sufficiently comprehensive to address the circumstances, and no other provision exists to deal with the situation.

The procedures for conducting such an evaluation are as follows.

1. The administrator shall notify the faculty member to be evaluated, in writing, of the reasons for initiating the evaluation and of the scope of the intended evaluation. Copies of this notification shall be sent to the provost, the dean, and the department chairperson.
2. The faculty member is guaranteed due process and the right of appeal as specified in the **Code** and the **Faculty Handbook**.
3. In all cases, the provost shall appoint a committee of at least three tenured faculty members who are to conduct the evaluation. **If the provost initiates the review, the chancellor shall appoint the committee.**
4. The administrator who initiated the evaluation shall assemble the appointed committee in person, charge the committee with its duties, and lay out a timetable for the completion of its task. The written notification to the faculty member being evaluated shall be made available to the committee.
5. The committee members shall be explicitly authorized to have access to confidential records of the evaluated faculty member, access ordinarily confined to those directly involved in evaluation for the purpose of reappointment, promotion, tenure, or annual departmental review. This shall include access to annual reviews and to student and peer evaluations of teaching.
6. The faculty member being evaluated shall have the right to review all evidence presented to the committee and to meet with meet with the evaluating committee for the purpose of presenting information relevant to the
evaluation.
7. The evaluating committee shall report its recommendations in writing to the administrator who initiated it, with copies to the provost, the dean, the department chairperson, and to the faculty member being evaluated.
8. Within sixty (60) calendar days from the date of assembly of the committee, the faculty member being evaluated and the evaluating committee shall be notified in writing of the outcome of the evaluation, with copies to the provost, the dean, and the department chairperson.

*For the purposes of this policy, "chairperson" shall include the University Librarian.*
President Richard Veit called the meeting to order at 2:30.

Roll Call

Absent were: Adams (Nursing), Bartl (Biology), Blundo (Library Comm.), Clifford (English), Dodd (Biological Sciences), Earney (Accounting & Business Law), Hackney (Biological Sciences), Lawson (Economics & Finance), McCarthy (History), Moss (Provost), and Smith (Earth Sciences).

Approval of Minutes: The September minutes were approved.

Individual Reports:

1. Chancellor James Leutze reported as follows:
   - The General Assembly is still in session with no full budget approved yet. Two items of interest for UNCW are potentially at risk. First, the General Assembly is talking about using funds now used for repair and renovation for technology. Second, the Senate has not approved funds needed for the construction of our new Education Building. We hope that they will do so soon. Faculty will see merit increases and bonus reflected in the October paycheck, as well as retroactive payment to July. If they have not already been notified, faculty will hear this week on the amount of their raises.
   - There have been some questions from faculty as to why the Provost Search Committee includes four administrators. This is justified by the fact that the provost is acting chancellor during the chancellor's absence from campus, and all other vice chancellors then report to the provost. The majority of the committee is faculty, and faculty have the predominance of votes on the committee.

   • President of the Senate Richard Veit reported as follows:
     - The post-tenure review policy requires faculty to provide SPOT results for the last five years. The Office of Institutional Research, which currently provides a summary of SPOT question 16 for RTP candidates, will now provide the summary for the last five years for faculty undergoing post-tenure review.
     - The university now offers a number of online courses. Dick Ward will report on the progress of these courses at the next Senate meeting.

   • Faculty Elections Officer Ann Crawford reported as follows:
     - Barbara Waxman (English) was elected to the Committee on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion. In response to questions from faculty who asked why they never received a nomination ballot for the recent election, she explained that the vacancy on the committee was for Division I and thus nominations only came from that division. The final ballot was sent to the entire faculty.

   • Faculty Assembly Delegate Dan Noland reported as follows:
     - Representatives from all 16 faculties will gather on November 5 in Chapel Hill to formulate a policy on intellectual property and copyright issues.
Committee Reports:

1. The **Faculty Welfare Committee** presented a report on faculty short-term disability issues. A motion to suspend the agenda to allow an immediate vote on motions was approved without dissent. The following motions then carried:

   a. Whereas the University of North Carolina at Wilmington offers at modest cost a UNC system-coordinated supplemental disability insurance plan provided by Liberty Mutual designed for faculty participating in the State retirement system (TSERS), and

      Whereas the supplemental program for TSERS participants implemented in 1996, with a current participation rate of 25% of eligible faculty, is a discretionary, but underutilized benefit of great value to the other 75% of eligible faculty who tend to have been employed by the University for longer periods of time, and

      Whereas there is an open enrollment period available October 19—November 13 for those TSERS participants who have not enrolled in the Liberty Mutual plan who may do so without being required to provide medical evidence of insurability as would ordinarily be required,

      Therefore, be it resolved, that the Faculty Senate urges all TSERS participants to review now the status of their disability benefit policies and strongly urges those who are not members of the Liberty Mutual Voluntary Supplemental Group Disability Insurance Plan to seriously consider taking advantage of the open enrollment period. *(Motion 99-2-5, carried without dissent)*

   b. Whereas the University of North Carolina at Wilmington offers at very modest cost a UNC system-coordinated supplemental disability insurance plan provided by TIAA designed for faculty participating in the Optional Retirement Program (ORP), and

      Whereas the supplemental program for ORP participants, with a current participation rate in excess of 95% of eligible faculty, is a discretionary benefit of great value to remaining eligible faculty,

      Therefore, be it resolved, that the Faculty Senate urges all ORP participants to review now the status of their disability benefit policies and strongly urges those who are not members of the TIAA Group Long-Term Disability Plan to seriously consider enrolling now even though medical evidence of insurability will be required for faculty employed by UNCW for more than 31 days. *(Motion 99-2-6, carried without dissent)*

   c. Whereas the Provost and the Faculty Welfare Committee recognize the need for a clear and fair campus-wide procedure for handing requests for extended time away from work due to disability, and

      Whereas Section VII.D.4 of the Faculty Handbook entitled "Disability Coverage" does not address any salary continuation plan during the 60-day exclusion period before the commencement of benefits under the North Carolina Disability Income Plan (which covers all employees), and

      Whereas the Provost has outlined a salary continuation proposal designed to provide among faculty—temporarily disabled including disability related to childbirth—equal treatment and consistent administration of university benefits and to provide to affected departments the resources to continue class coverage and other duties of disabled employees,

      Therefore, be it resolved, that the Faculty Senate commend the Provost for his attention to the need of a salary continuation policy, and

      Be it further resolved, that the Faculty Welfare Committee assist the Provost in the further refinement of a salary continuation policy, for eventual approval by the Faculty Senate, that will provide in the case of an approved leave the following:

      1. informal, collegial coverage of responsibilities of the absent faculty member for an initial period not to exceed two (or some other number to be determined) weeks.

      2. after two (or some other number) weeks, formal notification of the absent faculty members status to the Human Resources Department by the department.

      3. a. subsequent salary continuation for the faculty members at a 100% level of base salary for the ensuing 60-day exclusion period of NC-DIP (or end of the disability which ever ends first) including employees with less than 1 year of service.
b. salary continuation at a 50% level of base salary for periods of 61-90 days of disability for employees with less than one year of service.

4. and also subsequent to (2), funding from the Provost or Dean to the department to recruit temporary faculty to cover the duties of the disabled faculty member.

5. This policy does not affect the status of departmental negotiations between faculty and departmental chairs concerning work schedules and assignments or leaves without pay. (Motion 99-2-7, carried without dissent)

2. The following motion by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee carried:

   That a policy be developed by the Building and Grounds Committee, with input from faculty and ratification by the Faculty Senate, on the use of the University Common for public functions, and that the policy specify what restrictions, if any, should be placed on amplified microphones and amplified music, both at times when classes are in session and on weekends/holidays, and, if the policy should permit noise levels that might interfere with the normal use of adjacent faculty offices, classrooms, or parts of Randall Library, that affected parties, including faculty in the affected offices, be given timely prior notice of functions that might render their workspaces unusable. (Motion 99-2-2, carried)

3. The following motion from the University Curriculum Committee carried:

   That the following courses be approved as Basic Studies courses:

   1. GRN 101: Introduction to Gerontology, in Category G (Interdisciplinary Perspectives)
   2. P&R 233: African Religions, in Category C (Humanities)

   and that the designation "EGNL" be approved for laboratory sections to accompany EGN courses. (Motion 99-2-3, carried)

Old Business: None

New Business

1. The following motion from the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures was referred to the University Curriculum Committee:

   Whereas a goal of the Basic Studies requirement in foreign languages is that UNCW students attain a certain level of proficiency in a second language, and
   Whereas a realistic target level is at an intermediate level of proficiency in that language,
   Therefore, be it resolved, that the University waive the language requirement for entering students who place into the 300 level or above of a foreign language. (Motion 99-2-4, referred to the Curriculum Committee)

Announcements

1. Chairs of Senate committees would meet immediately following adjournment.

2. The Symposium on Wilmington in 1898 will take place on October 23rd and 24th. The event is free and open to the public. Faculty and students are encouraged to attend.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Submitted by: Raymond L. Burt
President Richard Veit called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

Roll Call

Absent were: Ainsley (Stu. Aff. Com.), Appleton (A&BL), Baker (Budget Com.), Blundo (Lib. Com.), Burt (FLL), Buttino (Comm. Stud.), Cummings (Nur), Earney (A&BL), Galbraith (M&M), Hackney (Bio.), Howell (Economics & Finance), Hobbs (Foreign Lang. & Lit.), Hunt (Mgt. & Mktg.), Morden (Fin. Aid Com.), Noland (Eng.), Parish (Bookstore Com.), Parnell (Lib.), Rockness (CSBA), Sargent (A&T), and Wray (P&DS).

Approval of Minutes: The September minutes were approved.

Individual Reports:

1. Chancellor James Leutze reported as follows:
   - The General Assembly has approved its budget. UNCW and the UNC system did well. UNCW received $1.8 million for the education building. Seventy-five million dollars was approved for the UNC system for technology; more technology money is coming. $106 million has been budgeted for UNCW. One-half of this will come from state appropriations and the rest from tuition and fees. UNCW spends $710,000 a year for academic computing alone, so 1/10 of this money will be for academic computing. This money will basically maintain the status quo and will not be any help for the distance-learning programs. More money needs to be spent on developing technology. UNCW asked for a 6% raise from the General Assembly and didn't get it. We have plenty of other needs in technology as well: money is needed for staff to teach use of technology—we will need several hundred million dollars to do this effectively.
   - The UNC system says that by 2008 UNCW should have an enrollment of 15,500. The Chancellor did not think that this was possible unless drastic measures are taken—he noted that if we are to have this enrollment by 2008 we will need at least four new buildings the size of the New Science Building. By 2006 the Chancellor thinks that 12,500 should be the realistic enrollment.
   - The meeting of the first Board of Visitors was held; 40 of 60 attended. The University needs to spread its reach beyond Board of Trustees to promote itself beyond a small Southeastern, North Carolina delegation to help identify additional sources of revenue.
   - UNCW was part of the 1898 Foundation. There was a two-day affair on campus where John Hope Franklin Spoke. The Chancellor was impressed by the presentations and the commitment towards better racial relations in Wilmington. The Chancellor thanked Jim Megivern and Melton McLaurin for their participation and work to make this event a success. Melton McLaurin spoke about the final commemorative program held at Thalian Hall. The Chancellor feels there needs to be a follow-through on the Centennial with one goal of increasing African-American tourism in Wilmington.
Dick Ward of the Chemistry Department reported on on-line courses:
- Summer 1998 Initiatives were used to develop on-line courses, which are just a small part of distance learning at UNCW. Web-based courses at UNCW were developed through 10 faculty grants which were to develop basic studies on-line courses. Dr. Ward identified 15 courses enrolling 380 students, of which about 95% are traditional students. Assessment will be done at the end of the semester. The goal is high quality, high context interaction. Next spring there will be nine courses offered; the goal for next year is 15-30 Web-based courses.

President of the Senate Richard Veit reported as follows:
- Some students have requested that SPOTs be made public so students could consult them while selecting courses. SPOTs were intended only as an evaluation instrument to be interpreted only with great care and in combination with other evaluation instruments; consequently, scores should not be available to the public.
- Institutional Research sought faculty reaction about putting certain documents (grade distributions by faculty member and instructor, faculty workload) on-line with restrictions on who would have access to them. This would save on printing costs. A discussion followed regarding privacy, interpretation of such information, and FOIA implications.

Faculty Assembly Delegate Ken Gurganus reported as follows:
- In two days, the delegates had seven meetings involving copyright issues. It was stressed that users of the Web must be careful not to use copyrighted materials. Companies actually have hired individuals to search the web for copyright infringement.
- President Broad says the faculty benefits package does not compare favorably to other systems with respect health care and retirement contributions.

Committee Reports:

The following motions from the Academic Standards Committee were acted upon:

a. That the Three-Year Rule [see Agenda Appendix A] be repealed. (Motion 99-3-8, returned to committee)

   In debate, some argued that the monitoring provisions of the rule were unenforceable. Others argued that students showing marked improvement deserved a second chance. Others argued that the policy language needed to make clear that readmission under the rule was a privilege, not a right. The Senate returned the matter to the committee for further study.

b. That the course-repeat policy be modified to enable a student receiving a grade of C- for a course to repeat that course; i.e., that, in the first line of the policy [see Agenda Appendix B], that "C" be substituted for "C-"; and that the opening of the second paragraph be altered to read: "Students who receive a grade of 'C-', 'D+', 'D', 'D-' or 'F' in a course taken at ..." (Motion 99-3-9, failed in tie vote)

Old Business: None

New Business: None

The meeting was adjourned at 4:14 p.m.

Submitted by: Bruce McKinney
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President Richard Veit called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

Roll Call

Absent were: Adams (NUR), Ainsley (Stud. Aff. Ctme.), Bartolome (Curric Stud), Blundo (Library Cmte.), Crawford (Spec Stud), Earney (A&BL), Galbraith (M&M), Jones (CHM), McLaurin (MAT), Moore (Pub. Serv. Ctme.), Morden (Fin. Aid Ctme.), Moss (Provost), Myers (A&T), Parnell (LIB), Rack (MUS), Ragon (HPER), Seidman (HST), Spivack (ERS), and Wray (PDS).

Approval of Minutes: The November minutes were approved.

Special Order of the Day: Richard Veit was reelected as Faculty Senate President for 1999-2000.

Individual Reports:

1. Chancellor James Leutze reported as follows:

UNCW has not received a fair share of funds for tuition remission for graduate students. The last time they were awarded, for example, 240 tuition remissions were given out in the UNC system, and UNCW received only one of those. This year we were told we would obtain 3% of the total allocated or approximately 28 remissions, worth $204,000. Later, however, General Administration informed us that a provision had been added to the bill at the last minute that eliminated UNCW and other comprehensive universities from access to tuition remission funds. This alteration was the result of a lobbying effort by faculty of the research institutions. Even General Administration was unaware that the change had been made to the bill. Thus UNCW will not receive any tuition remission funds this year. It is not fruitful to attempt at this late date to pressure legislators to rescind this provision. The best we can do is to convince the legislature that the comprehensive universities deserve their fair share of these funds in future. Apart from the loss of tuition remissions, the Chancellor is concerned that this maneuver sets a bad precedence for the system and does not bode well for future support for our graduate programs. The Chancellor feels that we have committed ourselves to these programs and he will find funds for 14 remissions this year only. This is only a temporary solution, as such funds must be taken from other purposes. We cannot afford this kind of support in the long run. Nevertheless, any graduate students who are recruited with remissions can expect the university to continue to support them as long as they qualify for such funding.

2. President Richard Veit thanked John Myers for his service as parliamentarian. John has a scheduling conflict next semester. Anyone interested in serving as parliamentarian should contact the president.

Committee Reports:

1. The following motions by University Curriculum Committee were acted upon [amendments that carried are denoted as follows: additions, deletions]:

   a. That the following changes be made to Basic Studies requirements (Motion 99-4-10):
i. That THR 136 (Movement Exploration), MUS 101 (Theory), MUSL 101 (Aural Skills, Keyboard & Sight Singing I), and MUS 140 (Basic Piano for Non-Majors) be added under Category D, Fine Arts.  (Carried as amended)

ii. That NSG 215 (Foundations for Contemporary Nursing Practice) be deleted from courses meeting the oral-competency requirement; that the following courses be added to courses meeting the oral-competency requirement: NSG 330 (Nursing Process I: Nursing Management of Clients with Basic Health Needs across the Lifespan), 370 (Nursing Process II: Nursing Management of Clients with Acute Health Problems), 389 (Family Nursing), and 489 (Chronic Illness Nursing).  (Carried)

iii. That the designation EVSL be approved for laboratory sections to accompany EVS (Environmental Studies) courses.  (Carried)

iv. That students who complete ENG 103 instead of ENG 101 and 102 for their composition requirement no longer receive a waiver of 3 hours from their Basic Studies requirement but be required to complete 45 hours of Basic Studies courses.  (Failed)

The change suggested in section iv. of the motion prompted much discussion.  The crux was whether demonstrations of proficiency by students in areas covered by Basic Studies courses warrant the reduction of the total required Basic Studies hours equal to the credit hours of the waived course(s).  Those who believe they do no (i.e., those in favor of the motion) argued that Basic Studies is not punitive but rather an opportunity to be exposed to a wide range of disciplines. The requirement of 45 hours in Basic Studies is not excessive and if students are waived from certain requirements within Basic Studies, requiring them to complete a total of 45 credit hours would not be a hardship.  Those arguing against the motion maintained that by requiring the students to complete additional Basic Studies classes in lieu of classes from which they are waived is unfair to good students whose preparation already includes some of the educational goals of Basic Studies.  They should be free to take more advanced classes. Moreover, the change would be a disincentive to recruitment of honors students.  Section iv. was defeated.

b. The following motion (originally from the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures) was approved after amendment [additions, deletions]:

Whereas a goal of the Basic Studies requirement in foreign languages is that UNCW students attain a certain level of proficiency in a second language, and

Whereas a realistic target level is at an intermediate level of proficiency in that language,

Therefore, be it resolved, that the University waive the language requirement for students who place into the 300 level or above of a foreign language who score at the 300 level or above on the foreign language placement exam.  Students must still complete 45 hours of basic studies credit.  (Motion 99-2-4, carried as amended)

A motion to return the motion to the University Curriculum Committee for reconsideration failed. Arguments for deleting the last sentence (which had been added to the FLL motion by the UCC) were the same as those regarding section iv. of the previous motion, above. The motion carried as amended.

Old Business: None

New Business

1. The following motion by Lloyd Rohler of the Communication Studies Department carried as amended [additions, deletions]:

Whereas, the Glass Room in the University Union has been used as a faculty-staff dining room for several
Whereas the ARA has recently been providing a buffet lunch at a reasonable price two a week, and
Whereas this dining area promotes collegiality between faculty and staff from different departments, and
Whereas there have been proposals to use the Glass Room for other purposes,
Therefore be it resolved by the UNCW Faculty Senate that the administration is hereby requested to continue the use of the Glass Room as a faculty-staff dining room.
(Motion 99-4-11, carried)

Representatives from Student Government said that SGA wished to make the Glass Room more student friendly. The building is primarily built for student needs with student funds. They do not wish to drive anyone out, but a closed-off section sends the wrong message to students. The need of faculty for a space of their own is valid, but the space should not be at the expense of the students. A proponent of the motion said that its intent was not to make the room exclusively for faculty and staff, but that information indicating that Business Affairs was planning to make an office out of this space prompted the resolution. The intent of the resolution is to maintain its function as a dining area. Business Affairs said that the room is not planned for offices. The plan is to relieve pressure for dining room space. Students do not have adequate space in the Hawk's Nest during lunch. It was agreed by all who spoke that students are welcome to participate in the buffet, which is offered twice weekly.

Announcements

1. Senators and guests in NSB 103 should honor the posted notices and refrain from bringing food and drink to the Senate meetings.
2. Dr. William Schabas will deliver the annual B. Frank Hall Lecture on "The Universal Declaration of Human Rights after 50 Years: Still a Common Standard of Achievement" in Cameron Auditorium on Thursday, December 10, at 8:00 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Submitted by: Raymond Burt, Secretary
President Richard Veit called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

Roll Call


Approval of Minutes

The December minutes were approved.

Individual Reports:

1. Chancellor Leutze's report included the following:

   - An update on the provost search: Close to 200 candidates applied for the position. The search committee recently requested videotaped responses to questions from 15 finalists. If we are not satisfied with the pool, we may turn to a search firm to seek out candidates. Our standards must be very high. If we are not successful this year, he will ask Provost Moss to stay on for an additional year.
   - The graduate tuition-remission issue: President Broad is unhappy that money allocated by the legislature for graduate tuition remission will go to only two institutions. Rather than initiate a confrontation on the matter, energies are being directed at next year’s legislative budget discussion. The Chancellor informed her that he is concerned with the principle involved and with the coherence of the system. He does not approach the legislature unless he has the approval of the Board of Governors, although it is unsettling that some other chancellors do not share this view.
   - UNCW will continue to be primarily an undergraduate institution with selected strong graduate programs. The next provost must be dedicated to a strong undergraduate institution that also places an emphasis on research. UNCW can play an important role in the system as a dedicated undergraduate institution. We should not be tempted to pursuing graduate programs for the sake of meeting the new funding formula. We should not focus on feeder degrees to Ph.D. programs but on graduate programs which lead to professions. He would rather have fewer really good graduate programs than many that are mediocre. Marine science is the only area in which a future doctoral program might be envisioned.
   - Between now and 2006, we would need a new building and planning money for the next new building each year to grow to 12,500, and that prospect is not bright. We will grow only as funds are made available to support growth adequately. The new building near Morton Hall will handle our current size. If the new School of Education building is approved this session, we will continue growth. If not, we will remain at current enrollment.
• North Carolina needs to increase the education level of its population. Estimates concerning the anticipated influx of students to the university system range from 35,000 to 45,000. However, for economic and social reasons, the actual percentage of the population participating in higher education should be higher.

• President of the Faculty Senate Richard Veit made the following report:

He provided an update on motion 98-6-20 which recommended revisions to the Graduate Bylaws. The Senate had been concerned that the structure of the Graduate Council is inconsistent with the Faculty Governance Document in that its members were the deans and their appointees. Following wide consultation, no opposition was encountered to a proposal to have the graduate faculty elect Council membership, and the Senate subsequently approved a recommendation to revise the Graduate Bylaws. The Graduate Council accepted most of this recommendation but opposed the provision that the chair be elected by the Council, preferring to retain the graduate dean as chair. This raised some governance concerns, especially inasmuch as all other faculty committees elect their own chairs. Following a meeting with Provost Moss, Graduate Dean Hadley, University Attorney Hal White, and the Senate president, it was agreed that a referendum should be submitted to the graduate faculty incorporating all recommendations of the Senate except for an elected chair. That issue would be deferred to a meeting of graduate faculty in 2001. If the Graduate Council approves this compromise, a referendum ballot should reach graduate faculty shortly.

Committee Reports:

1. The following motion by the University Curriculum Committee carried:

That the following courses be approved as meeting the oral-intensive requirement of Basic Studies:

• EDN 409 - Practicum (12)
• EDN 411 - Practicum (K-6, 6-9, special education) (12)
• EDN 465 - Practicum in Education of Young Children (B-K)

(Motion 99-5-12, passed without dissent)

2. The following motions by the Buildings and Grounds Committee did not carry:

a. That the temporary trailer units behind Friday Hall be removed before the Fall 1999 semester. (99-5-13, motion defeated)

The discussion highlighted the fact that these temporary buildings are used by Summer Programs, by biology faculty and even have classes currently scheduled in them.

b. Given the Chancellor's 10 November 1998 report on proposed enrollment figures of 12,500 by 2006 and 15,500 by 2008; and
Given that current university parking facilities have almost reached full capacity; and
Given the current moratorium on the construction of new parking facilities; and
Given the University's commitment to taking a leadership role within the community and to its shuttle bus service; therefore,
   Be it resolved that the following program be implemented by Fall 1999 to address university parking and traffic issues:

• To discourage repeated parking violations and excessive automobile use on campus, the university shall adopt a booting system for parking violations.
• After two parking violations on university property during a given semester,
automobiles will be booted. (99-5-14, referred to committee)

There was a motion from the floor to refer this matter to the Chancellor’s Parking and Traffic Improvement Committee. Discussion: The Senate vote could be considered as a recommendation to that committee. The Chancellor’s committee is currently gathering information about repeat offenders and will soon issue recommendations. Booting and towing are including in our list of recommendations. Motion to refer passed.

3. The following motion by the Steering Committee did not carry:

That the Campus Police employ greater vigilance and vigor in the ticketing of non-faculty/staff vehicles in faculty/staff lots. (Motion 99-5-15, defeated)

Police Chief Billy Dawson reported that 45,112 parking tickets were written last year, an increase from 37,265 in 1997. That is about as many as the campus police can write. Some felt that specific solutions should be included in motion. The way it is written, it seems to be a criticism of the parking enforcement. Chief Dawson promised to add diligence to enforcement during inclement weather.

An additional question was directed to Chief Dawson concerning recent thefts from faculty lockers. He reported that the culprit entered the area with a bolt cutter. Supervision is currently upgraded in the locker room, but faculty are urged to leave valuables in the trunks of their cars or in their desks.

Old Business: none

New Business: none

Announcements: none

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.
Submitted by: Raymond L. Burt
President Richard Veit called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

Roll Call

Absent were: Ainsley (Stud. Aff. Cmte.) Appleton (A&BL), Baker (Budget Cmte.), Bartolome (Curr. Stud.), Bennett (HPER), Buttino (Comm. Stud.), Combs (Univ. Curr. Cmte.), Dodd (BIO), Dunn (BIO), Earney (A&BL), Hackney (BIO), Jones (CHM), Leutze (Chancellor), McCarthy (HIS), Meinhold (PLS), Moore (Pub. Serv. Cmte.), Parish (Bookstore Cmte.), Ragon (HPER), Robinson (E&F), Rockness (BA), Smith (ERS), Walker (Admiss. Cmte.), and Wray (P&DS).

Approval of Minutes

The December minutes were approved as amended in the agenda.

Special Order of the Day

1. Executive session: honorary degree consideration. Senators voted on a nomination for the honorary degree.

2. Election of the Senate President-Elect: The current President, Richard Veit, informed the Senate that he has been appointed Acting Chair of the English Department and must decline the previous election as President for next year. Nominated from the floor were: John Williams (Psychology), Lynn Snowden (Sociology & Anthropology). Lynn Snowden was elected as President-Elect.

Individual Reports:

1. President of the Faculty Senate Richard Veit has invited the new Vice Chancellor for Instructional Technology, Bob Tyndall, to speak at the next Senate meeting.

2. Faculty Assembly Delegate Dan Noland called for faculty input on system-wide issues to be discussed with President Broad in Chapel Hill this Friday. Two issues were mentioned from the floor:
   - Graduate tuition remissions
   - Increase in health insurance rates

Committee Reports:

1. The following motion from the Evaluation Committee carried:

That the present Annual Faculty Evaluation of Administrators be administered over the internet instead of through campus mail, with the following provisions:

   a. That the questionnaire not change in content.
2. That the Director of Institutional Research be responsible for verifying to the Evaluation Committee that the questionnaire responses are confidential and that no effort is made to trace the input source.

3. That to administer the questionnaire, letters (one for each faculty member within the department) be sent to the departmental secretaries for distribution to faculty mailboxes. These letters will contain instructions for accessing the questionnaire on the internet. Each letter also will include a randomly generated number within the sealed envelope. These numbers will be used to identify the department of the respondent but only the individual faculty members will know their personal access numbers and will use the number when they complete the questionnaire.

4. That faculty can only enter their response once.

5. That faculty who are still concerned about the security of the questionnaire have the option of:
   i. entering their responses from a computer in a computer lab or office; or
   2. using a paper copy of the questionnaire which they can obtain from the Institutional Research office.

(Motion 99-6-16, carried without dissent)

Discussion of the motion pointed to savings in resources, time and effort in tabulation of results, and the general improvement of the process.

2. The following motion offered by The Academic Standards Committee was defeated:

That the following policy be adopted to replace the current "Three-Year Rule" (Undergraduate Catalogue Supplement, p. 10):

The Five-Year Rule

Although the traditional policy for re-admission is the norm, the University recognizes that individuals can gain personal and intellectual maturity over a period of years. Hence any former UNCW student whose quality point average was below the current Retention standard may apply for re-admission under the Five-Year Rule provided the student has been out of school for a minimum of five years and has not attended any other institution since leaving UNCW. The Five-Year Rule must be exercised at the time of application for re-admission and is irreversible. Degree requirements for the student granted admission under the Five-Year Rule will be those in effect at the time the student re-enrolls. The student's original academic record will not be altered, and the student will receive academic credit only for past courses in which a grade of at least 2.00 was attained. The student's quality point average will be calculated only for those courses taken subsequent to re-enrollment. Failure to maintain an overall 2.00 quality point average after re-admission will result in dismissal from the University. The Five-Year Rule can be invoked by a student only once.

(Motion 99-6-17, defeated)

Discussion brought forth the fact that the success rate of students currently admitted under the three-year rule is high, indicating that the current policy that is successful. Another issue of concern was the exclusion of students from other institutions or the fact that former UNCW students who took classes successfully at another institution would not be allowed admission under the proposed revision. There was support for the idea of holding the students to an "overall 2.00" instead of the current policy which requires a minimum 2.00 in each semester, and a future motion incorporating that revision is anticipated.

Old Business

New Business

1. The motion offered by Film Studies Coordinator Ellen Walters and Associate CAS Dean Steve Pullum carried:
Whereas several non-UNCW students inquire each semester about the possibility of obtaining a film studies internship in Wilmington through UNCW; and
Whereas UNCW students already have a difficult time obtaining a film studies internship due to the small number offered relative to the large number of UNCW film studies students,
Therefore, be it resolved that the following statement be place in the UNCW catalog:

Unless there is an official student internship exchange agreement with another college film program in the film studies office, film studies internships at UNCW are limited solely to UNCW degree-seeking students.

(Motion 99-6-18, carried without dissent)

2. Lee Schweninger of the English Department introduced the following motion, which was seconded and will appear on the next agenda:

Whereas, the current drop/add policy allows a student to enroll in a class a full week after classes have begun (in some cases, after missing as many as four class meetings); and Whereas, such a student may start a course already having missed more classes than an instructor might permit under the class attendance policy; and
Whereas, the first classes may be so essential to the course that a student who has missed them has a deficit that cannot be overcome; therefore,
Be it resolved that the drop/add policy be changed so that enrollment after a class has had its first meeting shall require the consent of the instructor. (Motion 99-6-19, new business)

Announcements: none

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.
Submitted by: Raymond L. Burt
President Richard Veit called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

Roll Call

Absent were: Adams (Dean, Nursing), Ainsley (Student Affairs Committee), Appleton (A&BL), Baker (Budget Committee), Buttino (Comm. Stud.), Earney (A&BL), Hadley (Dean, Grad. School), Howell (E&F), Hobbs (FLL), Moore (Nursing), Moore (Pub. Service Committee), Rack (Music), Robinson (E&F), Rockness (Dean, BA), Seaton (Chem.), Snowden (S&A), Tyndall (Dean, Ed.), Walker (Admissions Committee), and Wray (P&DS).

Approval of Minutes

The February minutes were approved.

Special Order of the Day

Executive session: Senators considered a nomination for an honorary degree.

Individual Reports:

1. Chancellor James Leutze gave the following report:

   a. The Senate requested clarification of the name "Global Virtual University." The designation "Virtual University" is a commonly applied term denoting a means of delivery and marketing of certain types of courses. UNCW uses the term to designate our current distance learning exchange of courses with Japan. Two types of courses are delivered: for-credit and not-for-credit. The for-credit courses were approved by the departments concerned in the same manner as courses offered on campus. Oversight of the GVU is handled by a steering committee which has a faculty chairperson. The terminology is being used at the request of the Japanese. It does not designate a separate entity within the university.

   b. Student Government wants to play a role in the selection of a graduation speaker. The traditional selection of speakers involved identification of prominent members of the community who volunteered their time to give the commencement address. The only compensation came in the form of an honorary degree, if nominated and approved by the Faculty Senate. This year the students have voted $10,000 to hire a speaker. They have requested that Student Government have a role in the selection of commencement speakers in the future. Student Government also requests that in the future the administration provide some matching funds. The Chancellor is happy to have the students play a role in the selection of a commencement speaker, but there are some logistical problems on future procedures yet to be worked out. If the students are involved the faculty should also be involved.

   c. Three strong candidates for the provost position have been on campus and we have one more scheduled. The faculty are encouraged to attend the public lectures and other meetings. The Provost Search
Committee plans to move quickly after the campus visits are concluded.

2. President of the Faculty Senate Richard Veit gave the following report:

a. Robert Tyndall, the Vice Chancellor designate for Information Technology, was unable to address the Senate today about his new division. He will address the April 20 Senate meeting.

b. President Veit expressed concerns about how financial rewards are allocated for teaching. Governor Hunt’s budget proposes that a portion of the next faculty salary increase be earmarked to reward teaching excellence. Should the legislature concur, Veit urges Academic Affairs to give chairs maximum leeway in distributing these increases. High morale occurs when faculty are rewarded in proportion to their desserts, and it is the chair's job to take all factors into account in determining an equitable salary distribution among faculty. Factors that tie chairs' hands lead to salary imbalances and impaired morale. The last time such a mandate occurred, our university raised the base salaries of 60 faculty by $2000 per year. No other UNC institution allocated the merit in this manner, which neither rewarded all excellent teachers (our faculty is notable for teaching excellence) nor rewarded faculty in proportion to their contributions nor took into account its effect upon carefully worked out salary balances among faculty. A decision now that might further increase the continuing rewards for those 60 faculty while giving no rewards to other deserving faculty would be a mistake.

A similar concern relates to UNCW's teaching awards, which have a pyramidal structure. Those who win the higher awards are generally those who have already won other teaching awards. This practice creates a small group of awardees and is no incentive for most faculty, who feel alienated from the possibility of becoming award winners. He recommends redistributing available award money so that awards may be offered to a larger number of faculty. He recommends that, insofar as possible, all awards have the same monetary value and that, except for the very highest awards, winners come from those who have not yet been rewarded.

Response from Chancellor Leutze: He is open to input in the process of determining a merit policy should the situation occur. As to the faculty teaching awards, there is no requirement that awardees have to have obtained previous awards. The awards are based on nominations from faculty.

c. Question from floor: Senate Motion 99-1-1 called for additional awards for excellence in faculty research. Where does that motion stand now? Response from Provost Moss: He would like to meet with a faculty committee to discuss the issue.

3. Faculty Assembly Delegate Dan Noland reported that our delegates expressed concern in the recent meeting with President Broad about the legislative decision to restrict all graduate tuition remissions to Chapel Hill and NCSU. Both Vice President for Planning Roy Carrol and President Broad were concerned by what occurred. UNCW is not alone in its outrage about the unfairness of the situation. There is a new proposal to rectify the situation in next year’s budget.

Committee Reports:

1. The following motion from University Curriculum Committee carried:

That the following course designators be approved:
CRW for Creative Writing
FST for Film Studies  
(Motion 99-7-20, carried without dissent)

Old Business:

1. The following motion from Lee Schweninger of the English Department was withdrawn:
Whereas, the current drop/add policy allows a student to enroll in a class a full week after classes have begun (in some cases, after missing as many as four class meetings); and
Whereas, such a student may start a course already having missed more classes than an instructor might permit under the class attendance policy; and
Whereas, the first classes may be so essential to the course that a student who has missed them has a deficit that cannot be overcome; therefore,
Be it resolved that the drop/add policy be changed so that enrollment after a class has had its first meeting shall require the consent of the instructor.  (Motion 99-6-19, withdrawn)

Discussion: The current policy implies that the first week of class doesn’t matter. Additionally, students not yet enrolled often attend the first meeting in hopes of entering the class. If non-attending students wait before dropping, then the faculty member would then have to over-enroll the class in order to allow the interested students into the course. Response from Associate Provost for Enrollment Affairs Denis Carter: Last spring an average of 4,591 add cards were processed per day during enrollment period. Currently departments can restrict enrollment in classes at registration. Thus there is a system to achieve the results desired by the motion. The enrollment could be frozen with no additional adds allowed, even if some drop. Additional adds could be allowed when signed by the faculty member. Professor Schweninger found this satisfactory and withdrew the motion.

New Business:

1. In response to a question from the floor, Joanne Nottingham gave an update on the recommendations of the Parking and Traffic Improvement Committee.

Announcements: none

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.
Submitted by: Raymond L. Burt
President Richard Veit called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

Roll Call

Absent were: Ainsley (Stud. Aff. Cmte.), Applefield (Curr. St.), Appleton (A&BL), Baker (Budget Cmte.), Bartolome (Curr. St.), Bingham (PHY), Bradley (PSY), Buttino (Comm. St.), Cummings (Nursing), Dodd (BIO), Dunn (BIO), Earney (A&BL), Evans (S&A), Howell (E&F), Hunt (M&M), Jones (CHM), Leutze (Chancellor), McKinney (Comm. St.), Moore (Nursing), Moore (Pub. Serv. Cmte.), Moss (Provost), Parnell (LIB), Ragon (HPER), Robinson (E&F), Rockness (Dean, Bus. Admin.), Shay (LIB), Walker (Adm. Cmte.), White (CRW.), and Wray (P&DS).

Approval of Minutes

The March minutes were approved.

Individual Reports:

1. Chancellor James Leutze was called out of town and could not report.

2. Vice Chancellor for Information Technology Systems Robert Tyndall gave a presentation on his new division, in which he described its mission and purpose, its vision statement, its organization, and its current initiatives.

Mission and Purpose of the Division is to coordinate and facilitate the various functions related to technology throughout the university. Three units currently fall under the division: Office of Information Technology (Bobby Miller), Management Information Support (Bill Pate), and Telecommunications (Bill Vereen). The mission: "to remove the artificial boundaries which inevitably arise in complex organizations."

Current initiatives include the following:

- Support to Web Course Development Team
- Upgrade the wiring on the campus
- 5 General Administration IT Strategies Task Forces
- Phase II (new personnel)
- Infrastructure Mapping Project to provide thorough information on the Web about UNCW's technical structure and resources
- Relationships of other functions (Technology College, Center for Teaching Excellence, etc)
- "Information Channel" web site for the division
- Analysis of Committees: There are 29 committees currently dealing with technology
- Executive Council Membership
- Advisory Committee Membership
Informational Technology Standards Committee
The Chancellor's goal of 24-hours 7-days-a-week student access to technology.

The next steps (May 1st to June 30th) include:

- Essential supporting infrastructure will be examined to determine the personnel needs for technical support.
- Future investment choices (fiber capacity, satellite uplinks, future networks, alliances, & wireless technologies)
- Research support and other technologies
- Expand a common glossary

Questions from the floor concerned funding from the General Administration and Y2K preparedness.

3. President of the Faculty Senate Richard Veit gave the following report:
   - Chancellor Leutze announced to the Faculty Advisory Council this morning that John C. Cavenaugh was offered the position for Provost and has accepted. If the Board of Governors approves the hire, he will begin in mid-July.
   - A list of Senate Motions approved by the Administration was read and will be reflected in the next Motions Log.
   - A farewell from the current president: This is his 24th final meeting as President of the Senate. He will continue to serve as a senator from his department. He expressed his view that the Faculty Senate is an essential institution for the university and he thanked all those who have served in the Senate and on the Steering Committee.

   A motion was then offered from the floor:

   The Senate wishes to express thanks to Richard Veit for his contributions and years of good service as President of the Faculty Senate. (Motion 99-8-23, approved without dissent)

4. Faculty Assembly Delegate Ken Gurganus gave the following report:
   In a meeting with President Molly Broad she reiterated important issues facing the system:
   - 40,000 additional students will seek to enroll in the UNC system in the next ten years.
   - Funds are needed for Instructional Technology.
   - Teacher preparation programs need expansion: estimates show that 80,000 new teachers are needed in NC in the next 4 to 10 years.

   Other topics:
   - President Broad realizes that faculty/staff benefits are not competitive with comparable institutions. The trustees of the State Health Plan have recommended that any increases in the costs of the health plan be covered by the state.
   - Faculty Welfare Committee reports the possibility that the state contribution to the Optional Retirement Plan may increase.
   - President Broad wishes to see more participation in budget preparation by faculty. In the Governor's budget, faculty salary increases are proposed at 5% (3% plus another 2% based upon teaching excellence). However, the President reminded the Assembly that much can happen to influence the final budget after the Governor's recommendations.
   - The Eva Klein firm studied UNC needs and determined that the system needs $7 billion maintenance money.
   - Faculty governance: The governor's committee of the Faculty Assembly met to discuss how the Boards of Trustees are selected. It should be noted that anybody can nominate candidates for Board of Trustees. Perhaps faculty should take a more active role in sending forward nominations. Last year UNCW had only 6 nominations for 4 open slots.
Committee Reports:

1. The **Computer Services Committee** offered the following motion:

   Whereas the language of the current name and charge of the Faculty Senate Computer Services Committee does not reflect current UNCW administrative units and incorporates names of administrative units no longer in existence,
   And whereas this language does not, in particular, take into account the formation of a Division of Information Technology Systems,
   Be it resolved that the name of the Computer Services Committee be changed to Faculty Senate Information Technology Committee and that the mission statement and membership statement be changed to read as follows:

   **Mission**
   To serve as an advisory liaison between the faculty senate and the Division of Information Technology Systems in the: (1) formulation of general information-technology policy; (2) development of information-technology services; and (3) allocation of information-technology resources.

   **Membership**
   Seven faculty members and one student member (to be nominated by the president of the Student Government Association), including membership from the College of Arts and Sciences, Randall Library, and the professional schools; the Vice Chancellor of Information Technology Systems; the Vice Chancellor for Business Affairs; the Director of Institutional Research, the Director of the Office of Information Technology, the Director of Management Information Support; the Director of Telecommunications; the University Librarian; the Vice-Chancellor for Student Affairs; and the deans of the schools and the College shall be ex-officio non-voting members.

   *(Motion 99-8-21, Carried without dissent)*

Old Business:

1. **Bruce McKinney of the Department of Communication Studies** offered the following motion:

   Whereas the University of North Carolina at Wilmington has a dedicated faculty who contribute in many ways to the enrichment of the university community and the community at large,
   And whereas service is considered one of the three major areas in which faculty are evaluated,
   And whereas the university recognizes faculty excellence in the areas of teaching and scholarship but offer no awards for service,
   Therefore, the Faculty Senate resolves that an award be established for faculty who contribute significantly in the area of service to the department, college, university, profession, and/ or community.

   *(Motion 99-8-22, referred to an ad-hoc committee for further study)*

New Business:

1. The **Research Committee** introduced the following motion, which will appear on the September agenda:

   Whereas the entry of animals (pets) into research facilities may result in significant health hazards to experimental subjects, students, faculty and staff, and
   Whereas the North Carolina State Workplace Requirements for Safety and Health state that animals are not permitted in any State buildings except: 1) Animals providing assistance to handicapped persons; 2) Animals used in research and teaching and authorized by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee; 3) special circumstances or events which are subject to approval from the safety and health officer, and
Whereas the policy regarding pets in UNCW Residence Halls is clearly stated in the Student Handbook and Code of Student Life,

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate request that; 1) the State Requirements Regarding Animals on State Property be inserted into the Faculty and Student Handbooks; 2) appropriate signs be placed in buildings containing research subjects indicating that pets are not allowed in these buildings; 3) the appropriate authorities be asked to enforce the existing State requirements regarding animals on State property. *(Motion 99-8-24)*

**Announcements:**

1. **Elections Officer Anne Crawford** announced that ballots for the autonomous-committee elections will be distributed this week.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.
Submitted by: Raymond L. Burt

---

**Senate Committees: Annual Reports**

The **Academic Standards Committee**, chaired by Bruce Kinzer, met five times. The main issues addressed by the committee were the Three-Year Rule and the course-repeat policy relative to a grade of C-. Committee discussions gave rise to three Senate motions, none of which passed. In addition the committee considered two honorary degree nominations that ultimately were presented to the Senate. Moreover, the Director of Admissions met with the Committee and brought us up to speed on admissions for the 1999-2000 academic year. The committee served more to raise issues this year than to solve them.

The **Admissions Advisory Committee**, chaired by Brad Walker, met once but corresponded via e-mail several times. It sent suggestions to enrollment affairs for improvement of international recruitment and the orientation tours that prospective students take. It had representation at each meeting of the university admissions committee, which met weekly to determine the status of applications for admissions which were neither clear admits nor clear rejects. The committee also handled all admissions appeals. This was a huge undertaking. The chair sat on a newly created committee to provide a forum for members of the student-support community to discuss concerns with members of the academic community and enrollment affairs.

The **Advisory Committee for the Department of Public Service and Extended Education**, chaired by Kemille Moore, met twice as a group. Issues discussed were the purpose of the committee, the role of DPSEE in the UNCW community, the moving of DPSEE to an off-campus location, and connections between university faculty and DPSEE activities. The chairman of the committee also served on the search committee for a new Director of Lifelong Learning within DPSEE.

The **Bookstore Committee**, chaired by Maggie Parish, did not meet. Clearly, it needs to take a more proactive role next year.

The **Budget Committee**, chaired by Jack D. Baker, met four times. It considered university budget issues and concerns and provided information to the faculty via the Senate Budget Committee's home page. The committee did not meet its goals for the year. Several budget issues that had been placed on the year's agenda were not considered.

The **Buildings and Grounds Committee**, chaired by Lee Schweninger, met six times. It was involved in design of new classroom building, discussions of use of University Common for public functions (especially concerning amplified music), parking and traffic issues (in conjunction with Chancellor's Traffic and Parking Committee), the design and placement of the Seahawk sculpture, and the location of the proposed...
new education building. The committee sent motions to the senate concerning the removal of temporary units behind Friday Hall (voted down) and booting automobiles (voted down). Having been convinced that faculty does have some control over and advance warning of public use of the common, we reported back to senate concerning University Common noise that no further regulations were necessary. The committee is made up (for the most part) of concerned and active, participating faculty, who have a genuine interest in the campus. Regrettably, however, again this year, the committee was essentially ineffectual concerning issues of importance on campus. It is usually told after the fact about building locations, construction and remodeling, parking issues, and road widenings. Despite its effort to be pro-active, it is essentially overlooked by the administration and such divisions as Student Affairs. Plans reported to it are already in motion more often than not. Next year's committee should make efforts actually to have input on important buildings and grounds issues—such as road widenings, placement of traffic signals, clearing of woods, and placement of new buildings.

The Computer Services Committee, chaired by Joe Wilson, met twice this year with the directors of the Office of Information Technology and Management Information Support and was briefed on the state of information technology on campus and on future plans. A representative of the newly created Division of Information Technology Systems was also present. Vice Chancellor designate Tyndall has advised us that the chair of this committee will be a standing member of an Information Technology Systems Advisory Council. A motion that its name, mission, and membership be changed to reflect current administrative units was passed by the Senate.

The Evaluation Committee, chaired by Ronald K. Sizemore, met four times. It considered ways to improve SPOTs to evaluate distant learning courses and proposed Web based administration of the Evaluation of Administrators tool. The later proposal was accepted by the Faculty Senate and will be put in place this Spring. The chair of the committee was also responsible to insure appropriate SPOTs are printed and distributed. In this role he was a liaison between academic computing and the chairs. The committee had a successful year thanks to the constructive attitude and hard work of the committee members. Continuing attention needs to be placed on evaluation of nontraditional courses such as the distant learning courses. Plans need to be made to move toward Web based (and paper-less) evaluation procedures.

The Financial Aid Committee, chaired by Jack C. Hall, met once this year. It received information from the Director of Financial Aid but did little or no advising on financial aid matters. The committee needs to work with the director so that it has more than just a passive role.

The Library Committee, chaired by Robert Blundo, met twice. A library newsletter, "The Randall Report," was initiated and has since been published twice. Discussion included the effect on the collection of diversity issues and new departments and minors, as well as space needs and feedback from faculty. The chair believes the committee should reexamine its purpose next year.

The Research Committee, chaired by Steven I. Dworkin, met twice and corresponded by email. Its major responsibility is the Undergraduate Research Fellowship Competition. The competition was widely advertised, and nine applications were submitted. The committee's chair served on the Cahill Awards Committee, and the committee brought a motion to the floor of the Senate regarding pets being brought into buildings containing research animals. The committee performs an important function, but, with the growing research interests of the faculty at UNCW, the responsibility of the committee regarding issues related to research could be expanded.

The Student Affairs Committee, chaired by W. Frank Ainsley, met once. No student members showed up. Those present decided not to meet again unless requested to do so. Clearly this committee needs to be more proactive next year.

The University Advancement Committee, chaired by Lou Buttino, met nine times with additional meetings still to come. It considered problems/challenges with new development officers; ways the committee might be more support of university advancement—especially in regards to faculty, invited the Chancellor to a discussion about the post of VC for University Relations, and served as a sounding board for UR proposals and strategies. It was a very effective and participatory committee. So enthusiastic is the committee that members have agreed to serve another year. After a few years of exploration and explanation, the committee plans to take on a more advocacy role next year.
The **University Curriculum Committee** met six times and corresponded by email. It recommended changes in Basic Studies offerings, new course designators, changes in foreign-language requirements, and oral-competency courses. It was a rather "slow" year for the committee with limited requests from faculty and administration. One "unfinished" item is the issue of waiving Basic Studies hours when a basic study has been met other than by completion of the course at this university. Next year the committee will review natural and mathematical divisions of Basic Studies requirements, address supplemental credit and its effect on Basic Studies requirements, and computer literacy requirements.
President Lynn Snowden called the meeting to order at 2:30.

Roll Call

Absent were: Baker (Budget Cmte.), Blundo (Lib. Cmte.), Combs (Univ. Curr. Cmte.), Earney (ACG), Elikai (ACG), Feng (MATH), Grindlay (ERS), Hall (Fin. Aid Cmte.), Jones (CHM), Kermani (CS), Leutze (Chancellor), McLaurin (MATH), Parish (Bookstore Cmte.), Parnell (LIB), Rockness (CBA), Sizemore (Eval. Cmte.), Walker (Adm. Cmte.), Wray (PDS)

Approval of Minutes: Lee Schweninger offered the following amendment:

In the Senate Committee Annual Report from the Business and Grounds Committee, the third to last sentence states: "...overlooked by the administration and such divisions as Student Affairs." It should read "overlooked by the administration with the exception of such divisions as Student Affairs and the arboretum task force."

The April minutes were approved as amended.

Special Order of the day

Lou Buttino was elected as Vice President. Tom Schmid was elected as Secretary. Other members of the Steering Committee are Denise Dipuccio, Steve Dworkin, Steve McNamee, and Rick Olsen.

Individual Reports:

1. Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs John Cavanaugh gave the following report:

   The City and County Commissioners will hold off on evacuation decisions until tomorrow at 10:00am, but the school system is closed. Most of the hurricane forecasts put the landfall of Hurricane Floyd west of us. At this point we will have business as usual until we hear otherwise.

   He provided the Senate with some highlights of his discussions with the Faculty Senate President:
   1. Discussion about the training of faculty in matters of advising.
   2. Discussion about workshops in the Spring for faculty as to how to prepare for tenure and promotion.
   3. Diversity: every vacancy in the faculty is an opportunity for diversity. He will look at that carefully in order to improve diversity in our faculty and in our student body. Funds are available for helping in the diversity of faculty.

2. The President of the Faculty Senate Lynn Snowden gave the following report:

   - She acknowledged Richard Veit’s role as former Senate President and presented him with a gift of appreciation on behalf of the Senate. She also acknowledged Raymond Burt for his service as Secretary of the Senate and presented him with a gift on behalf of the Senate.
   - She introduced Ken Gurganus as the new parliamentarian.
Goals:
- Increasing the visibility of the senators among their constituents
- Environment: Although the minutes are available on the web, we send out over 600 printed copies. We should aim at eliminating this waste.
- Encouraging colleagues to increase service to the university, and having that service reflected in the faculty workload

- The annual meeting of committee chairs - Tuesday Oct 17th

3. **The Parliamentarian of the Senate Ken Gurganus**, provided the senators with "Survival Tips on Parliamentary Procedure and discussed some particularly useful points.

4. **Senate Steering Committee Member Richard Veit** provided a brief orientation for new senators.

**Committee Reports:**

1. The following motion by the **Research Committee** carried as amended:

   Whereas the entry of animals (pets) into research facilities may result in significant health hazards to experimental subjects, students, faculty and staff, and

   Whereas the North Carolina State Workplace Requirements for Safety and Health state that animals are not permitted in any State buildings except: 1) Animals providing assistance to handicapped persons; 2) Animals used in research and teaching and authorized by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee; 3) special circumstances or events which are subject to approval from the safety and health officer, and

   Whereas the policy regarding pets in UNCW Residence Halls is clearly stated in the Student Handbook and Code of Student Life,

   Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate request that; 1) the State Requirements Regarding Animals on State Property be inserted into the Faculty and Student Handbooks; 2) appropriate signs be placed in buildings containing research subjects indicating that pets are not allowed in these buildings; 3) the appropriate authorities be asked to enforce the existing State requirements regarding animals on State property. *(Motion 99-8-24)*

Discussion: It was stated that this motion is not necessary and the senate should not pass it. It was also pointed out that perhaps signs indicating that animals are allowed in particular buildings, would imply that animals would be allowed in other buildings, therefore, signs be posted in all buildings.

A motion was accepted to amend the last sentence to read "regarding animals in State buildings." Another motion changed "These" to "any UNCW building"

The last paragraph of the motion now reads:

   Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate request that; 1) the State Requirements Regarding Animals on State Property be inserted into the Faculty and Student Handbooks; 2) appropriate signs be placed in buildings containing research subjects indicating that pets are not allowed in any UNCW building; 3) the appropriate authorities be asked to enforce the existing State requirements regarding animals in State buildings. *(Motion 99-8-24, carried without dissent)*

The **Building and Grounds Committee** moved the following:

   Whereas, the University is being offered gifts, artwork, memorials, and senior gift projects with increasing frequency, and,

   Whereas, there is no overall policy or procedure for such projects or any provision for them in the current master plan for the campus, therefore

   Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends to the Chancellor that there be a policy setting guidelines concerning issues of the location, size, style and appropriateness of such beneficences and also a committee overseeing their establishment and maintenance. *(Motion 00-1-1)*

A motion was made to postpone the vote until next senate meeting.
Discussion: A committee is being proposed by the administration that would deal with this issue. The artworks committee is being formed at the suggestion of the Chancellor and will deal with art gifts, senior class gifts, etc. and to look at budget for maintenance. This would be an advisory committee to the Chancellor. It was countered that the motion is a rather benevolent one. It asks that the Chancellor consider this matter. Perhaps the Buildings and Grounds Committee Chair could attend the next meeting for the artwork committee.

Vote on postponement motion was defeated

Motion to amend 00-1-1 by adding the phrase: "to include representation from the Buildings & Grounds Committee" in the last sentence following the word "committee" passed without dissent.

**Amended motion 00-1-1: passed without dissent**

Old Business: none

New Business: none

Announcements:

- There is a Faculty Assembly meeting in Chapel Hill on Friday, Pat Comeaux, Ken Gurbanus, and Lynne Snowden are our representatives and should be contacted concerning issues.
- Author of *Dead Man Walking* is speaking on campus as scheduled tonight.
- Dr. David W. Blight will present a lecture on "Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory" at the Cape Fear Museum on Friday, Sept. 24th at 7:30 p.m.

Adjourned 3:50

Submitted by Raymond L. Burt
Faculty Senate Minutes

University of North Carolina at Wilmington

Tuesday, 12 October 1999 2:30 p.m. New Science Building 103

President Lynn Snowden called the meeting to order at 2:35 pm.

Roll Call:

Absent were: Applefield (CS), Baker (Budget), Dutka (Library), Earney (Acct.), Elikai (Acct.), Galbraith (Mgt.), Hall (Finan. Aid), Leutze (Chancellor), Huntley (Pub. Service), Parish (Bookstore), Parnell (Library), Rack (Music), Sizemore (Evaluation), Walker (Admissions), White (Creative Writing)

Approval of Minutes: The September minutes were approved.

Individual Reports:

1. Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs John Cavanaugh gave the following report:
   - The Provost thanked the Senate and the faculty for their helpful attitude and efforts on behalf of the university and students during the hurricane and afterward.
   - A significant impact of the hurricane on state expenditures is that all capital projects at the university are temporarily frozen, including the classroom building at UNCW. The Provost has made it clear to the Advisory Budget Commission, legislators, and other state officials that it is necessary that these funds be released, if UNCW is to remain a growth campus; UNCW cannot meet the strategic state goals of providing educational opportunity for increasing numbers of students without the physical capacity to do so. Already, UNCW is strained in this regard, e.g. system wide, the typical classroom building is in use 25 hours/week, but at UNCW, 36 hours/week.
   - The administration has decided to make the online version of the Faculty Handbook the official version, which will make the document easier to keep updated and more accessible. The RPT materials will be given in hard copy to new faculty members, along with the URL of the handbook and the injunction to check it regularly. Changes in the Handbook will be electronically archived, and directly available.

2. President of the Senate Lynn Snowden gave the following report:
   - President Snowden also wished to thank faculty and Senators who attended the emergency faculty meeting for their efforts and for the communal spirit in evidence there.
   - There is an orientation meeting for Faculty Senate Committee Chairs, 2:30 p.m., Tuesday, October 26, SB 209.
   - Action has been taken on Motions 97-4-17, 98-8-32 and 99-1-1, as noted in the Motions log.
   - The Fall Faculty meeting for the UNC system was postponed, due to the hurricane.

Special Presentation:

Registrar Ron Whitaker gave the following report on grade forms:
- Grades will no longer be mailed to students, except to new students and those with deficiency reports; students can access their grades via Sealine and Seaweb.
Parents will be informed that grades are now on Sealine and Seaweb.
There are new services available online for students and faculty, e.g. Web for Students and Web for Faculty. These allow, with appropriate security, access to schedules, transcripts, degree audits, and other information. Advisors and other faculty interested in these services should contact Steve Perry at 3103.

Committee Reports

The University Curriculum Committee recommends the following changes to Basic Studies courses (Motion 00-2-2):

1. That the number of ENG 102, "College Writing and Reading II," be changed to ENG 201, and that "sophomore standing" be added to the prerequisite for the course.
2. That the title of ENG 103, "College Writing and Reading III," be changed to "College Writing and Reading (Advanced)."

It was moved and approved that this be separated into two motions:

1. That the number of ENG 102, "College Writing and Reading II," be changed to ENG 201, and that "sophomore standing" be added to the prerequisite for the course. (Motion 00-2-2, approved)
2. That the title of ENG 103, "College Writing and Reading III," be changed to "College Writing and Reading (Advanced)." (Motion 00-2-3, approved)

Discussion: Dr. Veit presented the rationale for the changes, which included the pedagogical value of extending students’ practice of writing into their second year, and linking their research project, if possible, to their major field. The changes would have an effect on courses that made ENG 201 a prerequisite; in the English department, it was decided to change it to a co-requisite for such courses. It was also said that the proposed changes might be confusing to students and advisors, since ENG 201 was, presumably, less “advanced” than ENG 103.

Old Business: none

New Business:

- It was noted that faculty have just now received their summer SPOTS, and that these would be more helpful to faculty if they could get them more quickly.

Announcements

- Dr. Russell Herman, new chair of Academic Standards, noted that faculty who have nominations for honorary degrees should submit them to him.
- The B. Frank Hall speaker for this year is W. Fitzhugh Brundage, one of the nations’ leading historians of the South. He will speak on “The Muse of Public Memory: Shaping Collective Memory in Black and White Communities in the South” at 7:30 p.m., Thursday, October 21, in NSB 134.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.
Minutes: November 1997

Back to: Senate | UNCW. || Comments to Senate Secretary.

Faculty Senate Minutes
University of North Carolina at Wilmington

Tuesday, 9 November 1999

President Lynne Snowden called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

Roll Call

Absent were: Adams (Nursing), Applefield (Curricular Studies), Baker (Budget), Dodd (Biology), Earney (Acct.), Hall (Finan. Aid), Hayes (School of Ed.), Jones, B. (Chemistry), Olsen (Comm. Studies), Parish (Bookstore), Rack (Music), Rockness (Bus. School), Sandell (Soc. Work), Scheuring (Nursing), Sigler (Finance), Sizemore (Evaluation), Walker (Admissions)

Approval of Minutes

The minutes were approved.

Individual Reports:

Chancellor Leutze:

- Reviewed the difficult financial situation facing the university and the state.
  - Noted there are substantial needs for the university system in the areas of capital construction, faculty salaries, technology, and financial aid. For UNCW, these needs are tied directly to our projected growth to 12,500 students in the coming years.
  - The sources for meeting these needs include legislative appropriations, tuition, bond issues, fees, and gifts.
  - There has been a decline of approximately 1% per year for the last decade in the amount of funds provided for the university system by legislative appropriation. It now stands at 43% of the total.
  - The legislature adjourned without determining the future of the bond issue, which would have addressed the capital construction needs for the university system.
  - The hurricane flooding has caused extreme hardship in the eastern part of the state, which will impact on the amount of funds available for higher education.
  - In addition to legislative appropriation and the bond issue, which will probably go to the public for a vote, there are two other ways in which the university system, and UNCW in particular, might help to meet these financial needs.
    - In the area of technology needs, the Chancellor may ask for an increase of $120 per year in the technology fee.
    - In the area of faculty salaries and benefits, UNC-CH has decided to raise tuition a total of $1500 over the next five year period. If NC State and other UNC system campuses move to increase tuition, UNCW may be forced to also, in order to remain competitive. The Chancellor feels strongly that if tuition were raised, it would be essential to also increase funding for financial aid students.
  - It is important for the university system, and UNCW in particular, to communicate its concern for NC flood victims, and to demonstrate the ways in which we serve the public. This may include adjusting the reward structure of the university, to offer more recognition to faculty who have served the community in this way.
  - It was noted in discussion that the purpose of having university system proposals on funding is to avoid conflicts
among the separate institutions. The UNC-CH decision is counterproductive to that end.

- It was suggested to the Chancellor that funding at the departmental level has declined in recent years. The Chancellor responded by directing the Provost to make a review of the financial situation of the departments, and report back to him on it.

President of the Senate Snowden:

- Thanked the new chairs of Senate committees for attending a productive orientation meeting, and noted that the Senate Steering Committee is considering a change in the by-laws to allow chairs of Senate committees to vote.
- Reported that Motion 97-4-17 has been approved by the UNCW Board of Trustees and forwarded to the UNC Board of Trustees for approval.
- Noted to committee chairs that there are several outstanding motions which have not been returned to the Senate for action.
- Announced the existence of a university system wide task force which is in the process of formulating recommendations on intellectual property matters. Any member of the university may address concerns to members of the task force. If interested in their names, contact President Snowden.
- Called for a UNCW-wide "cultural-intellectual event" to inaugurate the new millenium.

Ken Gurganus, Delegate to the UNC Faculty Senate:

- Will report the following concerns to the UNC Faculty Senate:
  - Lack of clarity regarding the current understanding of the GA, Board of Governors, legislature and individual campuses about the funding of research assistantships and the general issue of how to support graduate education throughout the system.
  - Concerns about the budget relating to the impact of the hurricane damages, the impact of the Klein facilities study which notes the general lack of adequate building maintenance, and the issue of equipment maintenance.
  - Concerns at some institutions about declining ratios of full-time to part-time, and of tenure-track vs. non tenure-track faculty.
  - Concerns about the relation between new technology and traditional educational values.

Ken Spackman, Director of SACS self-study:

- Noted that we are not seeking reaccreditation (we did not lose it), but reaffirmation of accreditation
- A steering committee has been formed, and faculty will soon receive a letter on the self-study and a preference survey re: which committee they wish to serve on.
- Self-study timetable:
  - F1999: initial preparations
  - S2000: further organization
  - F2000-S2001: most of the study to be completed
  - F2001: final report due
  - S2002: external visititation and review; reaffirmation of accreditation
- Noted that the process of self-study is valuable. For example, the basic institutional format in terms of departmental mission statements, goals and objectives, policies and programs to implement them, and measurement procedures to assess their success, which grew out of the last self-study process, is now a institution-wide format.
- While much of the work of the last self-study will not be repeated, there are important new areas:
  - Distance education, and the whole role of the WWW in relation to educational programing.
  - Demonstration that we utilize evaluation procedures to assess and change policies and programs, or goals, objectives and understanding of our mission where appropriate.

Committee Reports:

- The following motion by the University Curriculum Committee was unanimously approved (Motion 00-3-4):
1. To make the following changes in Basic Studies:

   a. To designate PSY 210, "Science and Pseudoscience," 3 credit hrs, as a Basic Studies course in Interdisciplinary Studies.

   b. To remove PAR 216, "Business Ethics," 3 credit hrs, and PAR 217, "Military Ethics," 3 credit hrs, as Basic Studies courses in Philosophy.

   c. To delete the following sentence in the catalogue under "Philosophy" in the Basic Studies Humanities requirement: "*Basic Studies credit from P&R 215, 216, and 217 may not exceed three semester hours."

   d. To designate ITN 201, "Intermediate Italian," 3 credit hrs, as a Basic Studies course in Language.

   e. To designate ART 205, "History of Photography," 3 credit hrs, as a Basic Studies course in Fine Arts.

   f. To renumber Basic Studies courses MUS 101 to MUS 111, and MUSL 101 as MUSL 111.

2. To make the following prefix changes:

   a. To create a new prefix, ARH for Art History courses, including changing the prefix of ART 201, 202, and 205 to ARH 201, 202, and 205, and keeping them as Basic Studies courses.

   b. To create a new prefix, AFA, for courses in the African American Studies minor.

3. To make the following changes in courses meeting the oral competency requirement:

   a. To designate the existing course PED 348, "Practicum in Athletic Training," 3 credit hrs, as meeting the oral competency requirement for students in the Athletic Training program in HPER.

   b. To designate existing courses SOC 496 and SOC 498 as meeting the oral competency requirement for students in the Applied Sociology track within the SOC major.

Old Business: none

New Business: none

Announcements:

- November 11, 10 am-3 pm, the UNCW Business School, in cooperation with Bob King and General Motors, has a program on campus.
- The Randall Library book sale is on Monday and Tuesday of next week, Nov 15-16.
- There will be regional and local growth colloquium on campus, sponsored by the Political Science department and the Program in Public Education, on Wednesday, November 17, in the Warwick Center ballroom.
- On November 18, 5-7 pm., SGA is sponsoring a One Mile Radius Forum, in the Hawksnest.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.
President Lynne Snowden called the meeting to order at 2:35 pm.

Roll Call

Absent: Adams (Nursing), Baker (Budget), Bennett (HPER), Buttino (Commun. Studies), Cavanaugh (Provost), Dodd (Biology), Earney (Acct.), Elikai (Acct.), Evans (Soc. & Anthro.), Galbraith (Mgt.), Hall (Finan. Aid), Hayes (Education), Howe (Mgt. & Mktg.), Jones (Chemistry), McNamee (Soc. & Anthro.), Parish (Bookstore), Parnell (Library), Sizemore (Evaluation), Walker (Admissions), White (Creative Writing)

Approval of Minutes

The November minutes were approved, with the correction noted that the growth colloquium of Nov 17 was co-sponsored by the Division of Public Service and Extended Education.

Special Order of the Day

1. Lynne Snowden was elected President-elect of the Faculty Senate for 2000-2001 by acclamation.
2. The Senate went into executive session for consideration of an Honorary Degree nomination.

Individual Reports

1. Chancellor Leutze

- This may well be a difficult year to obtain funding for capital projects (such as the School of Education building), given the financial obligations caused by the hurricane and outstanding legal judgments affecting state government. As a result of current revenue and capital funding expectations, the projected growth of UNCW for 2008 has been revised downward from 12,500 to 11,000.
- Applications are up 10% over last year at this time. It appears the average SAT score will be over 1100. One downside of this positive development is its negative effect on the UNCW effort to recruit African American students. Though UNCW is very successful compared to other UNC system schools in retaining and graduating African American students, it is difficult for UNCW and other UNC schools to compete for African American students with 1100+ SAT scores. Private schools offer much better scholarship packages. Overall minority student enrollment, including Latino and Asian students, has increased, but African American enrollment is lagging behind university goals.
- The Chancellor is opposed to a tuition increase to raise faculty salaries, believing that the appropriation for such increases should come from the state legislature, and that such increases create an unnecessary conflict of interest for faculty with students. If there is a tuition increase, the UNCW administration intends to use the larger share of the funds generated to raise scholarships and address the issue of compacted salaries for lower-paid employees. The Chancellor is also concerned to find a way to improve faculty benefits.
2. President Snowden

- Offered thanks to the Administration for listening to Faculty concerns and to the Steering Committee for their efforts.
- Noted that very few human things last a thousand years, but that some universities number among them, and urged the faculty to join in a resolution to work together to make UNCW a place that will endure until the next millennium.

3. Faculty Delegate Ken Gurganus

- James B. Milliken, Vice President for Public Affairs and University Advancement of GA, suggested to the Faculty Assembly that the single advocate system of approaching the legislature was no longer sufficient. What was now needed was a distributive advocacy system. Interested faculty should volunteer their services in approaching legislative members to their campus legislative liason (at UNCW: Mark Lanier, special assistant to the chancellor).
- Reported on a resolution passed by the Faculty Assembly concerning faculty expectations for fair, just, and effective faculty dispute resolution procedures, including the following statement: “The governing board [board of trustees] and president [chancellor] should, on questions of faculty status, as in other matters where the faculty has primary responsibilities, concur with the faculty judgment except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be communicated in detail.”
- Presented details of the UNC faculty salary study, which are to be presented to the legislature. These showed that the UNCW average salary of $52,797 placed it in 4th place among the six comprehensive UNC system schools without engineering programs. This compares to the AAUP average salary of $56,083, and to the average salary of Peer institutions of $57,577. The Chancellor noted that the Peer institution salary projections were adjusted several times by GA, and that the most likely legislative outcome would be oriented to the AAUP standard, rather than the higher Peer institution standards.

Committee Reports

1. The following motion from the Academic Standards Committee was passed (Motion 95-4-10):

   That the Graduation Residency Requirement, as found on page 70 of the 1999-2000 UNCW Undergraduate Catalogue, be changed from this:

   "The final 30 semester hours of course credit, including the final 15 semester hours in the major, must be completed at the University of North Carolina at Wilmington."

   to this:

   "The final 30 semester hours of course credit, including the final 15 semester hours in the major, must be completed through coursework offered by the University of North Carolina at Wilmington."

   An amendment to change the 30 hour requirement to 31 failed.

2. The following motion from the Steering Committee of the Senate was passed (Motion 00-4-5):

   That the membership section of the Senate Bylaws be changed from this:

   1. Membership
A. Qualifications

1. To be eligible to serve in the Senate as an elected representative one must be a full-time faculty member of the University of North Carolina at Wilmington.

2. The chancellor shall be an ex officio voting member of the Senate. The chief academic officer and the dean of each college or school shall be ex officio non-voting members of the Faculty Senate. Chairpersons of Senate committees who are not elected senators shall be ex officio non-voting members of the Senate.

to this:

I. Membership

A. Qualifications

1. To be eligible to serve in the Senate as an elected representative one must be a full-time faculty member of the University of North Carolina at Wilmington.

2. The chancellor shall be an ex officio voting member of the Senate. The chief academic officer and the dean of each college or school shall be ex officio non-voting members of the Faculty Senate.

3. The chair of each standing Senate committee, or another committee member elected by the committee, shall be ex officio a voting member of the Senate. A faculty member may serve simultaneously as a departmental senator and as a committee senator but shall be limited to one vote.

3. The following motion from the University Curriculum Committee was passed (Motion 00-5-7):

That the following courses be designated as Basic Studies courses:


- In Fine Arts: CRW 201 Introduction to Creative Writing (3). Includes lectures, workshops, readings, and writing exercises in poetry, fiction, and creative nonfiction.

- In Fine Arts: FNA 101 Cultures of the World Through Music and Dance (3). Includes participation in dance and musical experiences.

Old Business

None.

New Business

Motion 00-4-6 was withdrawn, in light of the recent Administration decision to allow faculty to receive reimbursements for flights they book themselves.

Announcements
1. The University Holiday Party, hosted by Chancellor James Leutze and Margaret Gates, will be held at the Madeline Suite of Wagoner Hall, Thursday, December 16, 7:00-9:00 p.m.
2. There will be an Intercultural Week, Feb 14-20, including daytime and evening programs, culminating with an Intercultural Festival day, Feb 20. Departments or organizations who are interested in sponsoring events should contact Heather Smith at 962-7009 (smith@uncwil.edu).

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.
The meeting was cancelled due to a snowstorm.
President Lynne Snowden called the meeting to order at 2:35 pm.

Roll Call:

Absent: Adams (Nursing), Ainsley (Earth Sci.), Applefield (Cur.Studies), Baker (Budget), Blundo (Library Comm.), Bradley (Psych.), Cami-Vela (FLL), Cavanaugh (Provost), Dumas (Ec.&Finan.), Earney (Acct.), Elikai (Acct.), Evans (Soc. & Anthro.), Galbraith (Mgt.), Hadley (Grad. School), Hall (Finan. Aid), Hayes (Education), Hines (Stud.Affairs Comm.), Jones (Chemistry), Kasala (Math.& Stat.), McCarthy (Hist.), McNamee (Soc. & Anthro.), Morey (Spec.Studies), Narayan (Comp. Sci.), Parish (Bookstore), Parnell (Library), Rice (Spec.Studies), Rockness (Bus. Admin.), Sigler (Ec.& Finan.), Sizemore (Evaluation), Walker (Admissions)

Approval of Minutes:

The December minutes were approved, with the correction noted in Motion 95-4-10 that the Graduation Residency Requirement as found currently in the Catalogue reads “The final 30 semester hours . . . must be completed at the University of North Carolina at Wilmington.”

Individual Reports:

1. Chancellor Leutze:

- The Board of Governors approved tuition increases for UNCW, ECU, UNC-Charlotte, UNC-CH, and NCSU. The UNCW increase will be $235 over two years ($120/$115) for in-state students, $400 for out-of-state students. (This brings tuition for out-of-state students to approximately 100% of the cost of their education.) The Chancellor fully expects General Administration and the Legislature to agree to this decision.
- The money will be used for
  1. a salary pool to enable UNCW to bid competitively to retain and hire faculty;
  2. non-salary benefits for faculty; and
  3. financial aid for students for whom the increase creates a hardship.
- UNCW will ask the Trustees to review its Technology Fee request, in the light of this decision.
- The Legislature continues to decrease the percentage of budget allocated to higher education. Currently only 50% of costs are paid for by the state: the UNC system is becoming a state-supported rather than state-financed institution. This is a disturbing trend in a state that traditionally has been generous toward higher education.
- In response to questions from the faculty, Chancellor Leutze noted
  1. There are several reasons why our student fees are among the highest in the system, including (1) UNCW, ECU, and UNC-Charlotte get less money per student than other schools in the system; and (2) UNCW is still paying for many student-support buildings (residence, dining halls, etc.) through
fee income; when these are paid off, our fees should decline.

2. The Chancellor will be lobbying the Legislature for enrollment increase funds; faculty salary increases; and the School of Education building.

- In closing, the Chancellor discussed briefly his recent visit to Vietnam. He noted that over 50% of the population was born since the end of the war, and hoped that the Academy would find ways to provide scholarships for Vietnamese students and establish exchange programs with Vietnamese faculty.

2. President of the Senate Lynne Snowden:

- Noted that the Faculty Assembly will meet later this week.
- Announced a three month trial period in which the Senate will change from paper to electronic-only distribution of agendas and minutes. Courtesy paper copies will be available at Senate meetings.
- Introduced Associate Vice Chancellor McLaurin and Associate Provost Carter, who announced that the university was in the process of introducing a 3-digit, rather than 2-digit section code, to better enable students and faculty to identify on-line, technologically enhanced, honors, and extension courses by number. A question was raised whether this matter should have gone through the Senate.

Committee Reports:

1. The following motions by the Academic Standards Committee were passed as amended [deletions, additions]:

   a. That the following policy be adopted to replace the current "Three Year Rule" as stated in the Undergraduate Catalogue, p. 30 (Motion 00-7-8):

      **Special Readmission Policy**
      Although the traditional policy for readmission is the norm, the University recognizes that individuals can gain personal and intellectual maturity over a period of years. Hence any former UNCW degree-seeking student whose quality point average was below the current retention standard may apply for Special Readmission provided the student has been out of school for a minimum of five years and has not attended any other institution since leaving UNCW. Special Readmission may be granted only at the time of application for readmission and is irreversible. Special Readmission status, once granted, may not be changed. Degree requirements for the student granted Special Readmission will be those in effect at the time the student re-enrolls. The student's original academic record will not be altered, and the student will receive academic credit only for past courses in which a grade of at least 2.00 was attained. The student's quality point average will be calculated only for those courses taken subsequent to re-enrollment. Failure to maintain an overall 2.00 quality point average after readmission will result in dismissal from the University. A student may be granted Special Readmission only once.

   b. That the following changes be made to bring UNCW back into compliance with the 1996 SACS requirements, and that the appropriate catalogue statements and supporting documents be changed to reflect this policy (Motion 00-7-9):

      **Requirements for Graduation**, p. 69, second paragraph:
      Students may qualify for the bachelor's degree by completing successfully (1) the basic studies requirements, (2) the residency requirement (3) an approved course of study in an academic major, (4) a minimum of 124 semester hours of credit, and (5) a minimum quality point average of 2.00. The final 30-31 semester hours of course credit, including the final 15 semester hours in the major, must be completed through coursework offered by the University of North Carolina at Wilmington.

      **Residency Requirement**, p. 70, first sentence (as revised last semester):
      [The final 30-31 semester hours of course credit, including the final 15 semester hours in the major, must be completed through coursework offered by the University of North Carolina at Wilmington.] To qualify for the bachelor’s degree, students must complete at least the following through coursework offered by the University of North Carolina at Wilmington: (1) the final 20 semester hours of credit, (2) the final 15 semester hours in the major, and (3) a total of 31 semester hours. Exceptions to requirements 1 and 2 may be made only with the approval of the appropriate dean and the vice chancellor for Academic Affairs. Requirement 3 may not be waived.

      **Transfer of Credit**, p. 71, full section:
Students transferring to UNCW may receive up to 94 semester hours of academic credit from all institutions attended; however, no more than 64 semester hours can be transferred from two-year institutions. Correspondence courses (15 semester hours maximum), CLEP credit and military credit will be counted toward the total.

Credit earned at another institution with a grade of "C" (2.00) or better is accepted by the university if the work transferred is comparable to offerings of the University of North Carolina at Wilmington. Transfer students must meet the university’s residency requirement. Hours attempted and quality points earned at other institutions are not used in computing grade point averages except in the case of students applying to enter the nursing program and seniors graduating with honors and/or distinction.

2. The Steering Committee’s motions on Capital Funding and on Faculty Salaries passed (Motions 00-7-10 and 00-7-11):

   a. Whereas the UNC System's extraordinary capital needs were clearly identified in the facilities study directed by Eva Klein; and
   Whereas the General Assembly, because of the needs of the Eastern part of the State, may not be able to provide their traditional support for the UNC System; and
   Whereas President Broad has proposed a plan to generate funds for capital expenditures which draws upon State resources and student fees; and
   Whereas President Broad has also proposed a plan to provide need based financial aid which will provide relief to those students who would be most adversely affected by an increase in fees; and
   Whereas we recognize the great costs to our institutions and to the future education of our students if no action is taken to improve capital funding,
   Therefore we wish to express our strong support for President Broad's proposal; and
   Therefore we strongly encourage Chancellor Leutze and the UNC Wilmington Board of Trustees to support this plan; and
   Therefore we strongly encourage our Faculty Assembly delegates to support this plan in the Faculty Assembly; and
   Therefore we strongly encourage our regional General Assembly representatives to support this plan (Motion 00-7-10).

   b. Whereas President Broad has only proposed substantive tuition increases for North Carolina State University and UNC Chapel Hill; and
   Whereas President Broad's action conveys a message to the public that North Carolina State University and UNC Chapel Hill are more important to North Carolina than the other fourteen Universities that constitute the UNC System; and
   Whereas this proposal reflects an over-reliance on the Carnegie Classification system to justify limiting tuition increases to North Carolina State University and UNC Chapel Hill; and
   Whereas all members of the UNC System compete with each other, peer institutions, and institutions in all classifications, in the recruitment and retention of high quality faculty members; and
   Whereas President Broad has also proposed a plan to provide need based financial aid which will provide relief to those students who would be most adversely affected by an increase in tuition,
   Therefore we ask President Broad to reconsider her initial response and support the tuition proposals brought forward by UNC Charlotte, East Carolina University, and UNC Wilmington, proposals which received the public endorsement of their respective Board of Trustees; and
   Therefore we encourage President Broad to consider alternative criteria, such as the mix of programs offered by the members of the UNC System, in the evaluation of salary needs of the System's universities; and
   Therefore we encourage Chancellor Leutze to continue to work with President Broad and the General Assembly to find an appropriate means of addressing, not only the needs of UNC Wilmington, but also the needs of the entire UNC System; and
   Therefore we ask the Faculty Assembly to speak as one voice for a unified UNC System and support the requests for tuition increases submitted by UNC Charlotte, East Carolina University, UNC Wilmington, North Carolina State University, and UNC Chapel Hill (Motion 00-7-11).

3. The following motion from the University Curriculum Committee passed (Motion 00-7-12):

   That ANT 450 be designated as meeting Basic Studies requirements for oral communication intensive courses.

Old Business: none

New Business: none

Announcements: none
The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.
President Lynne Snowden called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

Roll Call

Absent: Baker (Budget Ctme.), Dumas (Ec.& Finance), Earney (Acct. & Bus.Law), Elikai (Acct.& Bus.Law), Galbraith (Mgt.&Mktg.), Hadley (Grad. Sch.), Hall (Finan.Aid Cmte.), Halls (Earth Sci.), Hayes (Ed.Sch.), Hines (St. Affairs Cmte.), Howe (Mgt.& Mktg.), Jansen (Art & Theater), Kermani (Cur.Studies), Luetze (Chancellor), McCarthy (History), Olsen (Comm. Studies), Parish (Bookstore Cmte.), Parnell (Library), Rice (Sp. Studies), Rockness (Bus.Admin.), Sandell (Soc.Work), Sargent (Art&Theater), Sigler (Ec.& Finance), Walker (Admissions Cmte.), Wray (Prod.&Dec.Sci.)

Approval of Minutes

The February minutes were approved.

Special Order of the Day

1. Executive session: nominations for honorary degrees were voted on.

2. Pat Comeaux and Dick Veit were nominated for the position of Faculty Assembly delegate.

Individual Reports

1. Provost John Cavanaugh:
   - Thanked the faculty for our cooperation in dealing with the snowstorm.
   - Mentioned that the NCAA basketball game will be televised at 12:30 on Friday, and may be broadcast on a big screen in Trask Auditorium.
   - Informed us that the State Labor Department will require SBA employees to make up the time for the snow days, despite UNCW's intensive lobbying to interpret that time as an emergency situation (similar to the hurricane).
   - Noted in response to questions that the contract for the new classroom building has been let, and that actual work on the building should begin within 30 days.

2. President of the Senate Lynne Snowden:
   - Requested faculty who are members of Phi Beta Kappa to serve on a committee that is being formed to bring a Phi Beta Kappa chapter to UNCW. Interested faculty should contact her for further details.
   - Thanked the chairs and members of Senate committees for their work during the year, and reminded them that reports are due at the end of the year, in time for inclusion in the April minutes.

3. Faculty Assembly Representative Ken Gurganus:
   - Noted that the next meeting of the Faculty Assembly is on April 7, and any faculty who have concerns should contact Pam Comeaux or himself.
Noted that there will be discussion at that meeting of the Capital Equity campaign.
Passed out copies of a questionnaire regarding issues facing the UNC system from Gretchen Bataille, the new Senior VP for Academic Affairs at General Administration. Faculty who wish to be part of the UNCW faculty responses to the questionnaire may respond to it directly, or email their responses to Ken at gurganus@uncwil.edu by March 27 for a joint response.

Committee Reports

1. The Faculty Senate defeated the following graduation requirement proposed by the University Curriculum Committee, which would have been inserted into the UNCW Undergraduate Catalogue immediately before the Required Oral Communication Competency (p. 89 of the 1999-2000 catalogue):

REQUIRED COMPUTER COMPETENCY

The university requires all students to develop competency in basic computer skills prior to graduation. Students in each major must satisfy the requirement of computer competency as specified by that major. (Motion 00-8-13, defeated)

Discussion raised a number of issues, including whether the requirement would represent a meaningful certification for graduates, if there were not a minimum threshold of specified competency skills; whether the proposed competency requirement would impose an obligation specifically on the departments, which they did not yet have; and whether the university should wait to insure computer competency until the students were already in their major.

2. The Senate passed the following resolution from the Financial Aid Committee and University Advancement Committee:

Whereas, UNCW seeks to attract students of the highest academic quality,
And whereas, scholarship funds often impact top-quality students' decisions about which academic institution to attend,
And whereas, the vast majority of scholarships allotted to incoming UNCW students are at least partially need-based, with few solely merit-based,

Therefore, be it resolved, that it is the sense of the Faculty Senate that the UNCW Division of University Advancement should seek to develop new funding directed toward the provision of solely merit-based scholarships for incoming students. (Motion 00-8-14, passed)

3. The Senate passed following motion from the Evaluation Committee:

The following changes (deletions, additions) be made to selected portions of Appendix J of the Faculty Handbook.

Appendix J

Guidelines for the Administration, Use, and Interpretation of the "Student Perception of Teaching" (SPOT) Evaluation

Revised by the Faculty Senate, Spring 2000 1999
A. Administration

2. SPOT shall ordinarily be used by all instructors in all courses every semester including summer sessions. Paper versions of SPOT will be used in traditional classroom settings and online courses will use an online version of SPOT. Recognizing, however, that some courses rely heavily on specialized, non-classroom learning experiences (e.g., field-based; hospital-based; laboratory-based; performance-based), exceptions may be established at the departmental level by mutual consent of a faculty member and the appropriate chairperson. In such cases, some method of student evaluation shall be implemented by the department chairperson.

4. Administration of the paper SPOTs instrument shall be delegated to an individual other than the instructor. That individual may be a student or another faculty member.

5. A brief standardized statement of instruction shall be presented to each class prior to the administration of SPOT.

6. During the administration of the paper SPOTs instrument, the instructor shall leave the classroom and its vicinity.

8. Following administration of the paper SPOTs instrument, the evaluation forms shall be sealed in an envelope and returned immediately to the departmental office. Department chairpersons will keep these secure and will forward them for processing. (Motion 00-8-15, passed)

Old Business

None.

New Business

1. The Faculty Senate voted to substitute the following motion from Richard Veit of the English Department for Motion 00-8-16, the Resolution on Teaching Grammar submitted by the Department of Biological Sciences. The Senate then passed this motion:

That the Faculty Senate Steering Committee shall appoint an Ad Hoc Faculty Committee with appropriate representation from across the disciplines to examine programs that have been successful in improving writing across the curriculum in other institutions and report back their findings to the Faculty Senate, with a preliminary report on their activities by the April meeting. (Motion 00-8-17, passed)

Discussion: there was considerable, sometimes strained, discussion on these motions, including presentations by members of the Biology and English departments. Among the issues that were raised relating to the substance of the motions: whether UNCW students are becoming worse, or better writers; whether there are too many students who do not become sufficiently proficient writers during their UNCW education, the causes of this, and who is primarily responsible for correcting this problem; that this is a matter of general university concern and requires the commitment of the whole university community; that there is "no easy fix" to this problem, and that time will be needed to formulate a good policy; that departments need to learn how to enable students to apply writing skills learned in a different context (e.g. the comp course) in their own disciplines; what research in composition shows to be the best methods of teaching composition, and the relation of those methods to teaching spelling and grammar; steps taken by the English department to address teaching composition, and to train instructors who teach it.

Announcements

None.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.
President Snowden called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

Roll Call

Absent: Adams (Nursing), Applefield (Cur. Studies), Baker (Budget Ctme.), Cavanaugh (Provost), Clifford (English), Dodd (Biology), Earney (Acct.), Elki (Acct.), Evans (Soc.), Galbraith (Mgt.), Griffin (HPER), Hall (Fin. Aid Cmte.), Halls (Earth Sci.), Hayes (Education), Howe (Mgt.), Jansen (Art & Theater), Jones (Pol.Sci.), McLaurin (Math), Moore (Nursing), Morey (Spec. Studies), Quackenbush (Biology), Rice (Spec. Studies), Rockness (Bus. Adm.), Sandell (Soc. Wrk.), Scheuring (Nursing), Sigler (Ec. & Fin.), Walker (Admissions Cmte.)

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of March 14, 2000 were approved.

Special Order of the Day

The Senate went into Executive Session for consideration of an honorary degree nomination.

Individual Reports

1. Chancellor Leutze:
   - Reported that members of the Facilities Use Commission visited the campus on April 17, and the university, supported by many political representatives and members of the community, made its case for capital expenditures and the need for classroom space. The Chancellor hopes that the Legislature will pass the capital request, or at least provide funds now for the School of Education building at UNCW, rather than putting the entire request up in the form of a bond referendum on the November ballot.
   - Thanked President Snowden, the members of the Faculty Senate, and chairs and members of Senate committees for their successful efforts in the past academic year.
   - Urged the Senate to pass a "Computer Competency Requirement" that would put UNCW in compliance with the SACS requirements.
   - Urged the members of the Faculty to consider voting for the "Green Space" bond referendum on the May ballot, noting that the university community itself might decide this issue, if there is a small voter turnout.

2. President of the Senate Snowden:
   - Thanked the Senate, committee chairs and members, and the university administration for the successful efforts of the past academic year.
   - Reminded Senate members to sign up for their committee assignments for next year.
   - Reported the formation and membership of the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee.
Announced that the Faculty Scholarship Awards committee needs four more members, and urged faculty to consider volunteering for the committee.

Noted that the Phi Beta Kappa committee had been formed, and that all faculty who were eligible to participate in it had been notified.

Indicated that the Senate Steering Committee planned to revisit the structure of Senate committees, with the goal of making them more efficient.

3. Faculty Assembly Delegate Gurganus:

- Reported that the Faculty Assembly had begun with a Forum on Instruction and Technology, attended also by Lynne Snowden, Jeff Brown, Richard Dixon, and Laura Rogers of UNCW.
- Noted that the Assembly had approved new admissions requirements for the UNC system, applicable in 2004 (two years of foreign language in h.s.) and in 2006 (a fourth unit of h.s. mathematics).
- Announced that GA was in the process of establishing websites which would inform faculty about system initiatives being proposed to the Legislature.

Committee Reports

1. The following motions from the Academic Standards Committee were passed as amended:

   i. Updating Honorary Degree Procedures (Motion 00-9-18; passed):

   That the following changes be made to selected portions of Appendix O of the Faculty Handbook.

   **Appendix O**

   **Purpose of and Criteria for UNCW Honorary Degrees**

   Effective August 14, 1996 - April 14, 2000

   Honorary degrees are granted by the faculty and trustees of the University of North Carolina at Wilmington and may be granted at Commencements or special events. Current honorary degrees awarded are Doctors of Humanities, of Letters, of Fine Arts, of Science, and of Laws. Other honorary degrees can be recommended by the Academic Standards Committee (ASC). An honorary degree is the highest accolade the university can bestow on an individual who is not currently employed as a member of its faculty or staff. It is given to honor an individual who possesses outstanding qualities and talents, who has made exceptional contributions to the field of his or her endeavor, and who exemplifies the highest standards of personal integrity and civic responsibility. There are three basic reasons for awarding honorary degrees from the university. A person may be recommended for an honorary degree for any one of the following reasons:

   1. Academic excellence in the individual's field of endeavor.
   2. Appreciation of time, energy, and financial resources spent in behalf of the university and for its sake.
   3. Excellence in fields other than those which would normally be called academic, i.e., the contributions which have enhanced society and its quality of life.

   **Procedures for Nominating and Evaluating Candidates for Honorary Degrees**

   1. At the beginning of each semester the residing Chair of the Academic Standards Committee will make a call for nominations. A call for nominations will be made by the President of the Faculty at the first Faculty Senate meeting and first issue of the Campus Communique, Seahawk, and UNCW Today Magazine of each academic year. A call for nominations will also be made by the President of the Faculty at the first Faculty Senate meeting of each semester. Nominations may be made at any time by any member of the University community, or by any Academic Department. Owing to institutional needs, it would be of benefit to have, at any given time, a number of nominees approved for receipt of honorary degrees.
2. Nominations shall be submitted on standard forms available at the Faculty Senate website http://www.uncwil.edu/facsen/ in the Offices of the Provost and Academic Deans and each academic department. The form should be accompanied by a single page of supporting information documenting the candidate's qualifications. The nominees should not be contacted. Such information can be obtained from local resources or reputable sources, such as Who's Who, the Internet, etc. The identity of the nominees should only be known to the nominator, members of the Academic Standards Committee, voting members of the Faculty Senate, the Provost, the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees, depending upon how far the nomination goes through the process as per item 8 below. 

3. Typically, nominations need to be received by the Academic Standards Committee no later than October 1st or March 1st to be considered for the Fall or Spring Commencement, respectively. However, the granting of Honorary degrees is not restricted to Commencements. Nominations for awards to be granted during special events should be submitted at least two months prior to the event in order to track the process in due time.

4-4 Nominations will be evaluated by the ASC at its next regularly scheduled meeting. That a nomination has been made will be announced at least five working days before the scheduled meeting; the name of the nominee will not be made public. Nominating materials will be made available by the ASC Chair's office for review by committee voting members prior to the meeting.

4-5 ASC will recommend for or against approval of the nomination with a recommendation as to the degree to be awarded. A simple majority of ASC voting members present is necessary for approval. If approved, the nomination will be recommended to the Senate at its next regularly scheduled meeting. Any nomination which fails to receive Academic Standards Committee endorsement but which is supported by two or more members of the Academic Standards Committee shall be reported to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee. The Steering Committee may either accept the report as information or, by majority vote of the entire committee, forward the nomination to the Faculty Senate for consideration at its next meeting.

5-6 That a nomination will be recommended to the Senate will be announced at least five working days before the scheduled meeting; the name of the nominee will not be made public. Nominating materials will be available in the Senate President's office for review by Senate members prior to the meeting. A 2/3 majority of voting members present is necessary for Senate approval. Only voting members of the Faculty Senate and the nominator of that nominee may be present during the discussion of the particular nomination.

6-7 If the Faculty Senate approves the nomination, it will be forwarded to the Provost who will then forward it to the Chancellor for recommendation to the Board of Trustees; if the Senate disapproves the nomination, it dies in the Senate. Approval or disapproval of the recommendation by the Senate shall be announced while the Senate is still in executive session and made known to the nominator.

8 Confidentiality at all points in the nominating process is crucial. No discussion concerning nominees should take place outside of those directly involved in the evaluation process or the formal evaluation meetings. Discussion and voting will be in executive session by all evaluating groups, as specifically allowed by the State open meetings law.

ii. Freshman Foreign Language Deficiency (Motion 00-9-19; passed):

That the following changes be made in the starred section on page 28 of the 1999-2000 UNCW Undergraduate Catalogue in the Admissions-Freshman section and that the Registrar's Office ensure that the policies on Freshman Deficiencies be enforced.

***Students who meet all minimum requirements except foreign language will be accepted with a deficiency and will be required to complete a foreign language sequence of 101 and 102, 102, or 120 101 and/or 102 or 120 before they may graduate with the baccalaureate degree from UNCW. Students must have their foreign language deficiency removed by the end of their sophomore year. A student who has not removed this deficiency by the end of the sophomore year may not register for any courses other than those needed to remedy the deficiency.

iii. Basic Studies for Second Baccalaureate Degree (Motion 00-9-20; passed):

That the following changes be made in the current Undergraduate Catalogue:
REQUIREMENTS FOR ANOTHER BACCALAUREATE DEGREE (Page 69)

A student with a baccalaureate degree from UNCW may receive another baccalaureate degree if it is a different degree and a different major. The student must meet all the requirements for the second degree and major, including the course work that meets the spirit of UNCW’s current basic studies requirements.

(Page 89) Students with Existing Degrees: For students who already possess an undergraduate degree from an accredited college or university, including UNCW, the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences (or her/his designee), after consultation with the chair(s) of the academic unit(s) through which the student is pursuing the second degree, will determine the extent to which the previous course work meets the spirit of UNCW’s current basic studies requirements and will determine any remaining requirements to be completed.

2. This motion from the Building and Grounds Committee was rejected (Motion 00-9-21):

   Whereas restrictions have been put on smoking immediately outside the entrance to Westside Hall to good effect, and

   Whereas smoking immediately outside the entrances to any campus buildings inconveniences and/or displaces non-smokers who would otherwise use the same area for studying or socializing between classes,

   Therefore, the Building and Grounds Committee proposes that at least one designated non-smoking entrance be established and so identified for each and every campus building.

3. This motion of the University Curriculum Committee passed as amended (Motion 00-9-22):

   That the following graduation requirement be inserted into the UNCW Undergraduate Catalogue immediately before the Required Oral Communication Competency (p. 89 of the 1999-2000 catalogue).

   REQUIRED COMPUTER COMPETENCY

   The university requires that all students prior to graduation develop competency in basic computer skills including knowledge of campus use policies, facility with standard applications, and awareness of legal and ethical issues. A student must demonstrate competency with the method approved for that student’s degree program. Students in each major must satisfy the requirements in computer competency as specified by that major.

Old Business

None.

New Business

None.

Announcements

None.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.
President Lynne Snowden called the meeting to order at 2:35.

Roll Call

Absent were: Bingham (Physics), Blundo (Library Comte.) Cavanaugh (Provost), Denny (Soc.Wrk), Friarson (IT Comte.), Hayes (Cur. Studies), Howe (Management), Hunt (Management), Lawson (Accountancy), Leutze (Chancellor), Moore (Arts/Theater), Quakenbush (Biology), Roscher (Accountancy), Sargent (Arts/Theater), Schweninger (Building/Grounds Comte.), Sizemore (Evaluation Comte.), Stowell (Nursing), Walker (Admissions Comte.).

Approval of Minutes: The April minutes were approved.

Special Order of the day

Steven Dworkin was elected as Vice President. Tom Schmid was reelected as Secretary. Other members of the Steering Committee elected were: Denise Dipuccio, Rick Olsen, Ann Pabst, Richard Veit.

Individual Reports:

1. President Snowden's Report
   - Thanked Lou Buttino for his outstanding service as Vice President for 1999-2000.
   - Introduced Kenneth Gurganus, new Senate Parliamentarian
   - Reviewed goals for last year and this year, including (1) a request to all Senators to forward pictures and email links to Marla Trobaugh, the new secretary in the Senate Office at 250 Friday Hall, extension 3556; (2) noted the successful move to electronic distribution of Senate agendas and minutes; (3) indicated the year would bring a renewed emphasis on the Faculty Senate committees and their involvement in university governance

2. Associate Provost of Enrollment Affairs Denis Carter gave a brief presentation on enrollment figures for this year (see enrollment report 2000). Among other points, he noted:
   - the approximately 60/40% female/male ratio reflected a phenomenon occurring both UNC systemwide and nationwide
   - total African American enrollment was higher in new freshman enrollment this year, but was two students lower in total enrollment due to an unusual drop in 1997
   - UNCW’s graduate rates continue to improve, and we had our largest graduation class in Spring 2000

Committee Reports:

1. The following motion by the Steering Committee of the Faculty Senate passed:

   Whereas the Honors Council and Academic Standards Committee share many interests in common, and
   Whereas the Director of Honors proposes to add the Chair of the Academic Standards Committee as an
   ex officio non-voting member of the Honors Council,
Be it resolved the Director of Honors be added as an ex officio, non-voting member of the Academic Standards Committee. (Motion 01-1-1).

Old Business: none

New Business

1. The following motion by John Clifford of the English Department passed as amended:

   Whereas, the university administration of UNCW is committed to principles of equality for men and women of all races, and
   Whereas, the faculty is interested in our progress toward equal pay for men and women, and
   The Faculty Senate requests that the annual faculty salary survey by OIR also include a report on salaries and raises by race and gender for each rank in each school, to begin with the data for 2000-2001. (Motion 01-1-2, carried)

Announcements

- Kenneth Gurganus invited faculty who have issues to bring before the Faculty Assembly next Friday to contact him
- Russell Herman of the Academic Standards Committee noted the October 1 deadline for nominations for honorary degrees for the fall semester commencement
- President Snowden announced the orientation meeting on the SACS requirements at Cameron Auditorium, Thursday, September 14 at 4:30 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.
President Lynne Snowden called the meeting to order at 2:30.

Roll Call

Absent: Blundo (Library Comte.) Clark (Dean, Business), Denny (Soc.Wrk), Dutka (Lib.), Evans (Soc.&Anth.), Friarson (IT Comte.), Garris (Info Syst.), Howe (Management), Lawson (Accountancy), McKay (Psych.), McLaurin (Math & Stats), McNamee (Soc.& Anth.), Moore (Arts/Theater), Olsen (Comm.Studies), Rogers (UCC), Roscher (Accountancy), Sargent (Arts/Theater), Sigler (Econ.), Sizemore (Evaluation Comte.), Walker (Admissions Comte.).

Approval of Minutes: The September 12 minutes were approved, with the correction noted in Associate Provost Carter's report that the approximately 60%/40% ratio of students in the UNCW freshman class is females/males, rather than males/females.

Special Order of the day

The Senate voted in closed session on two honorary degree nominations.

Individual Reports:

1. Chancellor Leutze:
   - Noted that although the polls look good at the present on the bond issue, the last bond vote passed by only 51.4%.
   - The bond issue is for $3.1 billion, of which $2.5 billion would go to the university system for capital funding, $.6 billion to the community colleges; UNCW would receive $108 million, CFCC $36.5 million. UNCW would be able to construct the School of Education building, a new Arts building, a new general classroom building, make renovations to 8 other buildings (Alderman, Hoggard, Friday, Kenan, Kenan Auditorium, King, and James).
   - Explained that the bond issue allows the University to borrow money to pay off over a 30 year period, just as one would take out a loan for a house, but that the State Treasurer has indicated that the bond can be paid off out of regular state revenues, without an increase in taxes, and will not change the states’ triple A bond rating.
   - Noted that if the bond issue does not pass, New Hanover County would have to raise the funds itself for CFCC, which otherwise would be provided by the state. The bond would allow the campus to grow to approximately 11,000 students. Additional funds would be needed to reach the projected final stage of 12,500 students.
   - Added that faculty who currently are in offices which need carpets, improved lighting, or comfortable chairs should forward that information through the departments to his office, since he is committed to providing such basic amenities to the faculty.

2. Provost Cavanaugh discussed a number of issues which had come up in the process of the SACS review, particularly having to do with the RPT policy. The University need not have uniform rules on these matters across all schools and all departments, but its practices should be consistent with its written policies.
The minimum number of people at rank involved in RPT decisions: there should be enough for a fair hearing. At present there are no set rules on this issue.

The decision process and final responsibility. At present some departments rest the decision in a faculty vote, in others the chair decides alone.

The timing of the RPT committee review. In many institutions, this comes after the Dean's recommendations, which may work to ensure a fair process at the schools, then at the university level. At UNCW, the RPT committee reviews dossiers before the Deans, who then send it on to the Provost.

External review. Should there be external review of RPT dossiers on scholarship, other items, how should this be administered?

Feedback to candidates and due process. What and when should candidates be informed about the decisions at the different levels, and what form should the appeals process take?

Added that there may be undue emphasis at present on Q16 SPOT scores for teaching evaluation, rather than a "wide variety" of materials, as the written policy indicates.

Reminded Senators of his willingness to visit department meetings.

In response to question, indicated that the salary increment for promotion would be increased this year, and that it would not come out of merit money.

3. President Snowden:

- Announced the orientation meeting for new chairs of Senate Committees would be October 17, SB 209, at 3:30 p.m.
- Noted that faculty may wish to include a cell phone policy in their syllabus, as some faculty have reported cell phones going off and being used even during examinations.
- Asked Senators to check the Facsen web site to make sure their names are spelled correctly, and email corrections to the Faculty Secretary.

Committee Reports:

1. The following motion by the Steering Committee of the Faculty Senate passed:

That the Faculty Senate Steering Committee shall appoint a task force to review RPT policies and procedures; and that this task force shall be broadly representative of the faculty, and shall present a report, possibly including recommendations, to the Faculty Senate (Motion 01-2-3).

Old Business: none

New Business: none

Announcements: none

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.
Minutes: November 2000
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President Lynne Snowden called the meeting to order at 2:30.

Roll Call

Absent: Ainsley (Earth Sciences) Buttino (UAC), Byington (Fac. Welfare), Cavanaugh (Provost), Clark (Dean, Business), Denny (Soc. Wrk.), Dutka (Lib.), Errants (Admissions), Evans (Soc.&Anth.), Friarson (IT Cmte.), Garris (Info Syst.), Kasala (Math & Stats), Kiddie (Research), Lawson (Accountancy), Leutze (Chancellor), McKay (Psych.), Roscher (Accountancy), Sargent (Arts/Theater), Scheuring (Nursing), Sigler (Econ.), Sizemore (Evaluation), Smith (Earth Sciences).

Approval of Minutes

The October minutes were approved.

Individual Reports:

1. President of the Senate Lynne Snowden made the following report:

   1. The Provost notified the Faculty Senate Steering Committee that raises directly linked to promotions had been increased to $1800 from assistant to associate, $2400 from associate to full professor. Associate Provost McLaurin added that these increases will go up annually with cost of living increments.
   2. The request for a gender breakdown on the salary survey (Motion 01-1-2) has been posted.
   3. The Committee review process is going well, with the exception of the Bookstore Committee, and President Snowden requests a volunteer to chair that committee. The Senate also seeks volunteers for the RPT committee, but she has held off from contacting specific individuals for this semester, on account of SACS. The committees are working on revisions of their mission statements.

2. Faculty Assembly Delegate Ken Gurganus noted that the Faculty Assembly will meet this Friday. If faculty members have concerns, they should email them to him or to Dick Veit. Ken added that he has served in this position for two terms, six years, and that at the next meeting of the Faculty Senate, we will have to nominate two people (!) to replace him.

Committee Reports:

1. In response to Dean Hadley's request, a vote on the following motion from the Faculty Senate Steering Committee concerning Faculty Governance was postponed until the December meeting, awaiting clarification of the relationship between the Faculty Senate and the Graduate Council:

   Whereas, the Faculty Governance Document assigns to the faculty primary responsibility and authority for establishing curriculum and reviewing proposed new academic programs:

   Section 4. The Faculty is accountable for the quality of instruction and scholarship at this university.
and accepts the responsibility and authority, both primary and shared, for developing, monitoring, and modifying policies affecting the academic environment, including but not limited to:

...c. establishing curricula; reviewing existing programs, including auxiliary academic programs (e.g. continuing education); deleting programs; developing and reviewing proposed new programs;

And whereas, the Faculty Governance Document delegates this authority to the Faculty Senate and, by extension, to the committees it establishes:

Section 6. The Faculty shall delegate to the Faculty Senate all of the duties and responsibilities listed in Sections 4 and 5.

Therefore, be it resolved, that it shall be the role and responsibility of the Faculty Senate to review and approve or disapprove recommendations for significant changes to the university’s curriculum, which shall include Basic Studies requirements; the establishment, dissolution, division or consolidation of academic departments or other degree-granting entities; and the establishment or revision of academic degrees, including majors, minors, and certificate programs.

And that the Senate shall assign initial review of these proposals to the University Curriculum Committee, which shall forward such proposals, with the Committee’s recommendations, to the Senate for action.

And that the provisions of this motion shall be effective January 1, 2001. (Motion 01-3-4)

There was considerable discussion of this motion, led by Senator Richard Veit, who spoke for the Steering Committee during discussion, and who stated that the proposal had the approval of Provost Cavanaugh. Among the points made in the discussion were the following: Faculty review degree programs on many campuses (e.g. ECU, NCSU), but this has not been the case at UNCW, where Faculty Senate review has been limited to Basic Studies courses. It is not clear at this time what mechanism exists for the Faculty review of degree program or departmental changes; this motion would address that issue, by reviewing such proposals through the UCC. It would not do away with the college curriculum committees, or their review of particular courses; it would deal only with "significant" changes. It would include review of all program proposals, including graduate proposals. This raised the question of the relationship between the Faculty Senate and the Graduate Council, and occasioned Dean Hadley's request that the inclusion of graduate programs be postponed until the December meeting, at which time the Provost might be present. A question also arose as to whether proposals that were rejected at the college level might be presented to the UCC; Senator Veit suggested they might be. Would there not have to be clarification of what "significant" meant? This could be worked out over time. If the Faculty Senate disapproved a proposal, would it stop there? Not necessarily, but it would be expected that the Faculty have primary responsibility for curricular matters.

An amendment to limit the amendment to review of the university's "undergraduate" curriculum failed.

2. The University Curriculum Committee offered a number of motions (Motions 01-3-6 through 01-3-16, and additional motions from the floor 01-3-20 through 01-3-27), which were consolidated as amended into the following motion, which passed (Motion 01-3-5):

1. In the area of Basic Studies,
   a. that THR 226 "History and Appreciation of Film: Sound" be approved (pending CAS Curriculum Committee approval) as a basic studies course in area D, Fine Arts.
   b. that THR 225 "History and Appreciation of Film: Silent" continue to be approved (pending CAS Curriculum Committee approval) as a basic studies course in area D, Fine Arts.

2. In the area of Oral Competency,
   a. that MUS 496 be designated as meeting the oral communication competency for music
majors.

b. that MUS 285 "Basic Conducting I" be designated as meeting the oral communication competency for music majors.

c. that MUS 495 "Senior Seminar in Music" be deleted from the list of currently approved oral communication intensive courses.

3. In the area of Computer Competency,

   a. that CSC 121 "Introduction to Computer Science I" be designated as a computer competency course for computer science majors.

   b. that REC 266 "Applications of Computers in Health and Recreation Management" be designated as a computer competency course for students pursuing the B.A. degrees in Therapeutic Recreation and Parks and Recreation Management.

   c. that MUS 110 "Introduction to Music Technology" be approved as computer competency course for music majors.

   d. that PED 266 "Applications of Computers in Physical Education and Health" (and HEA 266 pending CAS Curriculum Committee approval) be designated as a computer competency course for student pursuing the B.A. degree in Physical Education and Health with concentrations in exercise science and health education.

   e. that EDN 303 "Instructional Technology" be designated as a computer competency course for students pursuing the B.A. degree in Physical Education and Health (K-12).

   f. that EDN 303 "Instructional Technology" be designated as a computer competency course for education majors.

   g. that PAR 400 "Colloquium for Majors" be designated as a computer competency course for philosophy and religion majors.

   h. that GGY 320 "Introduction to Cartography" be designated as a computer competency course for geography majors.

   i. that GLY 201 "Mineralogy" be designated as a computer competency course for geology majors.

   j. that SPN 305 or 309 or 311 or 312 be designated as a computer competency course for Spanish majors.

   k. that FRN 301 or 306 or 311 be designated as a computer competency course for French majors.

   l. that SOC 301 "Sociological Data Analysis and Interpretation" be designated as a computer competency course for sociology and criminal justice majors.

   m. that HST 290 "The Practice of History" be designated as a computer competency course for history majors.

   n. that CHM 255 "Introduction to Computer Applications and Chemical Literature" be designated as a computer competency course for chemistry majors.

   o. that ENG 204 and 205, "Introduction to Technical Writing" and "Approaches to the Study
of Literature," be designated as computer competency courses for English majors.

p. that TEC 101 "Technology Seminar" be designated as a computer competency course for environmental science majors.

q. that COM 200 and COM 490, "Research Methods" and "Discipline Capstone," be designated as computer competency courses for communications majors.

r. that PHY 400 "Advanced Laboratory" be designated as a computer competency course for physics and physical oceanography majors.

s. that PSY 355 "Introduction to Experimental Psychology" be designated as a computer competency course for psychology majors.

(Motion 01-3-5).

3. The **Academic Standards Committee** offered the following motions, each of which **passed** as amended:

1. **On the Overload Policy:**

   That the section under **Registration** on page 67 in the Undergraduate Catalogue be revised as follows, "Students who have a cumulative grade point average of 3.50 or higher may be allowed, with special permission of the appropriate dean, to carry more than 18 semester hours up to 21 semester hours." (Motion 01-3-6)

2. **On the Cancellation of Course Registration for Non Attendance Policy:**

   That the first paragraph on p. 59 under **Cancellation of Course Registration Policy** in the University Catalogue be revised to read as follows: "An instructor of any course, upon recommendation of the instructor, may cancel a student's registration in their course, offered in that department, if the registered student fails to attend the first class meeting of the term and fails to notify the instructor department office of their desire to remain enrolled within 24 hours of the class meeting time. This action will only take place when a course is fully enrolled and additional students are waiting to enroll. Student appeals, resulting from emergencies or other extenuating circumstances, will be considered on a case by case basis in the appropriate Dean's office. Students who wish to drop or withdraw from a class should not assume they have done so by not attending the first class or subsequent classes, but they should follow the normal drop/add procedures, which are printed in the semester schedule of classes." (Motion 01-3-7)

3. **On the Honorary Degree Policy:**

   That **Appendix O** of the Faculty Handbook be revised as follows (italicized line added): "Honorary degrees are granted by the faculty and trustees of the University of North Carolina at Wilmington and may be granted at commencements or special events. Current honorary degrees awarded are Doctors of Humanities, of Letters, of Fine Arts, of Science, and of Laws. Other honorary degrees can be recommended by the Academic Standards Committee (ASC). An honorary degree is the highest accolade the university can bestow on an individual who is not currently employed as a member of its faculty or staff. It is given to honor an individual who possesses outstanding qualities and talents, who has made exceptional contributions to the field of his or her endeavor, and who exemplifies the highest standards of personal integrity and civic responsibility. The individual may not be an employee of the university at the time the degree is awarded. There are three basic reasons for awarding honorary degrees from the university. A person may be recommended for an honorary degree for any one of the following reasons: (1) Academic excellence in the individual's field of endeavor. (2) Appreciation of time, energy, and financial resources spent in behalf of the university and for its sake. (3) Excellence in fields other than those which would normally be called academic, i.e., the contributions which have enhanced society and its quality of life." (Motion 01-3-8)
**Old Business**

**New Business**

**Announcements**

There will be a presentation of the three finalist models for the sculptural work to be placed in the 1898 Memorial Part, by representatives of the different art groups, at the **Cape Fear Museum at 5:30 on Thursday, Nov 16**. All interested citizens are invited to view the works, talk with the artists, and provide input.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.
Minutes: March 20, 2001

Faculty Senate Minutes

University of North Carolina at Wilmington

Tuesday, 20 March 2001

President Lynne Snowden called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

Roll Call

Absent: Adams (Nursing), Alexanian (Physics), Clark (Business), Denny (Soc. Wrk.), Earney (Acct. & Bus.Law), Elikai (Acct.& Bus.Law), Errante (Admissions Cmte.), Feng (Math), Friarson (IT Cmte.), Garris (Info Systs), Hines (St. Affairs Cmte.), Johnson (HPER), Kasala (Math), Kiddle (Research Cmte.), King (Music), Lawson (Acct.), McCall (Anth.), McKay (Psych.), Moore (A&T), Narayan (Comp. Sci.), Sigler (Econ.), Sizemore (Eval. Cmte.), Stowell (Nursing), White (Chem.)

Approval of Minutes

The February minutes were approved.

Individual Reports:

1. Chancellor Leutze

- Noted the Governor's budget for next year includes a 2% salary increase, though this comes out of retirement reserves, but the budget for the following year includes $450,000,000 out of a lottery and closing tax loopholes, which the legislature must approve.
- Since the state is reviewing cell phone use, the Chancellor will direct the Provost to have the Deans review cell phone use in their schools, to determine what is necessary.
- Addressed the issue raised by Dr. Gurganus at the last Senate meeting concerning the decline in Afro-American enrollment at UNCW, noting the following problems:
  - UNCW's policy is concerned not only with enrolling, but retaining minority students. Our minority students graduate at a 36% rate in four years, compared to, e.g. 18% for UNC-Charlotte, and 26% for UNC-G.
  - We have determined through study of the problem that students below a 945 SAT are not likely to succeed at UNCW, but in the eight surrounding counties, 71 Afro-American students had SATs over 1000 last year, and in North Carolina, only 1100 had SATs over 1000. Thus if the UNC system wants all historically white institutions to enroll 10% minorities, it needs 10,000 minorities with SATs over 1000--but there are only 4000+ in every four year period. (The SAT is not the only measure, but it is a better predictor than GPAs.)
  - UNCW is caught in a "catch 22": (a) we are directed to raise minority enrollment, but (not-a), we are directed not to use affirmative action; we compete with other schools, inside and outside the UNC system, who have more money in scholarships to offer for a small pool of qualified students; and it is irresponsible to enroll students who probably cannot succeed.
  - UNCW is not content with the decline in minority enrollment, and is again reviewing its policies, to address this problem. Provost Cavanaugh added on this point that UNCW has a very aggressive outreach program that was begun a few years ago in the middle schools. UNCW continues to keep in contact with those students, who are now beginning high school, and expects the dividends of that program to begin in
2. Provost Cavanaugh

- Addressed questions raised about graduation, beginning with the problem, faced last year, that the number of graduates exceeded fire code regulations; lacking an indoor venue of sufficient size, something had to be done.
- Student and faculty groups surveyed split 50/50 over whether to have an outside ceremony with names or inside ceremonies and whether to have a speaker at a big outside ceremony or not; students voted 60/40 in favor of dropping the department ceremonies, faculty were 2/3 against calling names at the large ceremonies. With no consensus, the decision was made to have two Saturday ceremonies, and to move the department events to Friday (there was no support for 4 p.m. Saturday department ceremonies). It was agreed that students should not receive diplomas on Friday. Thus it evolved. The entire process will be evaluated and reviewed and, where change is called for, redesigned for next year.
- There have been some misunderstandings and false rumors about graduation, including:
  - There is nothing to prevent students from taking pictures and "walking" at Friday department ceremonies, though they receive their actual diploma at the Saturday ceremony.
  - The only change in the content of departmental ceremonies is what is in the envelope--departmental receptions will again be supported by university funds, and departments are free to do exactly what they have done before.
  - In response to concerns about where the families would eat on Friday night, there will be a large buffet at the Friday 8 p.m. Student Affairs event, in addition to what departments provide.
- Announced that motivational speaker and philosopher Tom Morris had agreed to speak at both commencements.

3. President of the Senate Snowden

- Reported on several matters from the Graduate Council, including:
  - Announcement of a joint Master's program with ECU in Education and a Certificate in Hispanic Studies.
  - A new policy on Grant Awards, which reads as follows:

    Academic Affairs Policy on Grant Awards made Directly to Faculty:

    To insure that departments and college/schools are cognizant of the academic and financial implications of all successful grant proposals, and to insure that all grants obtained by university faculty are included in the university's record of external funds received, all proposals submitted by university faculty to external funding agencies must be submitted through the appropriate departmental chair and dean to the Office of Research Administration. This includes proposals to funding agencies that traditionally award grants or fellowships directly to individual faculty members, such as the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Fulbright Scholar Program. Such grants shall be considered as a direct buy-out of faculty services, and any additional university resources requested by a successful applicant, if honored, are to be provided from the budgeted resources of the department and college/school of the submitting faculty member, unless prior arrangements have been approved by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The dean of the appropriate college has the prerogative to deny all requests for additional resources related to a grant award, and to deny requests for leaves of absence predicated upon grant awards.


    There was considerable discussion of this policy. Associate Vice Chancellor McLaurin explained that the policy was an effort to make it easier for faculty, especially humanities faculty, to get support from UNCW. Dean Hadley stated that the policy did not impose a "cut" for the university, from such grants. Some faculty objected to the policy, as imposing another hurdle of administration, and for not being publicly discussed, prior to announcement.

- Noted that Committee Selection Preferences will again take place electronically, as well as voting for Faculty Senate Autonomous committees, and that committee selection will occur soon.
- Announced an open meeting of the Special Select RPT Committee on March 27, 3:30 p.m., Dobo Hall, Rm. 202.
- Reported a website on a student/faculty initiative on the university's environmental policies,
4. Building & Grounds Chair Noland: report postponed until April

Committee Reports:

1. The following motions from the Academic Standards Committee were passed as amended (italics):

   a. Change in Student Withdrawal Policy (Motion 01-7-22)

   The Academic Standards Committee proposes that the Withdrawal Policy on page 71 of the Undergraduate Catalogue be revised as indicated below:

   **WITHDRAWAL POLICY FOR UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS**

   A student is allowed to withdraw from the university or from individual courses without financial or academic penalty through the end of the first week of the semester without having a grade entered on the academic record. Inclusive of the second through the sixth/seventh week of the semester, any student who withdraws from the university or from individual courses will receive a grade of "W." A grade of "W" will not affect the student's grade point average. Beginning with the seventh/eighth week of the semester, a grade of "WF" may be assigned for each course withdrawal and will count as hours attempted; this failing grade may be changed to "W" should extenuating circumstances warrant. If a student is suspended after the deadline for withdrawal with a "W," each instructor shall assign a grade of "WF" or "W" based upon the student's academic performance prior to the suspension.

   To withdraw from an individual class or classes, through the sixth/seventh week of classes, the student must report to the Registrar's Office before or on the last day for withdrawal, as indicated in the university calendar of events. Students attending summer sessions need to be cognizant that the withdrawal period in summer may be only one or two days. Therefore, summer school students should carefully note the last day to withdraw from classes as printed in the summer school schedule of courses.

   To withdraw from all classes and the university at any other time during the semester, the student must process an official withdrawal form through the office of the dean who oversees the student's major. A student who is assigned to Student Academic Support Programs, the General College must process the form through the director of Student Academic Support Programs the General College. If the student is unable to appear in person to withdraw from all classes and the university, written notice must be sent to the appropriate dean's or director's office.

   Should extenuating circumstances warrant, the grade of "WF" assigned for any course withdrawal after the withdrawal deadline may be changed to a "W." Documented extenuating circumstances may include: death of an immediate family member; traumatic and unforeseen circumstances which are considered beyond a student's control; prolonged emotional instability, physical injury or illness which has resulted in the student's inability to complete academic responsibilities.

   It is the student's responsibility to initiate an appeal for this change to be made by submitting a written request and supporting documentation within ten regular class days of the dean's decision. Grounds for appeals are limited to substantive new evidence or material procedural irregularity. In the case of late withdrawals from individual courses or late withdrawal from all courses, the student must initiate the appeal in the office of the dean or director as stipulated in the above procedure for university withdrawal. The dean or director may approve or deny this request for a "W." In cases where the request is denied by the dean or director, the student may submit a written request for consideration with supporting documentation to the Committee on Withdrawal Appeals. All decisions made by the Committee on Withdrawal Appeals are final. The written request with supporting documentation must be rendered prior to the end of the semester in which the withdrawal occurred is requested. A grade of "WF" that is not appealed successfully remains a permanent part of the student's academic record.

   Students attending summer sessions need to be cognizant that the withdrawal period in summer may be only one or two days. Therefore, summer school students should carefully note the last day to withdraw from classes as printed in the summer school schedule of courses.
b. Establishment of a Provost's Committee on Withdrawal Appeals (Motion 01-7-23)

Provost's Committee on Withdrawal Appeals

The committee has jurisdiction over all undergraduate appeal requests for exceptions to rules regarding course withdrawal after the deadline. It is the student's responsibility to submit an appeal through the office of the dean of the college who oversees the major or the director of the General College. Grounds for appeals are limited to substantive new evidence or material procedural irregularity. The appeal must be made within ten regular class days of the dean's decision. All information to be considered by the committee must be submitted in writing. All issues of discussion and record of voting shall be kept confidential. The decision of the committee is by simple majority and final.

The committee shall be composed of 5 voting members and 2 ex-officio non-voting members (i.e., Dean of Students and Registrar). The 5 voting members shall consist of one faculty representative of each college or school, appointed by the Provost, and a representative of the General College. The Dean of Students will serve as chair and be a non-voting member. The Registrar will serve as recording secretary and be a non-voting member. A quorum shall consist of any 3 voting faculty members.

2. Decision on 01-7-24, Research Faculty, and 01-7-25, non-voting student Senate representative, was postponed.

a. To add the following on Research Faculty to the UNCW Faculty Handbook (Motion 01-7-24):

V. A. 6 Research Faculty

The Research Faculty shall consist of those faculty whose major function is to conduct research in the academic units of the University and who hold the rank of Research Professor, Research Associate Professor, or Research Assistant Professor. Research Faculty shall be voting members of the department or academic unit but shall not hold tenured or tenure-earning appointments. The extent of voting privileges shall be determined by the host department or academic unit.

RESEARCH ASSISTANT PROFESSOR. Appointment to the rank of research assistant professor requires completion of professional training, in most fields marked by the doctoral degree, and the clear promise of a successful career in research.

RESEARCH ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR. Appointment to the rank of research associate professor normally requires a record of substantial success in research activities including grant funding and research publications.

RESEARCH PROFESSOR. Appointment to the rank of research professor requires a tangible record of research or artistic achievements and recognition as a scholar within her/his professional field.

Research faculty will support and conduct research for projects and programs that receive extramural funding. In addition, research faculty may teach courses as needed and receive up to twenty five percent of their salary from instructional sources. Those research faculty who also participate in the instructional activities and with the Department Chairs consent, may use flexibility when scheduling courses so as not to interfere with their research obligations.

Research faculty status will be recommended for those scientists who are needed to support research projects and programs sponsored by the University. The faculty sponsor or supervisor will submit recommendations for appointment to the Department Chair or Director. Upon approval by the Chair or Director, the recommendation will be processed according to University hiring policies. Appointments for Research Faculty will be issued for a definite period of time specified in the letter of appointment that will also specify rank, salary, and full-time or part-time status. Annual review of Research Faculty will be conducted by the Supervisor and Chair or Director. Research Faculty will be considered for promotion following the timetable and policies established for regular teaching faculty.

Research faculty will be eligible to hold graduate faculty status based on the criteria of the host department or academic unit.

Research Faculty members with a minimum of 5 uninterrupted years of service at UNCW are entitled to one month's notice with pay for each year of full-time continuous service as a Research Faculty member. The host department or
academic unit will be responsible for arranging the bridge funding. A maximum of twelve months of pay for twelve
or more years of service will be provided. Support will begin upon the termination of grant support. The Research
Faculty member will be assigned duties during the notice period and such pay will cease upon the availability of
other grant support at the University or acceptance of employment elsewhere. Notice so used may be re-earned at the
rate of one month per year up to the maximum of twelve months.

Discussion included questions about "voting privileges" research faculty might have, and whether research faculty
status should not be recommended for "scholars" rather than "scientists" needed to support research projects and
programs sponsored by the University.

b. Non-voting ex-officio seat for an SGA representative (Motion 01-7-25):

The Faculty Senate shall create a non-voting ex-officio seat for a student representative from SGA, with the
intention of fostering increased communication between the two Legislative Bodies. This ex-officio will be an
elected member of our body, appointed by the President of the SGA and approved by a simple majority of the SGA
Legislative Body, and will serve as a liason between the two bodies.

Senator Richard Veit proposed the following substitute resolution:

That section I.A of the Senate Bylaws be revised as follows:

I. Membership

A. Qualifications

1. To be eligible to serve in the Senate as an elected representative one must be a full-time faculty
member of the University of North Carolina at Wilmington. [See Art. I, Sec. 1 - Gov. Doc.]

2. The chancellor shall be an ex officio voting member of the Senate. The chief academic officer and
the dean of each college or school shall be ex officio non-voting members of the Faculty Senate. [See
Art. IV, Sec 2 - Gov. Doc.]

3. The chair of each standing Senate committe, or another committee member elected by the
committee, shall be ex officio a voting member of the Senate. A faculty member may serve
simultaneously as a departmental senator and as a committee senator but shall be limited to one vote.

4. A representative of the Student Government Association, appointed by the SGA President and
approved by a simple majority of the SGA legislative body, shall be a non-voting member of the
Senate and shall serve for a one-year term.

A Bylaws change requires a 2/3 vote of the Senators; this was no longer possible, leading to adjournment.

Old Business

1. Decision on 01-6-13, Writing Across the Curriculum, postponed in February, was again postponed.

New Business:

1. Decision on 01-7-26, Wellness Center, was also postponed due to lack of time and a quorum.

Announcements

None.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.
President Lynne Snowden called the meeting to order at 2:30.

Roll Call

Absent: Adams (Dean, Nursing), Ainsley (Earth Sci), Barker (Lib), Byington (Fac. Welfare), Cami-Vela (FLL), Clark (Dean, Business), Elikai (Acct.), Errante (Admissions), Friarson (IT Cmte.), Halkides (Chm), Hayes (Cur. Sts.), Hines (St.AffairsCmte.), Hunt (M&M), Kiddle (Research Cmte.), King (Music), Lawrence (Acct.), Lecci (Psych.), Leutze (Chancellor), Moore (A&T), Olsen (Com), Roscher (Accountancy), Sigler (Econ.), Sizemore (Evaluation), Smith (Earth Sci), Stowell (Nur), Weber (Com), White (Chemistry), White (CW), Wilson (P&R).

Approval of Minutes

The December minutes were approved.

Individual Reports:

1. Provost Cavanaugh

   1. Plans to use the SACS self-study to begin discussions this spring on the Strategic Plan for Academic Affairs, which must be submitted to the Office of the President in 2002. Among his concerns are (a) which program areas should be the focus of new growth? and (b) what kind of interdisciplinary agreements and cooperative programs can be formed?

   2. Intends to form focus group sessions involving faculty and community people who serve on UNCW boards, to develop better understanding, e.g. of the educational process at UNCW among community representatives, of what graduates will need in the work world among faculty.

   3. Will be gathering people from several areas to create an informational and coordination center for the area of service-learning.

   4. In response to questions, reported that there are no changes concerning who will be in the new classroom building, scheduled to open July 1, and that chairs may schedule with the assumption that it will be open for fall classes; noted that while the upcoming state deficit will affect the university system in some way, it is difficult to know how, until the Governor submits his budget.

2. President of the Senate Snowden

   1. Intends to help arrange faculty forums to contribute to the important process of long-range planning.
2. Gave an update on pending issues involving committees, including (a) the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee has been meeting and will soon make a proposal to the Senate; (b) the ad hoc RPT Committee has been chosen, with Professors Gray, H. Hayes, Sigler, Berkley, Blundo, Bongiorno, Galizio, Griffin, and Waxman as members, Dean Clark and President Snowden ex-officio, Professors Jackson, Spackman and Lowery as Resource Consultants; (c) one or more Senate committees will make update reports to the Senate in the coming months (exceptions: UCC and ACS, which report regularly).

3. The issues of Research Faculty Status and Student Withdrawal Policy have been referred to the ASC for review and recommendations.

4. Noted among Faculty Senate successes over the past year: obtaining a Senate office and 1/2 time secretarial assistance; electronic dissemination of agendas and minutes; submission of the application for a Phi Betta Kappa chapter; and extension of the role of the Faculty Senate in curriculum matters.

3. SACS Director Spackman

1. Department reports were submitted on Dec 15, but the work goes on, including 30 university wide self-study teams. The immediate timetable is for these teams to write their reports this spring, the final Self-Study Report to be available on line in the early fall for campus-wide review, forums, input and revision, and the SACS visit in February, 2002, which will include interviews of chairs, selected faculty and administrators.

2. There will be two further items for departmental reports, concerning (a) changes made in the eight month period from Dec 15 to next fall and (b) a progress report on recommendations. Departments will need to make plans, timetables for progress, and reports on these within the next 1/2 year.

3. Noted that the Academic Affairs Report will include direction to departments to (a) develop policies to obtain data on their graduates' scores on graduate proficiency/placement tests; (b) define policies for the evaluation of their curriculum; and (c) develop policies re: job and graduate school placement rates and graduate placement test scores for their graduates.

4. Requested four Senate committees to submit their reports on "must" statements: Advancement, Building and Grounds, UCC, and Research.

5. In response to questions, Associate Vice-Chancellor Carter said that the Registrar's Office will provide departments with graduation rates for majors; Director Spackman said that while the timetable for the additional departmental reports have not yet been set, since there is still much to be done this spring, the university is in good shape, and that follow-up Progress Reports will involve departmental replies to Self-Study Steering Committee memos inquiring about items which the departments indicated need correction.

Committee Reports:

1. The following motion (01-5-12) from the Steering Committee was passed:

   That the duties and procedures of the the University Curriculum Committee be updated to conform with those mandated by Senate motion 01-3-4:

   a. That Section V.C.1.o.i. of the Faculty Senate Bylaws, stating the University Curriculum Committee's duties, be changed from the following:

      i. Duties. To review all curricular matters concerning basic educational policies,
such as the basic studies program, total number of hours required for graduation, maximum and minimum number of hours required for majors and minors (program concentrations), any curricular conflicts between schools and/or colleges, and other general curricular policies which have total university impact. Proposed policy changes shall be submitted to the Senate at least one month prior to Senate consideration.

to the following:

i. Duties. To review all proposals for the following: the establishment, dissolution, division, or consolidation of academic departments or other degree-granting entities; the establishment, dissolution, or revision of academic degrees, including majors, minors, and certificate programs; policies for maximum and minimum hours required for majors, minors, and certificates; total number of hours required for graduation; basic studies requirements; university-wide competency requirements; course prefixes; any curricular conflicts between schools and/or colleges; and other general curricular policies which have total university impact. The committee shall submit all such proposals, along with the committee's recommendations, to the Senate for consideration.

b. And that all schools and colleges submit such proposals to the University Curriculum Committee for its review. Where possible, all proposals submitted to the committee should have the approval of the school/college, but the school/college may submit proposals to the committee before the school/college review is completed when doing so is necessary to meet a deadline, such as for the publication of the following year's catalog.

**Old Business**

**New Business**

**Announcements**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.
President Lynne Snowden called the meeting to order at 2:30.

**Roll Call**

Absent: Adams (Dean, Nursing), Clark (Dean, Business), Elikai (Acct.), Denny (Soc.Wrk), Dodd (Fin.Aid Cmte.), Earney (Accountancy), Elikai (Accountancy), Errante (Admissions), Friarson (IT Cmte.), Halkides (Chm), Hayes (Cur. Sts.), Hines (St Affairs Cmte.), Johnson (HPER), Kiddle (Research Cmte.), McKay (Psych.), Quakenbush (Bio), Sargent (A&T), Sizemore (Evaluation), White (CW).

**Approval of Minutes:**

The January minutes were approved.

**Individual Reports:**

1. **Chancellor Leutze**

   - In light of the state government financial crisis, it is likely there will be **no salary increases** next year; the chief hope now is to moderate the size of the **increase** in cost to participants in the state health plan.
   - Noted that all the makeshift remedies for state expenditures had been used up, and that, short of an extraordinary resurgence of growth in the state economy, the state was likely to continue to have financial problems in the coming years, if there were no new sources of revenue.
   - In response to questions, said that there will be funds for "enrollment positions" that are currently being filled; that the University retirement plan is not in jeopardy; and that UNCW is actively studying ways to increase benefits to faculty, including increasing the caps in summer salaries and increasing flexibility in faculty scheduling.

2. **President of the Senate Snowden**

   - Reported that the RPT committee had met twice since the last Senate meeting, and was considering two documents from the Provost's office which will be placed on the web.
   - The Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee of the Faculty Assembly passed a resolution commending the NCSU model of RPT, which will also be placed on the web.

3. **Faculty Assembly Delegate Gurganus**

   - Observed that whereas the UNC system is designed to see an increase in enrollment in the next decade, with the consequence that it will need 1200 new faculty in 2010 alone, the state's employees, including faculty, are "bleeding" and bearing the brunt of the state's financial crisis.
   - Added details to the Chancellor's remarks on the increase in medical costs for faculty, e.g. that deductions will probably **double** and copays will also go **up**.
Minutes: February 2001

- Noted that among state employees hired in 1997, 50% have left state service.
- Concluded his report with the presentation of a graph detailing black enrollment at historically white institutions in the UNC system. Although overall black enrollment in historically white institutions has increased from under 8% to over 10% (25+% increase) since 1980, black enrollment at UNCW has fallen from approx. 7% to 5% (almost 30% decrease). UNCW will have to address the question: What is the 'critical mass' of African American students that we expect to have here, to fulfill our mission?

4. Faculty Welfare Committee Chair Byington

- The committee met with Ron Penny, head of HR for the system, and spoke with him about phased retirement and childcare; his remarks were pessimistic for support in either area.
- Noted that if there is to be childcare are UNCW, it will have to pay for itself, and find appropriate space (the lack of space was a chief reason why the effort to bring it about in 1994 failed); but perhaps with the new buildings on campus, it is time to address this issue again.

5. SACS Director Spackman

- Dick Scott, Assistant Vice-Chancellor for Business Affairs, will head up the local arrangements committee for the SACS visit next year.
- Chairs and other administrators should plan to be on campus Feb 25-28, 2002.
- The self-study steering committee is busy reviewing parts of the completed report, and meeting with the relevant subcommittee chairs and university officers.
- Chairs have been notified that additional information for the unit self-studies should be submitted as an Addendum, rather than a revised report, as the process of cross-referencing has begun.

Committee Reports:

1. Decision on the following motion, by the Faculty Senate’s ad hoc committee on Writing Across the Curriculum, was postponed until the March meeting, to allow for departmental discussion (01-6-13):

Proposal for a Writing-Across-the-Curriculum Program at UNCW

Because of concerns about the state of student writing raised at the UNCW Faculty Senate meeting on 18 March 2000, a motion was passed (00-8-17) forming an ad hoc committee to explore the potential benefits of a Writing-Across-the-Curriculum (WAC) Program at UNCW. After studying information about WAC and researching the details of successful WAC programs across the country, this committee is proposing that UNCW create a WAC program of its own.

We believe the formation of a WAC program is the most intelligent response to concerns that student writing skills atrophy during their last two years in college. WAC practices are based on the idea that writing is both a tool for learning as well as a tool for communication. Hence, WAC practices include the use of informal writing-to-learn activities (such as journals and reading logs—often ungraded activities) and more formal writing-to-communicate-learning activities (such as essays, reports, and proposals). WAC programs are also based upon the idea that writing is less a “skill” than a “practice”; therefore, one grows as a writer through continuous effort.

It is not the aim of a WAC program to make “writing teachers” out of all faculty. But, because students need more opportunities to write in order to grow as writers, it is essential that student writing is given more attention in classes where it is currently omitted. Therefore, a well-run WAC program must have a director whose job it is to assist faculty in creating effective writing activities. Through interaction with faculty, the director reinforces these principles:

- An expert in a field can teach writing in that field better than the best general writing instructor.
- One does not have to be a grammar expert to teach writing.
- Adding writing assignments does not mean teaching writing instead of teaching content.
- Adding writing assignments to a course need not reduce the amount of content that can be taught.
• Adding writing to a course need not significantly increase a faculty member’s workload.

The Faculty Senate's ad hoc committee on Writing Across the Curriculum, therefore, makes the following motion (01-6-13):

That UNCW conducts a national search to hire a Director of Writing Across the Curriculum (see section I below) and that the UNCW Faculty Senate approves the formation of a WAC program with required Writing-Emphasis courses for all undergraduates (see section II below).

I. WAC Director position:

Our committee proposes that the University approve a faculty line at the Associate Professor level or higher for this position. The ideal person for this position would be a respected teacher/scholar in any discipline who has experience working with faculty from across the university to develop effective writing assignments and to manage a classroom in which student writing is given significant attention. The WAC Director will:

• hold a full-time faculty line with teaching duties limited to one class per year;
• serve as an *ex officio* member of a new Faculty Senate Campus Writing Committee, which will set guidelines for designating classes as “Writing-Emphasis” (see sect. II below);
• run regular course development workshops for faculty who will be teaching Writing-Emphasis courses, as well as follow-up, reflective workshops for faculty who have completed Writing-Emphasis courses;
• maintain a web presence with necessary information, forms, and course applications, as well as distribute a newsletter to faculty;
• work in close cooperation with the UNCW Writing/Reading Place to coordinate the type of tutorial and/or supplemental instructional assistance the W/R Place can provide to academic units;
• work in close cooperation with the UNCW Center for Teaching Excellence to coordinate the type of faculty development instruction the CTE can provide to academic units.

II. Pilot Program:

A. Writing-Emphasis courses

In addition to the English Composition courses (ENG 101 & 201) students will take during their freshman and sophomore years, students will also be required to complete six additional hours of courses designated as “Writing-Emphasis”; at least three of those hours must be in the student’s major discipline. Writing-Emphasis courses should:

• require each student to write a total of at least 15 pages over the course of a semester;
• base a substantial portion of the final course grade on student writing--that is, on written assignments and/or essay exams;
• spread writing requirements throughout the semester, with at least 10 pages of writing due before the last week of class;
• require students to review and revise a portion of their writing (e.g., revision in response to instructor comments and/or peer review);
• vary required writing in regard to factors such as content, audience, and/or format;
• enroll no more than 25 students (although larger enrollments may be justified by other factors related to the instructor's overall teaching responsibility, such as course-load reductions or the availability of teaching assistants).

B. Ongoing faculty development workshops
Faculty proposing courses to be designated as W-E will attend a workshop during the semester before the course is to be taught. This workshop will introduce faculty to the theories and techniques common to WAC, such as those emphasizing effective responses to student writing, fostering revision, and writing with new technologies. Workshops will also focus on practical teaching concerns such as managing the different workload of a W-E class and reflecting on teaching practices. Participants will offer their experience and expertise in cross-disciplinary discussions and in follow-up workshops.

2. The following motions, by the University Curriculum Committee, were passed (01-6-14, 01-6-15):

   a. In the area of Oral Communication Intensive, that CRW 496 "Senior Seminar in Creative Writing" be designated as oral communication intensive for Creative Writing majors (01-6-14).

   b. In the area of Computer Competency, that CSC 105 "Introduction to Computing and Computer Applications" be designated as a computer competency course for Art and Theatre majors. (01-6-15)

3. The following motions, by the Academic Standards Committee, were passed (01-6-16, 01-6-17, 01-6-18):

   a. Graduation with University Honors (01-6-16):

      The requirements for Graduation with University Honors on page 93 should be amended as follows:

      Program Requirements for Graduation with University Honors

      To graduate with University Honors, a student must:

      1. complete at least 12 credit hours of basic studies courses honors sections*

      2. complete six credits of "Interdisciplinary Honors Seminars" (HON 110 and in fall of freshman year, HON 210 in fall of sophomore year) *

      3. complete two credits of "Honors Enrichment Seminar" (HON 120) *

      4. maintain academic eligibility: at the completion of 27 credit hours at UNCW, an overall grade point average of 3.00 or better in all coursework is required. An overall grade point average of 3.20 or better must be established by the completion of 58 credit hours and maintained thereafter.

      5. earn a minimum of a C (2.0) in all honors work [B (3.0) in 499 and honors contract courses], and must have a 3.0 overall GPA in all honors curriculum coursework. If a student earns a grade below a C in an honors basic studies course, the grade may count toward that student's basic studies requirements but not toward his or her honors requirements. If that student wishes to complete the honors requirements for University Honors, he or she must take an additional honors basic studies course and earn no lower than a C. Students earning below a C in HON 210 or HON 120 must take additional seminars, respectively, and earn no lower than a C.

      6. complete requirements for Departmental Honors

      *Note: students entering as sophomores after fall of the freshman year must complete HON 210, one two credit hours of HON 120, and at least six nine hours of honors basic studies.

   b. Revision of the Retention Chart (01-6-17, amendment to the motion in italics)

      The RETENTION CHART, page 70 of the University Undergraduate Catalogue should be revised as follows:

      Proposed Retention Chart

      Total Quality Hours Required GPA Warning
Minutes: February 2001

and Transfer Hours for Eligibility to Continue in the University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-26</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50-1.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-58</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.75-1.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59-88</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.90-1.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89 or more</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the same page, a standard should be established addressing minimal eligibility for each term:

"**Full time students (at least 12 hours)** who do not earn at least a 1.00 Semester GPA and pass at least nine academic hours in any semester will be reviewed by the appropriate dean to determine academic eligibility."

**c. Transfer Credit for D's (01-6-18):**

The current practice of granting course credit and no hours for the transfer of D’s should be discontinued. In fact, no course credit or hours should be granted for the transfer of courses in which a student had earned less than a 2.0.

**Old Business: None**

**New Business**

1. **The Steering Committee** offered the following motion, which passed as amended (01-6-19):

   Whereas the *Faculty Handbook* establishes no minimal educational accomplishment for a variety of term (non-tenure track) appointments;

   The Office of Academic Affairs requests that the Faculty Senate amend the *Faculty Handbook*, Section V.A.1 APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, TENURE, RETIREMENT, AND FACULTY RIGHTS, Faculty Appointments, paragraph 2 as follows (revision in italics):

   Persons with other titles such as instructor, lecturer, visiting faculty, adjunct faculty, writer-or artist-in-residence, and teaching, laboratory, or research assistants and associates hold term appointments (non-tenure track) that do not culminate in eligibility for tenure review. *Normally, an Appointment to the positions of instructor, lecturer, visiting faculty, adjunct faculty, and writer-or artist-in-residence will require, at a minimum, a the master’s degree or equivalent. This requirement will may be relaxed in exceptional cases.*

2. **Virginia Adams** of the School of Nursing and **Richard Veit** of the Department of English offered the following motion, which passed (01-6-20):

   That a student who, having earned one degree, returns to UNCW to earn a second iteration of that same degree in a different major, be permitted to celebrate that accomplishment by marching at graduation ceremonies.

3. The **University Curriculum Committee** added the following motion, which passed (01-6-21):

   That the following courses be approved:

   a. **ANT 210** ("Physical Anthropology") and **ANT 326** (Human Osteology) as Computer Competency courses for Anthropology majors.

   b. **PLS 201** ("Introduction to Political Science Methods") as a Computer Competency course for Political Science majors.

**Announcements:** None.

Adjourned at 4:40 p.m.
President Lynne Snowden called the meeting to order at 2:30.

Roll Call

Absent: Adams (Dean, Nursing), Buttino (UAC), Byington (Fac. Welfare), Clark (Dean, Business), Denny (Soc. Wrk.), Dodd (Fin.Aid Cmte.), Dutka (Lib.), Errante (Admissions), Friarson (IT Cmte.), Garris (Info Syst.), Kasala (Math & Stats), Kiddle (Research Cmte.), King (Music), McKay (Psych.), McLaurin (Math & Stats), Roscher (Accountancy), Sigler (Econ.), Sizemore (Evaluation), Smith (Earth Sciences), Weber (Communications), White (Chemistry), Wilson (P&R).

Approval of Minutes

The November minutes were approved.

Special Order of the Day

Dan Noland of English was elected President-elect of the Faculty Senate; Steve McNamee of Sociology and Criminal Justice and Tom Schmid of Philosophy and Religion were nominated as candidates for Faculty Assembly Delegate.

Individual Reports:

1. Chancellor Leutze:

1. Welcomed members of the SGA to the meeting of the Faculty Senate, and urged greater involvement of students in the activities of governance at the university.

2. Thanked the faculty and, from his staff, especially Mark Lanier, for their help in promoting the bond issue, which passed in all 100 counties.

3. Indicated that although the university will attempt to minimize disruption, there will be not only three new buildings constructed, but renovations in eight buildings on campus, and urged departments and faculty to get their comments in early, particularly if plans involving their department areas will cause problems.

4. Noted that the new Fine Arts building is planned so that a Performance Hall could be added to it; but this will require raising the $20 million cost locally, and the Chancellor is not sanguine about this likelihood. The university will have $3 million to renovate Kenan, and is investigating what it might cost to enlarge it.

5. Continues to be concerned about the impact of pending court cases on future state revenues for higher education.
2. President of the Senate Snowden

1. Thanked Chancellor Leutze, Provost Cavanaugh and other members of the administration for their efforts to inform the public in relation to the bond referendum.

2. Reported that Steven Dworkin had volunteered and been appointed to serve as chair of the Bookstore Committee.

3. Intends to appoint the RPT committee before the new year, and urged faculty from business, nursing, and education to participate--at present no faculty from these schools have volunteered to serve on this important matter.

3. Faculty Assembly Delegate Gurganus

1. Reported that President Broad was also pleased by the bond vote, and had thanked the faculty on behalf of the UNC system.

2. Reported on President Broad's discussion of the 2 year budget for the system. The university intends to increase access through increasing enrollments, and expanding need-based financial aid. The university has asked for 6% faculty raises over each of the next two years; does not think these goals will be met.

3. There will be a report back to the general administration this spring on the Phased Retirement plan, now in the third year of the five year test period.

4. Reported on the level of faculty involvement in planning on different campuses. UNCW, Elizabeth City, NC Central, and Winston-Salem State were the only campuses in the system that did not have Faculty Senate involvement in undergraduate planning; there is currently a greater level of Faculty Senate involvement in graduate planning at NCSU, UNC-CH, and UNCG, though the proposed motion 01-3-4 would make our involvement comparable to NCSU.

4. Professor Mackain, for the Wellness Program

1. Reported on the issue of environmental smoking, noting that 68% of students in a survey of over 200 students were in favor of prohibiting smoking outside entrances to university buildings, and that this still was an issue on campus.

2. Recommended (a) prohibiting smoking at entrances; (b) providing attractive smoking shelters for smokers; (c) providing signs and ashtrays for the shelters.

3. Discussion included questions about the restriction and enforcement of smoking in outdoor space, and about costs of proposed shelters.

Committee Reports:

1. The following motion from the Faculty Senate Steering Committee concerning Faculty Governance passed:

   Whereas, the Faculty Governance Document assigns to the faculty primary responsibility and authority for establishing curriculum and reviewing proposed new academic programs:

   "Section 4. The Faculty is accountable for the quality of instruction and scholarship at this university and accepts the responsibility and authority, both primary and shared, for developing, monitoring, and modifying policies affecting the academic environment, including but not limited to:

   …c. establishing curricula; reviewing existing programs, including auxiliary academic programs
(e.g. continuing education); deleting programs; developing and reviewing proposed new programs; 

And whereas, the Faculty Governance Document delegates this authority to the Faculty Senate and, by 
extension, to the committees it establishes:

"Section 6. The Faculty shall delegate to the Faculty Senate all of the duties and responsibilities 
listed in Sections 4 and 5. "

Therefore, be it resolved, that it shall be the role and responsibility of the Faculty Senate to review and 
approve or disapprove recommendations for significant changes to the university’s curriculum, which 
shall include Basic Studies requirements; the establishment, dissolution, division or consolidation of 
academic departments or other degree-granting entities; and the establishment or revision of academic 
degrees, including majors, minors, and certificate programs.

And that the Senate shall assign initial review of undergraduate proposals to the University Curriculum 
Committee, which shall forward such proposals, with the Committee's recommendations, to the Senate 
for action. The ex officio Faculty Senate representative to the Graduate Council shall inform the Senate 
of all similar graduate proposals approved by the Graduate Council.

And that the provisions of this motion shall be effective January 1, 2001. (Motion 01-3-4).

2. The following motion from the Academic Standards Committee defining student records passed:

That the following paragraph be added to the Undergraduate Catalogue on page 71 as the first paragraph of 
the section Transcripts:

"Transcripts are permanent student records maintained by the Registrar's Office. A transcript provides an 
unabridged chronological listing of the academic history of a student's study at the University of North 
Carolina at Wilmington. This is the document which is forwarded at the request of the student or former 
student, to persons or agencies for their use in reviewing the academic performance of the student." 
(Motion 01-4-9)

3. The following motion from the University Curriculum Committee passed as revised:

That the following courses be approved:

   a. MAT 110 as a Basic Studies course in area E, Natural Sciences and Mathematical 
      Sciences.

   b. PSY 410, 412, and 417 as Oral Competency courses for psychology majors.

   c. THR 486 as an Oral Competency course for art and theatre majors, replacing THR 
      495, and the removal of THR 495 from Basic Studies Oral Competency 
      designation.

   d. MAT 161-162, 261, 335, STT 215 and CSC 112 or 121 as Computer Competency 
      courses, all of which are required for mathematics majors.

   e. ART 339, THR 411, and ARH 290 as Computer Competency courses for art and 
      theatre majors.

   f. SWK 496 and 497 as Computer Competency courses for social work majors.

   g. BIO 335, 345, 366, 410, 488, and 495 as Computer Competency courses in biology, 
      two of which are required for biology majors.
h. NSG 415 as a Computer Competency course for nursing majors.

i. CRW 207, 208, and 209 as Computer Competency courses for creative writing majors.

j. ACG 201 and MIS 313 as Computer Competency courses for majors in the school of business.

k. PED 306 as an Oral Competency course for HPER majors, replacing PED 348 and removing PED 348 from Oral Competency designation. (Motion 01-4-10).

Old Business

New Business

1. The following motion from the Department of Psychology on minors passed as revised:

   Whereas the guidelines stated in the current UNCW Undergraduate Catalogue indicates that "the declaration of a minor is done in the Registrar's Office," and neither the Registrar's Office or the student is required to notify the student's major department or the department in which they have selected to minor, and this lack of notification can lead to situations in which the student may not receive complete or accurate advisement as regards to graduation requirements,

   Therefore, be it resolved that the description in the Undergraduate Catalogue under Minors on page 97 be amended as follows (addition in italics):

   "Declaration of a minor or a certificate program is done in the Registrar's Office. Whenever a student declares a minor or certificate program, the Registrar's Office shall notify both the department of the minor/certificate and also the department of the student's major." (Motion 01-4-11)

Announcements

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.
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President Snowden called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

Roll Call

Absent: Adams (Nursing), Alexanian (Physics), Clark (Business), Denny (Soc. Wrk.), Dodd (Finan.Aid Cmte.), Earney (Acct.), Elikai (Acct.), Errante (Admissions Cmte.), Friarson (IT Cmte.), Hines (St. Affairs Cmte.), Hunt (Mgt.), Huntley (Pub. Srve. Cmte.), Huntsman (Budget Cmte.), King (Music), Lawson (Acct.), Leutze (Chancellor), McCall (Anth.), McKay (Psych.), Sigler (Econ.), Sizemore (Eval. Cmte.)

Approval of Minutes

The March minutes were approved.

Special Order of the Day

The Senate went into executive session for consideration of an honorary degree nomination.

Individual Reports and Acknowledgements of Appreciation

1. Provost Cavanaugh

- Reported that the Masters in Public Administration degree had been approved by BOG, and acknowledged Professor Tom Barth's efforts on its behalf.
- Reported that we already have 1600+ deposits for next year's freshman class, and are showing a 39% yield rate, which puts UNCW in an elite group of institutions.
- The new classroom building is progressing on schedule and should open in the fall.
- In response to question, explained that the building next to the UNCW watertower is a support facility for wireless antennae that will be placed on the watertower.

2. President of the Senate Snowden

- Announced that, in the interests of time, she would present her "State of the Senate" report at the Faculty Meeting this Thursday, 4 p.m.

3. Vice President of the Senate Dworkin presented outgoing President Lynne Snowden with a gavel and stand in appreciation for her services to the Senate and the University the past two years in office.

Old Business

1. Faculty Senate Steering Committee substitute motion (01-7-25) was passed:
That section I.A of the Senate Bylaws be revised as follows:

I. Membership

A. Qualifications

1. To be eligible to serve in the Senate as an elected representative one must be a full-time faculty member of the University of North Carolina at Wilmington. [See Art. I, Sec. 1 - Gov. Doc.]

2. The chancellor shall be an ex officio voting member of the Senate. The chief academic officer and the dean of each college or school shall be ex officio non-voting members of the Faculty Senate. [See Art. IV, Sec 2 - Gov. Doc.]

3. The chair of each standing Senate committee, or another committee member elected by the committee, shall be ex officio a voting member of the Senate. A faculty member may serve simultaneously as a departmental senator and as a committee senator but shall be limited to one vote.

4. A representative of the Student Government Association, appointed by the SGA President and approved by a simple majority of the SGA legislative body, shall be a non-voting member of the Senate and shall serve for a one-year term.

2. Professor Bushman presented the Faculty Senate’s ad hoc committee on Writing Across the Curriculum motion (01-6-13) to the Senate.

That UNCW conducts a national search to hire a Director of Writing Across the Curriculum (see section I below) and that the UNCW Faculty Senate approves the formation of a WAC program with required Writing-Emphasis courses for all undergraduates (see section II below).

I. WAC Director position:

Our committee proposes that the University approve a faculty line at the Associate Professor level or higher for this position. The ideal person for this position would be a respected teacher/scholar in any discipline who has experience working with faculty from across the university to develop effective writing assignments and to manage a classroom in which student writing is given significant attention. The WAC Director will:

- hold a full-time faculty line with teaching duties limited to one class per year;
- serve as an ex officio member of a new Faculty Senate Campus Writing Committee, which will set guidelines for designating classes as “Writing-Emphasis” (see sect. II below);
- run regular course development workshops for faculty who will be teaching Writing-Emphasis courses, as well as follow-up, reflective workshops for faculty who have completed Writing-Emphasis courses;
- maintain a web presence with necessary information, forms, and course applications, as well as distribute a newsletter to faculty;
- work in close cooperation with the UNCW Writing/Reading Place to coordinate the type of tutorial and/or supplemental instructional assistance the W/R Place can provide to academic units;
- work in close cooperation with the UNCW Center for Teaching Excellence to coordinate the type of faculty development instruction the CTE can provide to academic units.

II. Pilot Program:

A. Writing-Emphasis courses

In addition to the English Composition courses (ENG 101 & 201) students will take during their freshman and sophomore years, students will also be required to complete six additional hours of courses designated as
“Writing-Emphasis”; at least three of those hours must be in the student’s major discipline. Writing-Emphasis courses should:

- require each student to write a total of at least 15 pages over the course of a semester;
- base a substantial portion of the final course grade on student writing--that is, on written assignments and/or essay exams;
- spread writing requirements throughout the semester, with at least 10 pages of writing due before the last week of class;
- require students to review and revise a portion of their writing (e.g., revision in response to instructor comments and/or peer review);
- vary required writing in regard to factors such as content, audience, and/or format;
- enroll no more than 25 students (although larger enrollments may be justified by other factors related to the instructor's overall teaching responsibility, such as course-load reductions or the availability of teaching assistants).

B. Ongoing faculty development workshops

Faculty proposing courses to be designated as W-E will attend a workshop during the semester before the course is to be taught. This workshop will introduce faculty to the theories and techniques common to WAC, such as those emphasizing effective responses to student writing, fostering revision, and writing with new technologies. Workshops will also focus on practical teaching concerns such as managing the different workload of a W-E class and reflecting on teaching practices. Participants will offer their experience and expertise in cross-disciplinary discussions and in follow-up workshops.

This motion was met with considerable criticism, including:

- departments could not provide the instructors to teach the courses
- the university should not create a new administrative position, when the funding for such a program would be taken out of academic affairs
- there was not a great need for such a program
- writing is not a uniquely difficult skill, and that other skills have similar claims
- we could have a pilot program, under the C.T.E., without hiring new personnel

As the Senate seemed unwilling to approve the entire proposal, Senator Dworkin moved that the proposal be divided into three motions concerning the separate sections, (1) supporting the hiring of a Director of the WAC program (01-8-32), (2) the formation of a pilot WAC Program (01-8-33), and (3) the provision of faculty development workshops (01-8-34). This motion (01-8-31) to divide the original WAC motion (01-6-13) passed:

The Senate then voted on the first of these motions, that UNCW conducts a national search to hire a Director of Writing Across the Curriculum (01-8-32). This motion was defeated.

Several Senators noted that the Senate had, the previous year, determined that Writing Across the Curriculum addressed problem that needed attention, and this was why the ad hoc committee had been created. Also, it seemed that at least some of the objections could be answered by minor changes in the proposal.

Senator Veit then proposed to refer the entire proposal back to the committee to see if it could redesign the WAC program proposal, taking into consideration the various objections that had been raised in discussion. This passed.

3. Faculty Steering Committee motion (01-7-24) was passed as amended:
That the category of Research Faculty be instituted and that the following section be added to the UNCW Faculty Handbook (changes to the motion since the previous meeting are indicated thus: addition, deletion):

**V. A. 6 Research Faculty**

The Research Faculty shall consist of those faculty whose major function is to conduct research in the academic units, centers and institutes of the university and who hold the rank title of Research Professor, Research Associate Professor, or Research Assistant Professor. They typically serve as principal investigators on grants or contracts administered by the university. Research faculty may must have an affiliation with a department or academic unit shall be voting members of the department or academic unit but shall not hold tenured or tenure-earning appointments, shall not hold tenured or tenure-earning appointments, and shall not be counted toward a department's representation in the Faculty Senate. The extent of voting privileges shall be determined by the host department or academic unit.

*The criteria for each of the titles are as follows:*

**RESEARCH ASSISTANT PROFESSOR.** Appointment to the rank title of research assistant professor requires completion of professional training, in most fields marked by the doctoral degree, and the clear promise of a successful career in research or artistic activity achievement.

**RESEARCH ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR.** Appointment to the rank title of research associate professor normally requires a record of substantial success in research or artistic activity achievements including grant funding and research publications.

**RESEARCH PROFESSOR.** Appointment to the rank title of research professor requires a tangible record of research or artistic achievements and recognition as a scholar within her/his professional field.

Although research faculty support and conduct research for projects and programs that receive extramural funding, they may teach courses as needed and receive up to twenty-five percent of their salary from instructional sources if granted adjunct status by their academic unit or department. Those research faculty who also participate in the instructional activities and with the Department chairs consent, may use flexibility when scheduling courses of research faculty so as not to interfere with accommodate their research obligations.

Research faculty status will be recommended for those scientists faculty who are needed to support research projects and programs sponsored by the university. The faculty sponsor or supervisor will submit recommendations for appointment to the department chair or director. Upon approval by the chair or director, the recommendation will be processed according to university and departmental or unit hiring policies. Appointments for research faculty will be issued for a definite period of time specified in the letter of appointment that will also specify rank title, salary, and full-time or part time status. The university does not guarantee it will provide space, facilities or services beyond those approved for currently active grants. Annual review of research faculty will be conducted by the supervisor and chair or director. Research faculty will may be considered for promotion following the a timetable and policies to be established for regular teaching faculty by the Faculty Senate.

Research faculty will be eligible to hold graduate faculty status based on the criteria of the host department and or academic unit or center.

Research faculty members with a minimum of five uninterrupted years of service at UNCW are entitled to one month's notice with pay for each year of full-time continuous service as a research faculty member. The host department or academic unit or center will be responsible for arranging the bridge funding. A maximum of twelve months of pay for twelve or more years of service will be provided. Support will begin upon the termination of grant support. The research faculty member will be assigned duties during the notice period and such pay will cease upon the availability of other grant support at the university or acceptance of employment elsewhere. Notice so used may be re-earned at the rate of one month per year up to the maximum of twelve months.

4. **Department of Earth Sciences** motion (01-7-26) was passed as amended:

Whereas requiring faculty to telephone the Wellness Center on a case-by-case basis to learn whether or not students have been ill serves no medical or educational purpose;
Whereas the current policy may have the effect of encouraging students who actually are ill to come to class to avoid penalty;

The Faculty Senate requests that the Wellness Center provide excuses notifications for students who are ill and should not be in class, at the student's request.

New Business

1. **Jessica Maher** of the Graduation Pledge Alliance spoke in support of the following pledge:

   "I pledge to explore and take into account the social and environmental consequences of any job I consider and will try to improve these aspects of any organizations for which I work."

2. **SACS Director Ken Spackman**

   - Reported that 7 of the 25 section reports are completed, and that the SACS steering committee is working to insure that UNCW is in compliance with the 450+ "must" statements
   - Noted that the university intends to use the Self Study to identify suggestions for improvements (the "should's")
   - Urged the Senators and all UNCW faculty to stay informed on SACS developments via the SACS web site, and showed the Senators how to access the the recommendations and suggestions accepted by the SACS steering committee

3. **University Curriculum Committee** motion (01-8-27) was passed:

   That the Faculty Handbook statement about membership in the UCC in Appendix F, section V.A.1.o.ii be changed as follows:

   Membership. Nine faculty members, including at least four from the College of Arts and Sciences and at least one from each of the professional schools, and two others from the faculty at large. Term of membership shall be three years with staggered terms so that 1/3 of the committee terms expire in a given year. A member may serve a second consecutive term. Committee shall elect a vice-chair at the initial Fall meeting who will normally assume the role of chair in the following year. The chief academic officer and a representative from the library faculty shall be ex-officio non-voting members.

4. **Academic Standards Committee** motions (01-8-28, 01-8-29) were passed as amended:

   The Academic Standards Committee submits the following motions to the Senate:

   1. **Pass/Fail 498 Internships (01-8-28)** was passed as amended:

      The Committee moves that the changes be made on Page 95 of the 2000-01 Undergraduate Catalogue under Internships and on page 62 under Grades and Reports as given below and suggests that this be implemented in Fall 2002, the expected date that the changes will appear in the Catalogue.

      **GRADES AND REPORTS (Pg 62)**

      | Grade | Description          |
      |-------|----------------------|
      | Z     | Unreported Grade     |
      | HP    | Distinguished Work   |
      | P     | Satisfactory Work    |
      | NP    | Unsatisfactory Work  |

      An “IP” is assigned to departmental honors projects (499) in semesters other than their final one. Upon successful
completion of the entire project, “IP” grades from previous semesters are converted to letter grades, and quality points are retroactively awarded.

Grades of “HP”, “P” and “F” can be assigned to internships designated by a 498 number as described in the section on Internships. The credit hours earned with a "P" will count towards the number of hours required to graduate, but will be excluded from the computation of the GPA. Grades of "F" will be included in the computation of the GPA.

INTERNSHIPS (pg 95)

Several departments in the College of Arts and Sciences and the Cameron School of Business offer students the opportunity to earn academic credit within a work environment. The purpose of the internship experience is to enhance, supplement, and integrate the learning that occurs in formal classroom settings. Permission of the dean and department offering the internship is required to enroll, and limits are placed by the department on the number of credit hours earned in this manner which may be applied toward graduation. Internships designated by a 498 number will be graded on a High Pass (HP), Pass (P), Fail (F), No Pass (NP) basis. These credit hours earned will count towards the number of hours required to graduate, but the grade of Pass (P) will be excluded from the computation of the GPA. For further information on internships, refer to the courses numbered 498 in the course listings and then contact the departments offering them.

2. Extension of Time for New Retention Schedule (01-8-29) was passed:

The Academic Standards Committee moves that an extension of time be given for Freshmen to clear a warning. With the new standards for the whole campus and the desire to give them a chance to adjust to the expectations of college, the committee agreed that the following wording be added as a second paragraph after the new Retention Chart (01-6-17) and that the third paragraph on page 70 be changed as indicated.

Transfer students are placed in the above retention chart based on total hours transferred from all institutions attended. Transfer students' grade point averages are computed only on quality hours attempted through the University of North Carolina at Wilmington.

All Freshmen, regardless of the semester enrolled, will be given one semester (Fall or Spring) past the warning period to remove any deficiencies. If such deficiencies are not removed, the student will be suspended from the university for one semester. Suspended students must reapply for re-enrollment for fall or spring semesters. However, admission is contingent upon availability of space. Suspended students may re-enroll in any summer session. Applications for re-enrollment are available in the Admissions Office and should be filed as early as possible to ensure enrollment consideration.

Any other student who does not meet the minimum grade point requirement for retention at the conclusion of the spring semester will be declared ineligible. The student will be allowed to make up deficiencies during this university's summer sessions which immediately follow the spring semester in which he/she was declared ineligible. If such deficiencies are not removed, the student will be dismissed suspended from the university. Suspended students must reapply for re-enrollment for fall or spring semesters. However, admission is contingent upon availability of space. Suspended students may re-enroll in any summer session. The student may re-enroll for any summer and fall semester if space is available. Applications for re-enrollment are available in the Admissions Office and should be filed as early as possible to ensure enrollment consideration.

A second academic dismissal declaration of academic ineligibility will result in dismissal from the university and is final unless eligibility for continued residence or for readmission is restored by completion of sufficient work during the summer sessions at the University of North Carolina at Wilmington.

Students may, through appropriate administrative review of mitigating circumstances, be authorized to continue with their studies on a conditional basis. Written permission must be obtained from the appropriate dean prior to the beginning of the semester in which such students wish to enroll.

5. Faculty Senate Steering Committee motion on the University Mace passed (01-8-30):

Whereas the University Mace is a symbol of authority representing both the Faculty and the Chancellor of the
University, and

Whereas, it brings great dignity and a sense of pageantry to university ceremonies of prominence,

Therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends all consideration be given to the inclusion of the University Mace in its major university ceremonies attended by the Faculty and the Chancellor, including commencements, honors convocations, and other significant events. Furthermore, it is the recommendation of the Faculty Senate that the University Mace be maintained as a symbol of the University's authority and displayed in a place of honor that is protected and yet accessible to the University Community.

New Business

1. Senator Pabst observed that the proposal to refer the WAC motion back to committee was shirking the responsibility to decide on the matter, and that it would be appropriate, if the committee could put forward a revised proposal in the time remaining this semester, before a new Senate met in the fall, to vote on such a proposal. She therefore moved (01-8-35):

   That a special meeting of the Faculty Senate be held on May 1, if the ad hoc WAC committee is able by that time to present a revised motion concerning a WAC program to the Senate for consideration.

   This motion passed.

Announcements

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.
President Noland called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

Roll Call

Absent: Barker (Library), Bingham (Physics), Buttino (Advan. Cmt), Byington (Fac Wel Cmte), Clark (Business), Dodd (Finan.Aid Cmte.), Earney (Acct.), Errante (Admissions Cmte.), Friarson (IT Cmte.), Garris (IS), Grindlay (Earth Sci), Hines (St. Affairs Cmte.), Howe (Mgt.), Hunt (Mgt.), Huntley (Pub. Srve. Cmte.), Lawson (Acct.), Leutze (Chancellor), Lundeen (Bio), McLaurin (Math), Rogers (UCC), Roscher (Acct.), Sigler (Econ.), Sizemore (Eval. Cmte.), Stowell (Nursing), Tyndall (ITSD).

Approval of Minutes

The April minutes were approved.

Special Order of the Day

The Senate elected new officers: Vice-President, Mark Spaulding; Secretary: Tom Schmid; Members of the Steering Committee: Denise DiPuccio, Richard Olsen, Ann Pabst, Richard Veit.

Individual Reports

1. Provost Cavanaugh

- Reported on the University's response to the tragic news of the terrorist attacks. The decision not to cancel classes was in part to allow faculty/staff to help students deal with concerns they had about it. University staff were deployed across campus to counsel students who seemed especially concerned.
- Noted that the University is planning a Memorial Service for Friday, 3 p.m.
- Expressed thanks to the many faculty and staff who were especially helpful to students in this difficult time.
- Introduced Jim Dragna, Director of Student Development Services, who reported in more detail on the UNCW response to the crisis, in particular in relation to international students and students with relatives in the DC and NYC areas.
- Noted that students and faculty who are traveling by air may be grounded for one or two days.

2. President of the Senate Noland

- Instructed the Senate on the basic function and form of Senate procedures and urged Senators to bring the concerns of their faculty before the Senate.
- Noted that the Ad hoc PTR Policy Committee, chaired by Richard Veit, had been reconvened. Senator Veit explained that this was due to a question that had arisen about the absence of an appeals process in relation to a finding of deficiency.
- Has formed an Ad hoc Faculty Handbook Committee, and is looking for volunteers.
- Explained the concept of a "consent agenda" for noncontroversial items, which allows such items, if
there are no objections, to be grouped and voted on together, without debate.
- Noted that if there are individuals who do not want to be on the Senate listserv, they should notify him.

3. Faculty Assembly delegate Richard Veit

- Reported that the first meeting of the Faculty Assembly will be this Friday; if Senators have items they would like to see addressed, they should convey them to him or the other UNCW delegates, Dan Noland and Steve MacNamee.
- In response to question, said that among the items the Assembly would be addressing were the Health Care plan, salaries, University Governance. A suggested item was university tuition waivers for faculty.

4. SACS Self-Study Director Spackman

- Began his report by noting that it was important to counteract the perception that the SACS report would "gather dust" after the February visit: on the contrary, it will affect what we do in the future.
- Reviewed the future timetable for SACS events on campus: (1.) Oct 1-19: Review of edited Self-Study report. This will be available on the web, and faculty should participate in this critical review process. (2.) Oct 15: Deadline for responses to the 30 recommendations (which correspond to "must" statements, i.e. are necessary for renewed accreditation) and 48 suggestions (which correspond to "should" statements and ways to improve the university). (3.) Feb 25-28: Campus accreditation visit.
- Explained in detail the rationale behind the ten Recommendations and Suggestions affecting the Faculty Senate: 3.1 Suggestion 4 (evaluation of faculty service), 4.2 Recommendation 1,2,5 (foreign languages requirement, diversity of languages, rules concerning declaration of a major), 4.4 Recommendation 2 and 6.1 Recommendation 2 (concerning the Faculty Handbook), 6.2 Recommendation (Planning), 6.3 Suggestion (the Budget Committee), 6.4 Suggestion 2 (the Building and Grounds Committee), 6.5 Recommendation 2 (supplemental compensation).

Committee Reports

The following items were submitted as items under a "consent agenda." There being no objections from the Senate, they were voted on and passed in one vote.

1. The Faculty Senate Steering Committee motions to refer to committee as a result of recommendations approved by the SACS Steering Committee (02-1-1, 02-1-2):

   a. Refer to the Academic Standards Committee for consideration and a report to the Senate by the November, 2001 meeting the following recommendation from SACS Section 4.2: Undergraduate Program (Motion 02-1-1):

   The Faculty Senate must consider imposing an effective rule requiring undergraduate students to declare a major after 48 credit hours have been earned at UNCW. (Motion 02-1-1)

   b. Refer to the University Curriculum Committee for consideration and a report to the Senate by the December, 2001 meeting the following recommendations from SACS Section 4.2: Undergraduate Program (Motion 02-1-2):

   i. The Provost, in collaboration with the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures and the faculty senate, must develop a plan to increase the diversity of languages offered at UNCW appropriate to the purpose and goals of UNCW.

   ii. The Faculty Senate must review the Basic Studies requirement in foreign language to ensure a level of language proficiency appropriate to the purpose and goals of UNCW.
Old Business

None.

New Business

None.

Announcements

None.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m. Afterward, President Noland gave a brief orientation on Senate procedures to new members.
President Noland called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

Roll Call

Absent: Barker (Library), Buttino (Advan. Cmt), Clark (Business), Dodd (Finan.Aid Cmte.), Earney (Acct.), Errante (Admissions Cmte.), Grindlay (Earth Sci), Hines (St. Affairs Cmte.), Hunt (Mgt.), Lundeen (Bio), McLaurin (Math), Narayan (Comp.Sci.), Roscher (Acct.), Sigler (Econ.), Sizemore (Eval. Cmte.), Tyndall (ITSD), Weber (Communications), Wilson (P&R)

Approval of Minutes

The September minutes were approved.

Special Order of the Day

The Senate voted on an Honorary Degree Nomination.

Individual Reports

1. Chancellor Leutze

- Thanked the Faculty for its continuing efforts to accommodate students needs in the present crisis, and for their concerns for foreign students and support for free discussion.
- Noted that Faculty could encourage students who might be experiencing unusual stress to seek help at the Counseling Center.
- Reiterated the point that some members of the General Assembly do not understand the concept of tenure, and that it is important to have a Post-Tenure Review Policy, in order to protect the system of tenure.
- Said that he would like to see the media "lower the temperature" on the topic of terrorism; the University is a very unlikely target, but we do have heightened security on campus.

2. President of the Senate Noland

- Also expressed his thanks to UNCW and to the UNC system for its support of academic freedom and freedom of expression.

3. Faculty Assembly delegate Richard Veit

- Reported that UNC system enrollment has increased 7000+ students this year, a gain of 4.3%; this is as if the system added one whole new campus.
- One effect of this unsustainable level of growth has been the addition of part-time faculty; the Assembly will have a report on non-tenure track faculty at the next meeting.
- Reported on the State Budget, noting that although the UNC system had to endure over $50 million...
in cuts, there were no reductions in EPA teaching funds, and the State Legislature had the courage to raise over $1 billion in revenue (1 Republican voting yes), which prevented massive, damaging cuts to the University.

**4. Faculty Welfare Cmte Chair Byington and Human Resources Dir. Sam Connally**

- Reported good news: the University has found a new life-insurance underwriter; that university-paid insurance will continue; rates for employee-paid insurance have been significantly reduced; and there is now an open-enrollment period for faculty interested in more life insurance at excellent rates; see [http://www.uncwil.edu/univ_planning/messages.htm](http://www.uncwil.edu/univ_planning/messages.htm).

**5. SACS Self-Study Director Spackman**

- Noted there have been only 40 responses to the Self-Study posted on the web; if faculty read it, but have no comment, please add "no comment," so it will be recorded that they have visited the site.
- Reminded the Senate of the Hearing on the Self-Study, Thursday, Oct 18, 3:30-5 p.m. at Dobo 134.
- Explained that in the next phase of the SACS process, especially the site visit, the focus will be on department and committee chairs, deans, etc., and urged all faculty to read the Introduction and Summary of the SACS report.

**Committee Reports**

1. Senator Richard Veit, chair of the **Senate Ad-Hoc Committee on Post-Tenure Review**, addressed the committee on their motion to modify the PTR policy (Motion 02-2-3). He noted that the purpose of Post-Tenure Review is not to re-evaluate a tenure decision, but is a five-year review, similar to the annual reviews; it is expected that the overwhelming majority of faculty will be found "satisfactory," rather than "exemplary" or "deficient;" and that UNCW's policy, along with others in the UNC system, may have helped to prevent a widespread movement in state legislatures to end tenure: Mary Burgen, Executive Secretary of the AAUP, told him "Post-Tenure Review saved tenure." In response to question, Veit said that 2-3% of faculty across the UNC system, 4% of faculty at UNCW had thus far been found "deficient" (the difference not being statistically significant).

There were several questions raised about the motion to add the option of a hearings procedure in the case of a disputed finding of "deficient." Among the questions and his responses:

- **Why does the proposed policy have two options, mediation through the Faculty Professional Relations Committee and a Hearings Panel?** Mediation has to be agreed to on both sides; this failing, the policy turns to a more formal procedure.
- **What would be done if a department had an internal appeals procedure for findings of deficiency?** This had not been discussed (apparently only one department has one), but the committee might, on further discussion, want to recommend that all internal appeals proceedings be completed, before appeal to the university hearing panel.
- **Are some units out of line with the university PTR policy?** Discrepancies had been found. Some schools, e.g. Nursing, are moving quickly to make their guidelines congruent.
- **Is there a conflict between the proposed policy and the duties of the FPRC as described in Section 607 of the Code?** There is no explicit conflict, but questions have been raised about the proposal which the committee could taken under advisement in its discussion, if the motion were postponed.

The Senate then **passed** a motion (02-2-4) to postpone the vote on motion 02-2-3 (concerning PTR policy) until the November meeting.

**Old Business**

None.
New Business

None.

Announcements

None.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.
President Noland called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

Roll Call

Absent: Benedetti (Library), Byington (Fac.Welfare), Clark (Business), Denny (Soc.Wrk.), Dodd (Finan.Aid Cmte.), Dworkin (Psych.), Earny (Acct.), Errante (Admissions Cmte.), Hayes (Cur.Stds.), Herstine (PER), Hunt (Mgt.), Huntley (Pub.Srvc.), Huntsman (Budget), Johnson (PER), Kasala (Math), King (Music), Lerch (Anthro.), Martinez (Cur.St.), McElheny (A/T), Mory (Cur.St.), Narayan (Comp.Sci.), Roscher (Acct.), Shay (IT Cmte), Sigler (Econ.), Sizemore (Eval. Cmte.), Spaulding (Hist), Tyndall (ITSD), Weber (Communications), White (Chem.), White (Cr.Writing)

Approval of Minutes

The October minutes were approved.

Individual Reports

1. Chancellor Leutze, University Attorney Hal White, and Provost Cavanaugh

- **Chancellor Leutze** opened the floor to questions. The first concerned the University policy regarding the privacy of emails. He deferred to University Attorney Hall White.
- **Attorney White** made several points in response to questions:
  - the controversy involved an email sent to a wide distribution by a student criticizing the US in the aftermath of 9/11, to which a professor responded critically, after which the student received several strong responses by others; the student's parents and attorney demanded on three occasions to have all emails of the professor opened and made available, which the University refused, but in their fourth request stipulated that the University provide public record documents on his computer, arguing that although this was a personal exchange it involved faculty and students in a matter of public debate, and therefore was a professional activity on the professor's part.
  - by North Carolina law, all documents, emails, faxes, etc. that are stored on public property and created "pursuant to public business" are "public" documents; the extent to which this includes "personal" items is as yet legally undecided. Attorney White had been involved in the UNC system/UNCW effort to extend a zone of privacy for faculty, such that personal documents, emails, etc., where there was a "reasonable expectation of privacy" could be protected. But it is possible that a court could find that all documents, emails, etc. produced at work or on stored on university property are public records.
  - the University believed it was necessary to respond to the demand for the public records, as required by law, but also sought to protect the professor's personal records. The email logs of the professor were opened (in his and the student's presence), and a spot-check was done to determine if any were "public records." None were determined to be such, and no emails were turned over (one email had been incidentally deleted from the professor's computer, concerning the scheduling of spring classes).
  - UNCW does not monitor, spot-check, or archive emails or other items. However, there is a three week period in which emails are backed up on the server, during which time they might be recalled, should a
call for public records be made.
- if a newsreporter says to a faculty member, "I want to see your email files," they should refer the reporter to Attorney White.
- a link to the Computer Resource Use Policy is located at www.uncwil.edu/www/admin.html.
- the distinction between public and private documents applies to downloaded as well as faculty-generated material.

- **Provost Cavanaugh** responded to further questions, after the Chancellor had to leave:
  - public information/disclosure statutes apply to research, except where trade secrets apply, and therefore data requested must be provided, but the identity of participants is protected.
  - a firm 2.7% and a possible 4% cut are under discussion in Raleigh. Until a decision is made, UNCW is sequestering 4% and vice chancellors are anticipating a 2% cut in permanent funding. If funding from state revenues continues to decline, the University will have to increase revenues, with the most feasible sources being auxiliary services, grants and contracts, tuition and fees. UNCW continues to receive the fewest dollars per student of any UNC system school, and we continue to educate BOT members to this fact. Some tuition increases are likely, and some of those funds will be used for equity adjustments in faculty and staff salaries.
  - the target freshman class for 2002 is 1600. We have exceeded maximum 18% out-of-state enrollment for some time and must cut back or lose funds. Admissions practices have been changed to better control enrollment, and for spring 2002 we will admit a minimum number of freshmen and transfer students.

2. President of the Senate Noland

- Noted that next month's meeting includes election of the Senate President for next year, so Senators should come prepared to nominate and/or vote.

3. Faculty Assembly chair Richard Veit

- Meeting this Friday; if you have matters you wish to see considered, let him know. Email privacy is an item on their agenda.

4. SACS Self-Study Director Spackman

- The plan is to have the UNCW Self-Study Report printed in the first week of December, and distributed and mailed soon thereafter.
- Thanked all those who added additional materials to the report concerning matters of assessment; he believes UNCW avoided recommendations as a result, and he "feels good" about the final product.
- There will be an exit report by the SACS Reaffirmation Committee on Feb 28. All recommendations by the SACS team will be given verbally at that time. A written report of the Committee will not be received until April.

**Committee Reports**

1. The following two motions (02-2-3, 02-3-4) by the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Post-Tenure Review passed:

   1. That the UNCW Post-Tenure Review policy be changed as follows (deletions, additions):

      **Post-Tenure Review**
      
      **University of North Carolina at Wilmington**

      **Introduction**
Post-tenure review (PTR) is a comprehensive, formal, periodic evaluation of cumulative faculty performance to ensure faculty development and to promote faculty vitality. The purpose of PTR is to support and encourage excellence among tenured faculty by recognizing and rewarding exemplary faculty performance; providing for a clear plan and timetable for improvement of faculty found deficient; and for those whose performance remains deficient, providing for the imposition of appropriate sanctions, which may, in the most serious cases, include a recommendation for discharge.

Just as an institution's policies governing the award of tenure must reflect the institution's mission, policies for PTR must also be guided by institutional mission, and the performance of each tenured faculty member must be evaluated in the context of the mission of the individual's college or school and department. While PTR is not a revalidation of the award of tenure, many characteristics of an institution's tenure policies remain relevant in judging the performance of tenured faculty. UNCW's "Criteria for Reappointment, Promotion and Award of Tenure" (Appendix C, Faculty Handbook) states:

> The primary concern of the university is teaching its students. Thus teaching effectiveness is the primary criterion for reappointment, promotion, and tenure.

It follows that teaching effectiveness should be the primary evaluation area in the post-tenure review of a faculty member. The "Criteria for RPT" also states:

> It is essential also that the university faculty be composed of individuals with a variety of strengths. Heterogeneity among faculty in contributions to the university is crucial.... Fixed weightings to be used in determining the relative importance of these different areas should be avoided in making reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions.

The most effective way to ensure that the importance of individual contributions is appropriately recognized, and to account for differences in the nature and mission of varied academic disciplines, is to base the post-tenure evaluation on peer review by departmental colleagues, and to have the department chair determine the quality of faculty performance and, when necessary, to guide the creation and implementation of a development plan. To effectively link the annual evaluation of faculty to PTR, the post-tenure review must take place at the departmental level, as do the annual evaluations.

PTR is an addition to an already elaborate process of faculty evaluation. Care must be taken to focus on the new features of evaluation that PTR brings, and to avoid redundancy of evaluation. The objective of PTR is to identify and reward exemplary faculty performance, and to identify and correct deficient faculty performance. PTR provides a new opportunity to identify sustained exemplary performance of faculty that may not be recognized over a period of only one year, and for which there has heretofore been no means of recognition. PTR provides a new constructive mechanism to correct deficient performance of faculty, in the rare event that it occurs. PTR should not be used to suggest ways that competent, conscientious faculty may merely improve their satisfactory performance—annual reviews already have that function.

**Faculty to Be Reviewed**

PTR is required of all tenured faculty whose primary responsibilities (50% or more) are teaching and/or research and/or service. Tenured librarians shall be subject to PTR. For each chair or administrator within a college or school\(^1\), the dean shall determine whether that person meets the criteria for mandatory review.

\(^1\) For the purposes of this policy, the term "college or school" shall include Randall Library, and the term "dean" shall include the University Librarian.

**Timetable**

Faculty of whom PTR is required must undergo a review no later than the fifth academic year following the most recent of these review events:

- award of tenure at UNCW
- departmental recommendation for promotion
- prior post-tenure review
- other equivalent comprehensive review of performance at UNCW
- return to faculty status following administrative service of two years or more

Exceptions shall be made in the following cases:

1. During the first five years of the PTR policy, faculty whose most recent review event occurred more than five years before...
2. A period when a faculty member is on leave from professional duties shall not be included as part of the five years between mandatory review events; in such cases, the maximum interval shall be extended accordingly.

3. A faculty member who is temporarily assigned to duties away from the Wilmington area during the period when a review is required shall undergo review during the academic year when duties in the area are resumed.

4. PTR is not required of a faculty member who has officially set an irrevocable retirement or resignation within the next 12 months.

A tenured faculty member may elect to undergo PTR during any academic year. No faculty member shall be compelled to undergo PTR as described in this policy earlier than as required by this timetable. At the beginning of each academic year, each dean shall provide a list of those faculty required to be reviewed during that year.

2 This restriction applies to post-tenure review and does not limit other currently-existing forms of evaluation; for example, the Policies of Academic Freedom and Tenure states, "When circumstances warrant, an evaluation may be initiated by the department chairperson, the appropriate dean, the provost and vice chancellor for Academic Affairs, or the chancellor" (Faculty Handbook, Appendix A: IV.D.4).

Procedures

Performance shall be reviewed for the period since the prior review event or for the preceding five years, whichever period is less. A faculty member being reviewed shall provide a succinct report, for the period being evaluated, on professional activities in teaching, research/artistic achievement, and service. Each department shall establish the format for the report, except that it must include (where applicable) courses taught, theses directed, and all evaluations of teaching; publications, performances, and presentations; service activities; and all annual evaluations for the years under review.

PTR must include peer review of faculty professional performance. Each department shall establish a procedure for peer review, which must include an evaluation by at least three tenured colleagues of the faculty member's record in teaching, research/artistic achievement, and service. Peer reviewers shall present their evaluations in writing as advice to the chair, who will then write the evaluation relative to the mission of the university, college/school, and program. The chair's evaluation shall state whether the faculty member's overall professional performance has been satisfactory, exemplary, or deficient. The chair shall provide a copy of the evaluation to the faculty member and shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the review. The faculty member has the option of attaching a written response. The chair shall forward a list of the peer evaluators, a copy of the evaluation, and the faculty member's response, if any, to the dean for information. The faculty member and chair shall sign the evaluation in acknowledgment of its receipt by the faculty member. In the case of a finding of deficient, the faculty member has the right to appeal the finding on the basis of the four grounds stated to be impermissible (see Appeal from a Finding of Deficient or from a Finding of Non-Compliance with a Development Plan below).

Each year the Provost shall establish deadlines for the completion of the PTR process.

3 For the purposes of this policy, the term "chair" shall be equivalent to "immediate supervisor" and shall include the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs of the School of Nursing and the University Librarian.

Criteria

Criteria for satisfactory faculty performance are professional competence; conscientious discharge of duties, taking into account distribution of workload as assigned by the department chair; and efforts to improve performance. Criteria for exemplary faculty performance are sustained excellence in teaching, research/artistic achievement, and service; and professional performance that is substantially above expectations and that significantly exceeds the performance of most faculty. Deficient faculty performance is performance that does not meet the criteria for being judged satisfactory, as stated above. Annual evaluations for the period under review shall be given great consideration during PTR; faculty whose annual reviews have indicated satisfactory performance or better during that period shall normally be expected to receive a satisfactory evaluation or better under PTR.

Outcomes

In the case of performance judged to be exemplary, the results shall be documented for university award consideration. Documentation of such performance shall also be forwarded by the chair to the dean, the Provost, and the Chancellor for appropriate recognition.
In the case of performance judged to be deficient, the chair shall forward to the faculty member a copy of the evaluation by the deadline set by the Provost. Within ten working days of receipt of the evaluation or within ten working days following the denial of an appeal of the finding of deficient, the chair and faculty member shall meet and, in consultation, begin to create a development plan. The plan shall include the following:

1. specific strategies and steps designed to lead to improvement,
2. delineation of specific outcomes which constitute improvement,
3. resources to be committed, if any,
4. a specified timeline, not to exceed three years,
5. a statement of the process by which performance under the plan will be evaluated and feedback provided to the faculty member, including a clear specification of who will conduct the evaluation, and
6. a clear statement of consequences should the improvement not occur.

The faculty member and the chair shall sign the development plan, and the chair shall forward a copy to the dean, who must approve any resources to be committed.

If a mutually acceptable plan is not reached within one month after the initial meeting, the currently existing mediation process of the Faculty Professional Relations Committee shall be utilized. If a mediated settlement cannot be achieved under the auspices of the FPRC, the dean shall act as arbitrator in the development of a plan.

A development plan shall not be required of a faculty member who has received a satisfactory review.

4 In the case of the Library and the School of Nursing, the plan shall be forwarded to the Provost or Provost's designee.
5 The Provost or the Provost's designee shall assume this role for the Library and the School of Nursing.

Due Process

The Code states: "A faculty member who is the beneficiary of institutional guarantees of tenure shall enjoy protection against unjust and arbitrary application of disciplinary penalties. During the period of such guarantees, the faculty member may be discharged or suspended from employment or diminished in rank only for reasons of incompetence, neglect of duty, or misconduct of such a nature as to indicate that the individual is unfit to continue as a member of the faculty" (VI: 603). Disciplinary actions for noncompliance with the development plan are limited to those established in Chapter VI of The Code. Due process and the right of appeal as specified in The Code and the Faculty Handbook shall be guaranteed. The outcome of evaluation should be confidential—that is, confined to the appropriate university persons or bodies and the faculty member being evaluated—and released only at the discretion or with the consent of the faculty member.

A faculty member may appeal a finding of deficient, a finding of non-compliance with a development plan, or the imposition of sanctions other than discharge, suspension from employment, or diminishment in rank to the Faculty Professional Relations Committee (FPRC). A faculty member may appeal the imposition of serious sanctions (discharge, suspension from employment, or diminishment in rank) to the Hearings Panel as specified in Chapter VI of The Code.

Appeal from a Finding of Deficient or from a Finding of Non-Compliance with a Development Plan

A faculty member may appeal a finding of deficient or a finding of non-compliance with a development plan, by letter to the chair of the Faculty Professional Relations Committee, within ten working days after the faculty member has received the written evaluation from the department chair. The FPRC reviews the request of the faculty member in order to determine whether the decision may have been based upon any of the grounds stated to be impermissible. A finding of deficient or a finding of non-compliance with a development plan may not be based upon (1) the faculty member's exercise of rights guaranteed by either the First Amendment to the United States Constitution or Article I of the North Carolina Constitution; (2) discrimination based upon the faculty member's personal characteristics, such as age, color, handicap, national origin, race, religion, sex, or sexual orientation; (3) personal malice; or (4) procedural irregularities that cast reasonable doubt upon the validity of the decision and which may include but are not limited to the following:

- a process not in compliance with the policies and procedures set forth in this document
- a process not in compliance with the policies and procedures set forth in the departmental PTR policy
- a process not in compliance with existing policies of faculty evaluation published in The Code or the UNCW Faculty Handbook
a finding of deficient that is inconsistent with the faculty member's annual evaluations for the period under review, unless reasons for the finding are both extraordinary and also clearly and reasonably articulated in writing.

- a finding of non-compliance with a development plan that is inconsistent with the terms stated in the development plan.

Should the committee determine that the evaluation may have been based upon any of these impermissible grounds, it grants the faculty member a hearing and either sustains the appeal or else confirms the previous evaluation. The committee's decision is a recommendation to the Provost or the Provost's designee, whose decision is final.

In a department that has established in its post-tenure review policy an internal appeals process, the faculty member must first use that process before using university-level processes. The faculty member must initiate the university-level action within ten working days following a denial of the departmental appeal.

**Failure to Agree on a Development Plan**

If a mutually acceptable plan is not reached within one month after the initial meeting, the currently existing mediation process of the Faculty Professional Relations Committee shall be utilized. If a mediated settlement cannot be achieved under the auspices of the FPRC, the FPRC shall advise adjustment by the dean as the committee considers appropriate and the dean shall act as arbitrator in the development of a plan.

The Provost or the Provost's designee shall assume this role for the Library and the School of Nursing.

**Policy Review and Revision**

UNCW's PTR policy was initially developed by a committee of faculty, adopted by the Faculty Senate in the spring of 1998, and approved by the Board of Trustees of UNCW and by the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina. The first academic year of its implementation was 1998-99.

Revisions in this PTR policy may be initiated at any time by action of the Faculty Senate. Non-editorial revisions require approval by both the Board of Trustees of UNCW and by the Board of Governors. Such revisions shall become effective in the academic year following their approval by the Board of Governors.

The policy was revised by the Senate in the fall of 2001 with implementation during the 2002-03 academic year.

---

2. That the Senate requests that the Faculty Professional Relations Committee (a) review its hearings procedures to determine if any adjustments are necessary to comply with the revised UNCW Post-Tenure Review Policy and (b) report its findings to the Senate by the February, 2002 meeting (02-3-4).

2. The following motions of the University Curriculum Committee (02-3-5, 02-3-6, 02-3-7, 02-3-8) passed.

1. That the following course and curricular changes in Basic Studies, Economics, Environmental Sciences and Environmental Engineering be approved (motion 02-3-5):


   d. GGY 205, *Practical Methods in Geography*, as a course fulfilling computer...
2. That the proposed minor in Economics be approved.

**Requirements for a Minor in Economics:** A minor in economics requires a total of 18 hours with a minimum overall quality point average of 2.00 in courses counted towards the minor. Business majors are not eligible for a minor in economics.

**Core Requirements (9 hours):** ECN 221, ECN 222 and ECN 328.

**Core Electives (9 hours):** Nine hours of any economics courses numbered above 299 for which one has the necessary prerequisite. Elective courses used to fulfill the requirements for the economics minor may not additionally be used to satisfy the requirements for other majors.

3. That the proposed 3+2 dual degree program in Environmental Sciences (UNCW) and Environmental Engineering (NCSU) be approved.

**3 + 2 PROGRAM IN ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING**

The 3 + 2 Program is a cooperative agreement between the UNCW Environmental Studies Program and the North Carolina State University Environmental Engineering Program. The Program gives students the opportunity to earn a Bachelor of Science in Environmental Science from UNCW and a Bachelor of Science in Environmental Engineering from NCSU. Students will complete courses listed below to meet the requirements at UNCW. This course of study can be completed in three years. If the student meets the transfer admission requirements for NCSU listed below, the student is accepted into the Environmental Engineering Program. This Program can be completed in two years. UNCW has agreed to accept credits from NCSU to complete the degree requirement at UNCW and NCSU has agreed to accept credits from UNCW to complete degree requirements at NCSU. Thus, the student received a degree from UNCW and a degree from NCSU.

To complete the 3 + 2 Program, a student must complete the following courses at UNCW:

- All current basic studies requirements.
- EVS General core requirements: BIO 110, CHM 101, EVS 195, MAT 111, STT 215, GGY 130 OR EVS (GLY) 120 AND EVSL (GLYL) 120, TEC 101.
- EVS Oral competency requirement: EVS 495.
- EVS Physical Science elective curriculum: must include CHM 211, CHML 211, EVS (ECN) 325 and 11 hours of additional physical science elective at the 300-400 level.
- In addition to these courses, students must also complete MAT 261.

A student must complete this course of study with an overall GPA of at least 2.90 and have at least a 2.50 GPA in the last two calculus courses (MAT 162 and MAT 261) to
meet NCSU’s transfer admission requirements. Students in this program will be advised jointly by the Director of Environmental Studies and the Director of the Engineering Program at UNCW to assure completion of the correct requirements for both programs.

2. That the following changes for Biological Sciences be approved (motion 02-3-6):

Department of Biological Sciences

Change

(The text replacing Biology requirements on pages 108-110 of the 2001-02 catalog follows.)

Requirements for a Major in Biology for the B.A. degree: BIO 110, 205, 206 should be taken early in the program of study; BIO 495; and completion of the additional requirements for one of the options described below.

Option 1. General: 51 credits. A minimum of 30 hours chosen from biology courses numbered above 299. CHM 101-102. A "C" (2.00) average is required on all BIO courses above 200. This option is a flexible program that can be designed by a student and an advisor to meet personal educational goals and interests that may or may not include graduate study. The program may be used to meet a set of specific requirements; for example, certification for teaching at the secondary school level.

Option 2. Conservation Biology: 51 credits. BIO 335 and BIOL 335, BIO 356, BIO 366 and BIOL 366, BIO 466, 475, CHM 101-102; and 11 additional hours selected from: BIO 345 and BIOL 345 or BIO 355, BIO 358 or 452, BIO 364, 375, BIO 377 or 446, BIO 430, BIO 435 or 436, BIO 454, 456, BIO 457 and BIOL 457, BIO 481, 482. This option is designed for students who are interested in the field of conservation biology or natural resource management. STT 215 is strongly recommended. Those students who plan to pursue graduate study should also take CHM 211-212, CHML 211-212, and either PHY 101-102 or 201-202. A "C" (2.00) or better average is required on all BIO courses above 299.

Requirements for a Major in Biology for the B.S. degree: BIO 110, 205, 206 should be taken early in the program of study; BIO 335 and BIOL 335; and completion of the additional requirements for one of the options described below.

Option 1. General: 63 credits. BIO 345 and BIOL 345 or BIO 347 and BIOL 347 or 355; BIO 366 and BIOL 366; and 495. CHM 101-102, CHM 211-212 and CHML 211-212 or CHM 211, CHML 211, BIO 465 and BIOL 465; PHY 101-102 or 201-202; MAT 151; STT 215; and at least eight additional hours from courses numbered above 299, of which 3 hours must be cellular/molecular biology. (The following are considered to be courses in cellular-molecular biology: BIO 320, 347, 410, 425, 430, 435, 436, 440, 465.) A "C" (2.00) average is required on all BIO courses above 299. Students planning to attend graduate school are encouraged to take CHM 235; MAT 152; CSC 112, 121. This degree program is designed for students who plan to attend graduate school or seek employment in various fields of biological specialization.

Option 2. Premedical Sciences: 65 credits. BIO 315, BIO 345 and BIOL 345 or BIO 347 and BIOL 347 or 355, and a minimum of eight hours chosen from BIO 316, 320, 371, 377, 410, 425, 435, 440. CHM 101-102, CHM 211-212 and CHML 211-212; PHY 101-102; MAT 151, 152. A "C" (2.00) average is required on all BIO courses above 299. This option is designed for students who wish pre-professional training in medicine, dentistry, optometry and other health-care fields. The sequence of courses conforms to entrance requirements prescribed in publications of the Association of American Medical Colleges, the American Association of Dental Schools and the Council on Optometric Education of the American Optometric Association.

Option 3. Preclinical Laboratory Science: 63 or 65 credits. To be eligible for application to a Clinical Laboratory Internship program, the student should follow the requirements for the BS degree (Option 1 or 2). BIO 320 and BIO 425 are required. The application for clinical internship should begin early in the senior year. A list of nationally available clinical internship programs can be
Requirements for a Major in Marine Biology for the B.S. degree: 68 or 70 credits. BIO 110, 205, and 206 should be taken early in the program of study; BIO 335 and BIOL 335, BIO 345 and BIOL 345 or BIO 347 and BIOL 347 or BIO 355, BIO 362, BIO 366 and BIOL 366; and BIO 495. A minimum of 10 hours chosen from BIO 358, 380, 434, 446, 447 or 472, BIO 457 and BIOL 457, BIO 458, 462, 463, 468, 481, BIO 483 and BIOL 483, BIO 486 (only 3 hours of 486 allowed toward the major). CHM 101-102; GLY 150; PHY 101-102 or 201-202; MAT 111-112 or 115 and 111 or 115 and 151 or a higher sequence. A minimum of four hours chosen from CHM 211-212 and CHML 211-212, CHM 235, 255, 475; CSC 112, 121; GGY 333; GLY 101, 337; STT 215. A "C" (2.00) or better average is required on BIO courses above 299. The UNCW marine biology curriculum is a unique baccalaureate program in the university system. It includes a strong foundation of biology with an emphasis in marine biology at the junior and senior levels. Full use is made of the natural laboratory provided by the adjacent Atlantic Ocean through extensive field work in many marine biology courses. The curriculum is flexible enough to meet the individual needs of the student enabling preparation for graduate studies or for teaching and research careers available to one with the baccalaureate degree.

Requirements for Teacher Licensure in Biology: In addition to completing the requirements for a degree in biology or marine biology and the other requirements of the Teacher Education Program, the following courses are required for licensure: BIO 315, 235 or BIO 335 and BIOL 335, BIO 345 and BIOL 345 or BIO 347 and BIOL 347 or 355, BIO 366 and BIOL 366, BIO 238 or 425, GLY 101 or 150, and PHY 101 or 105.

For information on the Teacher Education Program admissions criteria and the courses required for licensure in North Carolina, see the Watson School of Education section of this catalogue. Students planning to pursue licensure should apply to the Watson School of Education as soon as admissions requirements are met (typically in the sophomore year) and plan their programs in regular consultation with their advisors. Teacher licensure requirements are established at the state level and may be changed by the state at any time.

Clinical Laboratory Sciences

CLS 401. Immunology-Serology (2)

CLS 405. Hematology (8)

CLS 407. Immunohematology (4)

CLS 412. Clinical Microbiology (8)

CLS 414. Clinical Microscopy (2)

CLS 420. Clinical Chemistry (8-10)

CLS 490. Special Topics in the Clinical Laboratory Sciences (1-2)

Pages 163 and 164 of the current catalogue that include the Degree Requirements for Clinical Laboratory Sciences, the advisor and the web address.

3. That the following changes for the Geography Major be approved (motion 02-3-7):

Geography

Computer Competency Requirement: To satisfy the computer competency requirement
for the B.A. degree in geography a student must successfully complete GGY 205 and 320.

**Oral Communication Competency Requirement:** To satisfy the oral communication competency requirement for the B.A. degree in geography a student must successfully complete GGY 495.

**Requirements for a Major in Geography for the B.A. degree:** 47 hours. Core Requirements: GGY 205, 130, 140, 180, 181, 320, and 495 (21 hours). In addition, students must complete (1) a minimum of 17 hours within a chosen option, (2) 9 hrs outside of the option, (3) at least one laboratory class (**), and (4) at least one Regional class (**). At least 14 hours must be above the 299 level.

**Option 1. Applied Geography.** Option Requirements: GGY 222, 224, and 270. Choose a minimum of eight hours from GGY 322(**), 324(**), 426(**), 473, 478. This option is designed for students who are interested in careers as planners, remote sensing and GIS specialists, and historic preservationists.

**Option 2. Human Geography.** Option Requirements: GGY 210 and 382. Choose a minimum of eleven hours from GGY 245, 255(**), 282(**), 312, 317, 340, 350, 383(**), 384(**), 385(**), 388(**), 452 and 485(**). This option is designed for students who are interested in careers as regional specialists, international business officials, and social scientists.

**Option 3. Physical Geography.** Option Requirements: GGY 222, 230, and 335(**). Choose a minimum of seven hours from GGY 333(**), 336, 337, 433, and 435. This option is designed for students who are interested in careers as climatologists/meteorologists, geomorphologists, and hydrologists.

A “C” (2.00) or better average is required on all courses taken within the department and on all required courses above the 199 level in the department.

**Requirements for a Minor in Geography:** 23 hours. GGY 205, 130, 140, 180 or 181, 320 and six additional hours of geography courses, all of which must be at the 300-400 level.

4. That the following change in requirements for Chemistry be approved (motion 02-3-8):

**Chemistry**

Change the grade requirement for Chemistry majors from a “C or better” in each CHM course to and overall G.P.A. of 2.00 in all chemistry courses counted towards the major.

3. The Academic Standards Committee motion (02-3-9) to include the following statements in the Undergraduate Catalogue (p. 61 of 2001-2002 before CHANGE OF MAJOR OR MINOR) was approved:

**DECLARATION OF MAJOR**

Undergraduate students must declare and be accepted into a major field of study before or during the semester that they complete 45 semester hours of credit. Students will not be allowed to preregister or register for the following semester until a major or a pre-major has been declared. Additional advising may be required prior to registration for continuing students who have completed 30 hours or more and have not declared a major or a pre-major.

Transfer students are required to select a major or a pre-major at the time of admission to UNCW. Advising of transfer students is done within the chosen major field.

Schools, Departments and Programs with admission requirements have a pre-major and that academic unit provides discipline-specific advice. Students accepted into pre-major status should
have a high probability of completing the admission requirements in the major within two semesters of acceptance.

**Old Business**

None.

**New Business**

None.

**Announcements**

None.

The meeting was adjourned at 4 p.m.
Roll Call

Absent: Benedetti (Library), Byington (Fac Wel Com), Cami-Vela (FLL), Clark (CSB), Clifford (ENG), Denny (SWK), Dodd (Fin Aid Com), Dutka, (Library), Earney (Acc & Bus Law), Errante (MUS), Grindlay (ERS), Gurganus (MAT & STAT), Halls (ERS), Hayes (Curr St), Hines (Student Aff Com), Howe (Mgt & Mktg), Huntley (Pub Ser Com), King (MUS), Lawson (Acct), Narayan (CSC), Olsen (COMM), Schmid (PAR), Sigler (ECON), Sizemore (Eval Com), Tyndall (ITSD), Weber (COMM), Webster (BIO), White (CHM),

Approval of Minutes

The February minutes were approved as posted.

Individual Reports:

1. Chancellor Leutze

   • VP for Legal Affairs Leslie Winner has been on campus for two days and is very complimentary. When she asked what she could do to help UNCW the chancellor noted our need for money and greater diversity.

   • A visiting team made up of the past chancellors of NC A&T, Fayetteville State, UNC Charlotte, and UNC Pembroke will be on campus to observe and advise re: increasing minority enrollment and other diversity issues.

   • He is “overjoyed” at the outcome of the SACS review; there will be a campus party.

   • UNCW students (basketball team, cheerleaders, band, etc.) represented us well in the NCAA tournament. They were well received in California, and we got good coverage.

   • The recent BOG meeting was long and “depressing.” The Board approved a tuition increase of 8% for in-state and 12% for out-of-state students and designated 50% of that increase to help fund enrollment increases and 50% for return to the campuses. In addition, permission was given for individual campuses to raise tuition by $200.

   • The state budget picture is no better than he reported last month; legislators know that they must raise money but are still averse to raising taxes.

   • In response to a question:

      o UNCW’s current minority enrollment? African-American 4.5%; total minority just over 8%.
2. President of the Senate Noland

- Noting the significant changes in the professional “landscape” over the last few years, e.g. Post-tenure Review, Phased Retirement, and changes in RTP policies, he urged all departments to meet and discuss the proposed changes in the RTP document before the next Senate meeting so that the discussion and decision can be as informed as possible.

3. Calendar Committee Chair Walker

- The BOG has voted to allow greater flexibility in the academic calendar, moving from a mandated 75 instructional days per semester (exclusive of exam period) to 750 minutes per credit hour (2250 minutes per 3 credit hr. course) inclusive of exam period. The Calendar Committee wishes broad input from faculty, students, and administrators as they discuss how to respond to this opportunity to change the calendar. The calendar for 2002-2003 has been published, so the most feasible time for any change would be for the 2003-2004 AY. A straw poll indicated that Senators support the idea of returning to the shorter semester in place before President Spangler mandated the current one.

Committee Reports:

1. Motion 02-7-24 from the Faculty Senate Steering Committee concerning approval of the revised Phased-Retirement was passed.

Old Business

There was no old business

New Business

1. Motion 02-7-25 from Senators Dworkin, Olsen, Evans, Lecci, and Hunt to rescind Motion 02-6-23, and refer it to a relevant committee for more thorough investigation, was passed.

2. It was moved and seconded from the floor that the question of how to best reward non-tenure-track faculty for teaching excellence be referred to the Faculty Welfare Committee for consideration and a recommendation. The motion (02-7-26) passed.

The employment and status of non-tenure-track faculty is an area of growing concern nationally as well as in the UNC system. For additional information please see the recent system report online at http://www.northcarolina.edu/aa/reports/ntt_faculty/.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40.

Dr. Carol Ellis, acting Secretary.
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Roll Call

Absent: Byington (Fac Wel), Clark (Business), Clements (Psychology), Denny (Soc. Wrk), Dodd (Finan. Aid), Earney (Acct.), Feng (Math), Grindlay (Earth Sci), Hines (Student Af.), Howe (Mgt.), Hunt (Mgt.), Huntsman (Budget), Mintzes (Biology), Moore (A/T, UCC), Mory (Cur. St.), Sizemore (Evaluation), Tyndall (IT), Usilton (History), Walker (Cur. St.), White (Cr. Wrtng), Wilson (P&R)

Approval of Minutes

The December minutes were approved.

Individual Reports:

1. Chancellor Leutze spoke on three main issues: inclusion and committee participation; significant UNCW tuition increases; and the role of the Building and Grounds Committee in relation to University planning:

   - **Inclusion and committee participation**: UNCW is committed to an inclusive system of governance; to make this work, we need to have members of university committees, e.g. the bookstore committee or a committee to examine tuition increases, attend all meetings and participate actively.

   - **Tuition increases**: In response to the BOG decision allowing individual universities to put together five year plans which include tuition & fee increases, UNCW plans to propose a significant increase in tuition to the BOT and BOG.
     - Why will UNCW propose significant tuition increases over the next five years?
       - there has been a significant decline in state funding for higher education: it now stands at 40% of the total, a decrease from 60% in 1980
       - the amount of money from the state budget dedicated to higher education has decreased in this time from 15% of the total to 12% (there is more given now to K-12 education and health and human services)
       - in the near term, the state does not have the money to support the state universities: there will probably be a $700M shortfall
       - UNCW is chronically underfunded, as compared to other comprehensive universities in the system [at this point, the Chancellor called on Provost Cavanaugh to provide detailed information]:
         - If UNCW received the average amount of money the other schools receive per FTE student, we would have $11M more
         - If UNCW received in addition the other subsidies linked to that funding, we would have $14M more
       - Because UNCW does not get this $, we have:
         - many parttime where we might have fulltime instructors
         - limited course offerings, e.g. in foreign languages
         - case load in Financial Aid of 1100+ students (office turnover last year: 110%)
         - an average advising load in the General College of 350+ students
         - one professional counselor per 1600 students
         - one housekeeper per 25,000 square feet
The Chancellor and Provost answered several questions from faculty:

- Of the five schools which were granted tuition increases last time, UNCW raised faculty salaries only 20%, whereas UNC-Ch raised faculty salaries 66%, and no other university raised faculty salaries less than 33%; how come? Provost: Those schools, esp. UNC-Ch, have significant endowments, which cover financial aid increases and operating budgets for departments; we have to cover those matters first; afterward, we raise salaries as much as possible.

- What will the effect of large tuition increases be on recruitment? Chancellor: Probably not much. The Virginia system saw tuition double recently, and had no losses. UNCW starts out at a much lower level: $2500/yr. vs. $3096 Old Dominion, $4094 James Madison, $4,780 Wm & Mary, $5290 Delaware system, $3780 College of Charleston.

- Given that salaries are not being raised, might we hope for a break for faculty children? Chancellor: we have asked for it, but the Legislature probably will not extend benefits to one segment of state employees.

- Doesn't this approach shift the burden from the UNC system, which should give us our fair share, to the tuition providers? Chancellor: We have fought this battle for years; the problem is, for us to get more, the other universities have to agree to get less, and they won't do it. The long-run question for us is, will UNCW accept mediocrity, or have the funds needed for excellence? That's why we need the increase.

- What will the total be, about $1000+? Chancellor: Yes, but don't forget that is spread over several years. Note, however, that this increase will be in addition to whatever increases the BOG approves.

**Building and Grounds Committee and University planning:**

- the Building and Grounds Committee was not sufficiently consulted in relation to the Fine Arts building
- the University will re-examine the long-range plan, in conjunction with the B&G Cmte
- in the future, when it comes time to place a new building, the University will consult with the B&G Cmte

2. President of the Senate Noland

- the Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages has been appointed
- reminded departments to coordinate Senate elections with course scheduling for next fall/year
- reminded the Senate that motions need not come from committees, but can come from departments or individual Senators

3. SACS Self-Study Director Spackman

- 200 copies of the SACS report have been printed
- the report is online, at the SACS Self-Study page
- SACS has itself completed a review of its own accreditation process, and changes to simplify the process are scheduled for implementation beginning in 2004
- Dr. Gloria Raines, head of the SACS visiting team, will visit campus 1/16 and have a full day of meetings concerning the visit. The roster of the team is not complete, but will involve people from the Fine Arts, History, Science, Social Science, Business, Education, Nursing, and Computer Science

4. Faculty Assembly Chair Veit

- the Faculty Assembly will not meet this month
- the BOG is expected to approve a Faculty Assembly motion to allow universities to make the minimum length of the semester 14 weeks + exam rather than the current 15 + exam (this returns to what it had been; the increase to 15 was imposed under President Spangler)

**Committee Reports:**

1. The following motion from the University Curriculum Committee was passed (02-5-19):

   **a. Basic Studies/ Computer Competency issues.** That the following course be approved as a Basic Studies course in area D, Fine Arts:

   FST 225 (crosslisted THR 225): *History and Appreciation of Film: Silent* (3). Survey of the development of motion picture from its primitive beginnings to the advent of sound film. A visual illustration of the basic aesthetic principles controlling film as art.
b. **Honors Course change.** That the following changes to HON 120, as proposed by the Honors Council, be approved *(additions)*

HON 120. Honors Enrichment (1) Prerequisite: Formal enrollment in the Honors Scholars Program or consent of the director. Students attend a variety of visual/performing/cultural events, study a specialty topic, and participate in a variety of related enrichment activities on the campus and in the community. By direct contact, students have the opportunity to broaden their educational experience in both traditional and contemporary forums. Discussion and brief written assignments. May be repeated for a maximum of two semester hours, under different subtitles, for a maximum of three semester hours.

2. The following motion from the **Ad Hoc Faculty Handbook Committee** was passed *(motion 02-5-20):*

   a. That a Faculty Handbook Committee be established as a standing committee of the Faculty Senate to oversee the Faculty Handbook.

   b. That a one-time comprehensive revision of the Faculty Handbook be undertaken at an early opportunity.

      - That the revision make the Handbook accurate and up to date
      - That the Handbook be revised in design and organization according to principles most appropriate for a web document rather than a printed document
      - That, wherever possible, material subject to revision be documented through links to outside pages
      - That a comprehensive list be established of such links and the persons responsible for maintaining the links and keeping information current; that maintaining these pages and keeping the links active be assigned duties of the university personnel responsible for their maintenance
      - That a faculty member be appointed by the Steering Committee of the Faculty Senate as interim Handbook editor, with the responsibility for undertaking the organization of the Handbook, in consultation with and under the supervision of the Faculty Handbook Committee and the Office of Academic Affairs
      - That the faculty editor be given at least a two-course teaching reduction, or equivalent, for one semester to accomplish the revision
      - That the comprehensive revision be subject to approval by the Faculty Senate and the Office of Academic Affairs

   c. That, following the comprehensive revision, ongoing revisions be undertaken on a continuous basis by the Faculty Handbook Committee whose duties and membership shall be described in Article V.C of the Faculty Senate Bylaws as follows:

      Faculty Handbook Committee:

      i. **Duties.** To provide continuous review to and oversight of the Faculty Handbook. To review any material submitted for the Handbook for relevance and editorial consistency. To update the Handbook as required with substantive changes subject to the review and approval of the Faculty Senate and Academic Affairs.

      ii. **Membership.** Five faculty members, including at least one from each voting division of the Faculty. At least one member must have expertise in website management. The vice chancellor for Academic Affairs or a designee shall be an ex officio non-voting member.

   d. That future minor factual and editorial revisions be subject to approval of the Faculty Handbook Committee.

   e. That substantive revisions be subject to approval of the Faculty Senate and Academic Affairs.

**Old Business**

There was no new business.
New Business

1. The following motion from Provost Cavanaugh and the Office of Academic Affairs was passed (motion 02-5-21):

   That UNC Wilmington follow Office of Management and Budget guidelines (Cost Principles for Educational Institutions, Section J.8.d.(1)-(4) Salary Rates for Faculty Members OMB Circular A-21 [revised 8/8/00] url = http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars/a021/a021.html) for the types and amounts of supplemental compensation that faculty are eligible to earn from grants and contracts during the summer, the regular academic year, and for consulting services paid through UNC Wilmington.

   Note: This motion only affects money for grants or consulting work that is paid to faculty through the University; it does not apply to money that comes from another party.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m.
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Roll Call

Absent: Byington (Fac Wel), Clark (Business), Cliford (English), Clements (Psychology), Dodd (Finan. Aid), Earney (Acct.), Errante (Admissions cmte), Farinella (Econ), Garris (Info Sys), Grindlay (Earth Sci), Gurganus (Math), Hines (Student Af.), Howe (Mgt.), Huntley (Pub Srv), Huntsman (Budget), Lawson (Acct), McElheny (A/T), Moore (A/T, UCC), Narayan (Comp Sci), Sizemore (Evaluation), Snowden (Soc), Tyndall (IT), Usilton (History), Webster (Bio), White (Cr. Wrtng), Wilson (P&R)

Approval of Minutes

The January minutes were approved as posted.

Individual Reports:

1. Chancellor Leutze

- unhappy about the tuition increase, but sees no alternative, if UNCW is to fulfill its mission: UNCW getting $6 million less than budgeted: with $400 tuition increase, we're still -$2 million.
- 1980 the state provided 58% of the UNC system budget, now only 42%; even so, the % provided by tuition is about the same, 17.5% in 1980, 17.6% in 2000.
- responded to "misinformation":
  - Lakeside arches paid for by construction $, not tuition $; it was less expensive and physically more appropriate to build them than to connect the two buildings
  - tuition $ does not pay for parking; this is provided by the parking decals.
- pleased to be working with the B&G Cmte on planning and conservation matters; the campus map is being to reflect future plans.
- UNCW is now competing for the best students in the state:
  - current admissions class has average 3.7 h.s.gpa, and 1140 SAT
  - but UNCW has less $ than competitors to offer honor or merit scholarships
  - UNCW is more restrictive than other schools re: AP type credits, and the admin will be speaking with chairs about how this admissions/academic issue might be addressed
  - current crisis will not cause UNCW to change admissions target of 1650.
- for the future:
  - the UNC system will have to balance "access" with "quality"; if the Legislature continues to decrease funding, the UNC system will have to stop growing
  - there is little likelihood of a significant salary increase, since the state is in a real fiscal crisis (the state budget was based on 4.5% growth; it has seen 2.3% decline)
- endowment, other fundraising efforts going forward, but this is not the time for a capital campaign; Pat McDowell is stepping down as VC for Development, UNCW looking for someone who can fill the position for several years to come
- in response to questions:
  - given budget, endowment issues, given any thought to bringing football to UNCW? it is a
fiction that football raises $; almost everywhere it does not, plus it becomes a major
management issue, and requires more administrators for oversight
• UNCW has a student loan fund for emergency situations
• the average UNCW student leaves with debt of $12,000, which is lower than comparable
schools; we have a default rate of only 1.7%, which is excellent

2. Provost Cavanaugh (budget presentation; deferred to the end of the meeting)

3. President of the Senate Noland

• refrained comments, in light of lengthy agenda

4. Faculty Assembly Chair Veit

• the Faculty Assembly met last Friday, had a report on email and computer privacy. The report noted
that NC has a extremely open "public records" law. It is possible that all faculty work products
(anything done as part of your job; not incidental personal matters) are legally part of the public
record, including those done on home computers. (This issue has not been fully tested in court.)
• Ad Hoc Cmte on Nontenured Faculty reported that while their number is higher than in past years, it
is still lower in the UNC system than in other states; urged that nontenured faculty be recognized for
their contributions.

5. SACS Self-Study Director Spackman

• the Followup Plan and Addendum to the SACS Self-Study are at the SACS website.
• will be disappointed if UNCW does not receive some commendations for our efforts.
• wants to thank Lavonne Adams for her editorial work, and SACS Self-Study Steering Committee
members Lynne Snowden, Bob Fry, Melton McLaurin, Perri Bomar, Andy Jackson, Sue McCaffray,
Jimmy Reeves and Diane Levy.
• said this was his last report, and sat down to applause.

Committee Reports:

1. The following revision of motion 02-4-16 from Academic Standards Committee was passed (02-6-22):

   At the discretion of the instructor, a student may be given a grade of Incomplete when the work in the
course has not been completed for reasons beyond the control of the student. All incomplete grades must
be removed according to a deadline established by the instructor, not to exceed one calendar year from the
end of the semester in which the Incomplete was given, otherwise the "I" becomes "F" and cannot be
changed. A student must not register for the class when attempting to remove a grade of Incomplete. No
student will be allowed to graduate with an Incomplete grade on his/her academic record. Such grades that
have not been resolved at the time of graduation will be converted to an "F." If a student meets
graduation requirements, despite the "F," the appropriate degree will be awarded.

Old Business

There was no old business.

New Business

1. The following motion from the English Department was passed (motion 02-6-23):

   That all full-time UNCW faculty, including full-time lecturers, who otherwise meet the criteria of
eligibility for UNCW teaching awards, including requirements for length of service and teaching load, be
eligible for nomination for those awards.
Announcements

1. Adrienne Lopez, SGA President

- thanked the faculty for their support of Intercultural Week
- President's Commission on Diversity out of SGA will be distributing a student survey on diversity issues to faculty and hope that it will encourage discussion on diversity issues in the classroom

The Senate then turned to the budget presentation by the Provost.

---

Powerpoint Presentation by Provost Cavanaugh: "Budget Basics"

**Topics:** (i) sources of revenue; (ii) expenditure categories; areas of (iii) challenge, (iv) opportunity; (v) strategic directions; (vi) answers to questions. (Detailed % on revenues and expenditures provided subsequent to the meeting in response to request.)

- **Sources of revenue:**
  - where does the $ come from?
    - state appropriations (41.9%)
    - tuition and fees - use of these tends to be restricted (18%)
    - grants and contracts - this $ must be spent on the specific project (11%)
    - auxiliarites - food, bookstore (25.1%)
    - gifts (1%)
    - endowment/investment income (1.2%)
    - sales/services (1.1%)
    - other (.7%)
  - what kinds of $ is it?
    - continuing (e.g. positions) vs. one-time (e.g. equipment; restricted ability to flex)
    - operating (e.g. instruction) vs. construction (buildings)--illegal to switch one to the other

- **Expenditure categories**
  - education and general (77.6%)
    - instruction (33.7%)
    - organized research (8.1%)
    - public service (1.5%)
    - academic support, e.g. library, tutoring (7.4%)
    - institutional support, e.g. business office, payroll (8.5%)
    - physical plant (9.1%)
    - student financial aid (5.4%)
    - mandatory transfers (.1%)
  - other major categories:
    - auxiliary enterprise expenditures (19.3%)
    - mandatory transfers (3.1%)

- **Areas of challenge**
  - declining state appropriations
    - moved from "state supported" to "state assisted" university: if like Colorado, we move to "state located" university and become a "tuition-driven" institution, then we must increase the % of out of state students
  - serious NC economic recession
    - current recession different from 1990, where layoffs in manufacturing, and jobs returned: current lost jobs in tobacco, textiles and banking (mergers) will not return
    - NC will come out of this recession more slowly
  - lack of endowment, especially for scholarships, difficulty of raising $ in current economy

- **Areas of opportunity**
enhanced academic reputation:
  - UNCW is getting the attention of potential donors; attracting people with national and international visibility now participate on boards, in campus events

public support:
  - surveys indicate greater public support for higher education in NC than any other state

price elasticity:
  - UNCW tuition and fees still well below national average;
  - + professed support, suggests public will pay more, if keep quality (but how much?)

- **Strategic directions**
  - UNCW has separated itself from the pack academically:
    - no longer a "backup" school, like Pembroke, ECU, moving past ASU
    - different competitive pool for students
  - UNCW must target its academic market
    - this includes out-of-state students
    - area counselors now realize UNCW is no longer an easy admission
  - UNCW must educate the public on the true costs of higher education
    - public believes cost much greater than is; we can attract many who currently do not apply
  - UNCW must improve fundraising

- **Response to questions**
  - *Can $ from athletics go to other programs?* We could, if athletics made $; but they do not.
  - *Does UNCW put out an annual budget report?* Audited financial statement is part of the public record.
  - *Can we remain true to our regional mission, if we increase out of state students for $?* 'Regional service' is more than admitting regional students; but in fact we are seeing more good regional students now staying here, going to UNCW
  - *What is your sense of the long-term integrity of the system and our place in it?*
    - Can see some state systems, e.g. Colorado, that are working, even though they get only 10% state support (though they do admit more out of state students)
    - If the system breaks up into more independent units, as it did in Florida, the 'regional' schools may benefit, 'flagships' be harmed (Charlotte = NC financial center, not Raleigh)

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35.
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Roll Call

Absent: Adams (Nursing), Byington (Fac.Welfare), Cami-Vela (FLL), Clark (Business), Clements (Psy.), Dodd (Fin.Aid Cmte.), Dutka (Library), Earney (Acct.), Errante (Admis. Cmte.), Garris (Info.Sys.), Hayes (Cur.Stds.), Huntley (Pub.Srvc.), King (Music), Lerch (Anthro.), Leutze (Chancellor), Roscher (Acct.), Sigler (Econ.), Sizemore (Eval. Cmte.), Tyndall (ITSD), Weber (Communications), White (Cr.Writing)

Approval of Minutes

The minutes were approved as posted.

Special Order of the Day: Election of Faculty Senate President

President Dan Noland was re-elected by acclamation.

Individual Reports:

1. Provost Cavanaugh

   - All students' names will be read at the December graduation. In response to faculty objections that the new graduation practices will usurp the function of departmental graduations, the Provost answered that this was an issue the students felt strongly about and that it was an "experiment," so that if it did not work out, we could change it.
   - There is as yet no definite news about the budget, though there have been projections of approximately $1 billion shortfall.

2. Faculty Assembly Delegate Veit

   - The issue of email privacy will be discussed in the next meeting of the Assembly.
   - In consequence of a motion from the Assembly, the requirement in the Calendar that we have fifteen weeks of classes, excluding exams, has been changed to the requirement that institutions may have fifteen week semesters, including the exam period.

Committee Reports:

1. The Building and Grounds Committee motions concerning the siting of the fine arts classroom building, motion 02-4-10, and concerning smoking outside of classroom buildings, motion 02-4-11, both passed:

   a. The amended motion concerning the siting of a new fine arts classroom building in the woods behind Friday and Dobo Halls was approved (02-4-10; passed):

      Whereas, the proposed site is a valuable habitat for migratory birds and is an important outdoor classroom for about 240 undergraduate students each year, and
Whereas, the site will ultimately bring to the center of campus a huge volume of traffic and could necessitate the need for a parking deck and would create nighttime security and traffic flow issues in the middle of campus, and

Whereas, destroying these woods would send a negative environmental message to the local community, and

Whereas, in recommending the proposed siting, Resolution 94-4 of the UNC Faculty Assembly was ignored: a resolution stating that “it falls within the obligation of the University of North Carolina to exemplify and encourage responsible stewardship of our natural resources, especially land,” and that further, “campuses of the University of North Carolina [are to] give serious consideration to the impact of all their land-use plans on biological diversity and public health, and in that consideration to seek the advice of faculty with appropriate expertise,” and

Whereas, faculty with appropriate expertise were not consulted in the decision, nor were biological and educational concerns adequately addressed, nor were faculty consulted in a timely manner, and

Whereas, the SACS report stipulates that “The Faculty has the responsibility and authority to provide to the administration recommendations concerning the development and implementation of . . . policies affecting academic life,” and

Whereas, the members of the Buildings and Grounds Committee agree that UNCW should see itself and thus be seen by the community and the UNC system as a whole as one exemplifying sensible and careful stewardship of any and all undeveloped land on its campus, and further that preserving wooded land of campus should and could be a fundamental and important part of our commitment to University as Arboretum, and our commitment to being a leader in an environmentally aware and respectful entity, and

Whereas, there is an alternative site for the classroom building on the front of campus between Kenan Hall and Kenan Auditorium and another site for the possible arts center,

Be it resolved therefore, that the Chancellor reconsider the decision to site the arts building on the woods in question, after consulting with the Faculty Senate Building and grounds Committee and appropriate environmental experts on the faculty, and in fact, use the proposed site between the present art classroom, Kenan Hall, and the performance hall, Kenan Auditorium, along Wagoner Drive for this classroom building; and further that future performing arts center and parking deck be sited at the corner of Hurst and Wagoner Drives, thereby affording events parking for the arts center, athletic events, student overflow parking with one structure.

There was considerable discussion of this motion. Among the additional points made against the proposed site and in favor of the motion were:

- There will be serious traffic problems caused by the new siting.
- The woods in which the buildings will be situated are environmental areas which nest several species of animals and are used for teaching purposes.
- The decision process basically ignored the Faculty Senate B&G committee.

Among the points made in favor of the proposed site and against the motion:

- The alternative sites pose more serious problems, in terms of distance from the "ten-minute walk circle," noise issues with Trask events, and, above all, the potential of the increased cost involved in splitting the classroom building and performance hall (when it is built) to kill the project.
- Arts faculty members were involved in the process.
- Delays now might jeopardize the building itself.

b. The motion concerning smoking at building entrances on the UNCW campus was approved as amended (02-4-11, passed):

Whereas the Chancellor's Council on Health and Wellness recommends that: smoking be banned from entryways to
all campus buildings, and

Whereas the Chancellor has approved a smoking ban which has been successfully implemented at the entryway and steps to Westside Hall, and

Whereas the Chancellor’s Council on Health and Wellness is undertaking a highly publicized campaign that promotes campus beautification, environmental health of campus community members, and increased smoking cessation opportunities and programs,

Be it therefore resolved that smoking be banned from all entryways, landings and steps to all campus buildings at the University of North Carolina at Wilmington, and that appropriate signage banning smoking be placed at these locations.

There was also considerable discussion of this motion, including whether the ban should be limited to one entrance, whether new areas had to be designated for smokers, and whether it would be necessary to enforce the ban.

2. The University Curriculum Committee submitted several motions, two of which passed (motions 02-4-12 and 02-4-13):

a. As Consent Agenda items, the following courses for oral and computer competency were approved (02-4-12; passed):

   1. For oral communications competency:

      a. ARH 290: Practice of Art History, for Art History.


      c. FST495: Senior Seminar in Film Production, or FST496: Senior Seminar in Film Study for Film Studies.

   2. For computer competency:

      a. THR 311: Computer-Aided Drafting, for Theatre (renumbered THR 211 in new catalogue).

      b. FST/COM 201: Introduction to Film Production, or FST 395: Intermediate Seminar in Film Production, for Film Studies.

      c. STT305: Statistical Programming for Statistics.

b. The following minors/majors/programs were approved (02-4-13; passed):

   1. Choral Music. Requirements for a Minor in Choral Music: 24 hours. MUS 111, MUSL111, MUS 112, MUSL112, MUS 114, MUS 271 and 272. Choral Ensemble Experience: minimum of 6 semesters to include some experience in both large and small ensembles. Solo singing study: minimum of 2 semesters of 2 credits each (total of 4 semester hours). Choral-based independent study and/or elective study of at least 1 semester hour.

   2. Community Health. Requirements for a Minor in Community Health: 24 hours. HEA 105, HEA 207, HEA 234, HEA 245, HEA 301, HEA 452, and six additional HEA hours of which at least 3 hours are at the 300 level or above. In selecting courses to fulfill the six elective credits, students are strongly encouraged to consult with the faculty in health education. An overall 2.00 grade point average is required in courses counted toward the minor.

   3. Statistics/major. Requirements for a Major in Statistics for the B.S. degree: The Bachelor of Science degree in Statistics provides a variety of options for students wishing to study statistics. The program prepares graduates for careers as applied statisticians in government, business, and industry. Those students interested in further study beyond the bachelor’s level, may take coursework giving them the theoretical depth required to pursue graduate degrees. In recognition of the interdisciplinary nature of statistics, coursework in other disciplines such as biological, environmental, or social sciences can be undertaken, depending on the students' interests. Since
statistical practice routinely involves computers, the use of standard statistical software is integrated into most courses. Computer Competency Requirement: To satisfy the oral competency requirement for the B.S. degree in statistics a student must successfully complete STT 305. Oral Competency Requirement: To satisfy the oral competency requirement for the B.S. degree in statistics a student must successfully complete STT 490 or STT 498.

Core Requirements: 29 or 27 hours. MAT 161-162 or MAT 151-152; STT 215, 305, 315, 350, 411, 412, 490 or 498. Elective Requirements: 18 hours. Two of STT 420, 425, 430, 435, 465, 475 and at least 12 hours of collateral coursework in a substantive area of statistical or mathematical theory or application, approved by the Department of Mathematics and Statistics. These courses may come from different disciplines and some must contain mathematical or statistical content. An overall average of 2.00 or better is required for all 300-400-level statistics courses counted toward the major.

4. Statistics/minor: Requirements for a Minor in Statistics: 18 hours in statistics. STT 215, 305, and at least eighteen additional hours in statistics at the 300-400 level. An overall quality point average of 2.00 or better is required for all courses counted toward the minor.


c. The motion concerning Basic Studies requirements in Foreign Languages was referred to an Ad-Hoc Task Force, to be appointed by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, that is to report back to the Senate by the April meeting (motion 02-4-14; referred to ad-hoc task force).

Whereas, UNCW has stated in its mission statement and its strategic plan for 2000-2005 that internationalization of the curriculum is an important goal and principal theme in the university’s development,

Whereas, UNCW SACS self-study produced a recommendation that the foreign language curriculum and Basic Studies requirements in foreign language do not currently support our mission statement or strategic plans,

Whereas, compared with many other peer institutions, both in the UNC system and elsewhere, UNCW’s foreign language requirement is minimal;

The University Curriculum Committee moves that the basic Studies requirement in foreign language be changed so that a student must complete at least 3 hours of foreign language study at the 200 level. A student who is not prepared to enter a foreign language at the 200-level, may take a 100 level course in preparation, with the understanding that the 100-level course (s) will count as electives. Further, in order to give highly regulated programs, such as Nursing and Education, time to adjust their curricula, the UCC suggests that this change be implemented in the 2003-2004 catalogue.

There was considerable discussion of this motion. Among the concerns:

- The proposal might have a negative effect on efforts in response to SACS concerns to diversify the foreign language offerings for Basic Studies.
- The proposal, if accepted, might commit the university to adding virtually all of the new faculty lines in the next few years to Foreign Languages.
- The proposal departed from the university's philosophy of Basic Studies, which is an introduction to ways of knowing; in all other areas, no more than 100 level courses are required.

d. The Environmental Chemistry Track, proposed by the Chemistry Department and the EVS program, but not approved by the University Curriculum Committee, was not approved (motion 2-4-15; failed).

Environmental Chemistry Track (BA in CHM, BS in EVS). Requirements: Mat 161-162, STT 215 or GGY 222; PHY 101-102 (or PHY 201-202); BIO 110; CHM 101-102; CHM 211-212 (with Labs); CHM 235, CHML 235; CHM 312, CHML 312; CHM 321, CHML 321; CHM 377, CHML 377; CHM 445; EVS 195, EVS 495 (or CHM 495); GGY 130, GGYL 130; GLY 220; TEC 101 and three (3) credits from among EVS 325, 330, 362, 380, 491, 498 or CHM 415, 417, 419, 420, 425, 435, CHML 420, 435, CHM 465, 466, 467, 475, 478, 490, 491* and 499* (*If 491 or 499 is used, the student must take a total of three credit hours in 491 and may count only three of the six credit hours taken as 499 for credit toward the major.) This track is a total of 74 credit hours (failed).
Among the points made in discussion:

- The UCC thought this proposal raised the issue of "double-dipping," namely that a student could get credit for two different majors which were very similar in content (there is only 8 hours difference between these two majors)

- This was a vote about what would go in the Catalogue, not whether students could get the two majors on their transcript; by the Catalogue, any student with these courses is eligible to have both majors recognized.

- This was a vote to to indicate that the Faculty Senate was not in favor of creating majors which were basically similar in content.

3. The following catalogue changes, based upon the 2001-2002 Undergraduate Catalogue pages and proposed by the Academic Standards Committee, were approved (motions 02-4-16, -17, -18; all passed):

   a. Conversion of Incompletes (02-4-16; passed). Change the second paragraph on page 64 of the Undergraduate Catalogue, in the section titled GRADRES AND REPORTS to (addition underlined):

      At the discretion of the instructor, a student may be given a grade of Incomplete when the work in the course has not been completed for reasons beyond the control of the student. All incomplete grades must be removed according to a deadline established by the instructor, not to exceed one calendar year from the end of the semester in which the Incomplete was given, otherwise the "I" becomes "F." A student must not register for the class when attempting to remove a grade of Incomplete. No student will be allowed to graduate with an Incomplete grade on his/her academic record. Such grades that have not been resolved at the time of graduation will be converted to an "F." If a student meets graduation requirements, despite the "F," the appropriate degree will be awarded.

   b. Auditing of On Campus Courses (02-4-17; passed). In the Undergraduate Catalogue in the section titled AUDITING on page 61 change the paragraph to read (addition underlined):

      The auditing of courses without credit is approved by special permission of the registrar and of the instructor involved. Individuals not regularly enrolled as students in the university who wish to audit courses will be classified as special students and will be required to pay regular tuition and fees. Auditing by special students is restricted to classroom-based courses only. No distance education or computer-based courses may be audited by special students. These individuals must complete all registration and any other administrative processes in person at the Registrar's Office. University students in regular status will be permitted to audit courses and must pay the same tuition and fees required for credit courses.

   c. Retention of Non-degree Seeking Students (02-4-18; passed). In the Undergraduate Catalogue in the section titled ADMISSIONS-SPECIAL UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS on page 32 change the paragraph to read (addition and editorial amendment underlined):

      Any individual who already possesses a degree from a four-year regionally accredited college and wishes to enroll for an undergraduate course at UNCW must apply to the Office of Admissions before the application deadline date. An official transcript from the degree-granting institution must be sent from that institution to the Office of Admissions by the deadline date. Candidates seeking a second degree must apply as transfer students and have transcripts from all colleges attended submitted by the application deadline date. Non-degree seeking students must meet the same retention standards as degree seeking students.

Old Business

None.

New Business

None.
The meeting was adjourned at 4:42 p.m.
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Roll Call

We were short of a quorum, but stayed to discuss the RPT matters anyway.

Steering Committee Motion

At the end of the meeting, a motion was put forward concerning the effect of the state budget cuts on the teaching mission of the university. This was approved unanimously by the 35-40 Senators and Faculty present, and will be forwarded by the President of the Senate to the Chancellor. The motion read:

We, the Faculty Senate of UNCW, are deeply distressed at the budget cuts to UNCW and to the UNC system that have been proposed and are moving forward. These cuts, at 4% and possibly higher, will cause permanent harm to the teaching mission of the university and to the education that our students receive. The citizens of North Carolina must be informed as to the permanent harm that the proposed cuts will do to its university system.

Committee of the Whole on the RPT report

The chief part of the meeting continued the discussions of the Committee of the Whole, chaired by President Noland, focused on the RPT committee report. The Secretary does not take official minutes in such a meeting, but I was again asked by the Chair of the RPT Cmte to keep notes, which follow:

A library representative noted that some librarians would fall under the RPT process, and was concerned that the Library was never mentioned in the document.

Discussion focused on Recommendations IV.6 (external review), IV.4 (revise guidelines), IV.7 (link to professional progress), IV.8 (levels of review), IV.9 (written notification), IV.10 (additions), IV.11 (new structure) and B1-4 (Senior Faculty recommendation process)

IV.6 On external review (ER):

- Several departments reported up/down votes or specific concerns
  - A/T not opposed to ER, but questions how to apply to live art performances
  - ANTH: Supports ER, but questions how much weight will be given letters, if department has few full profs to vote on candidate
  - BIO: supports ER, notes need for flexibility, given disciplinary differences in some departments
  - CHM approves ER, but wants to maintain control over process, e.g. solicitation of letters.
    Number required could be same university wide, but department should retain control of the process.
  - CW: supports ER; this contributes to desire for national recognition
  - ENG: full profs should have "regional or national reputation"; this implies ER, and 5 letters
seems a good number

- FLL concerned about making ER optional at lower level, required at higher; should have it or not.
- MAT: opposed to required ER, but notes that many departments have too few full profs to make broad-based decision
- P&R: opposed to required ER; believes should be optional for the department
- SOC: opposed to required ER for all departments; concerned that this implies colleagues unable to render professional judgment; sees great possibility for abuse of ER

- Among other questions/points made and responses by committee members:
  - *Is there ER of teaching, service or just research?* Just research/scholarship. This is pretty much standard in all the schools we contacted.
  - *Who did you contact? What % of schools don't have ER?* Chair contacted UNC-G, ASU, UNC-C, JMU, Wake, Western Mich, BU, Radford. All had ER, most at both levels. 5 letters in the middle range.
  - *Doesn't this process imply the faculty are unable to judge their colleagues professionally? And won't there be a great opportunity for abuse of this method?* As Appendix 4, "External Review Guidelines" indicates, "Care should be taken to assure that the outside evaluations supplement, rather than supplant, the judgment of the departmental voting faculty." We do not believe the process will lend itself to abuse or the selection of prejudiced reviews, if the guidelines are followed.
  - ECU asks for 5 letters, but often gets less. Department needs some leeway with the number.

**IV.4** Among the questions/points made concerning revising guidelines:

- Doesn't the issue of revising guidelines relate to the question about external review procedures that are standardized? If guideline revision is up to the departments, shouldn't the decision about ER be also?
- *Who will judge whether departmental guidelines are "in line" with university-wide expectations?* If there is an issue, the decision must ultimately be made by the Provost.
- The idea here makes the point that there can be important connections among the three, teaching, scholarship, service, and that profs should get credit for it, when it occurs.

**IV.5** There were no questions about a flexible time clock. Everyone seemed in favor of this.

**IV.7** Among the points made concerning linkage:

- *Shouldn't the two parts of the opening sentence be reversed, i.e. the RPT decision must be linked to professional progress, rather than vice-versa?* Yes, that is correct.
- This is an important point, because it is too easy to treat the yearly evaluations casually, and this will no longer allow that. The tenure decision should *not* be a surprise. The faculty member should get a clear indication of what they should be doing to make progress.
- Yes, and it may be necessary to give new chairs guidelines as to what they should be doing in the annual reviews. Comments from senior faculty must be included. People have been blindsided.
- Some thought this might give more power to the chair. But it was pointed out that this report recommends requiring, for the first time, another voice (the report from Senior Faculty) than just the chair's.
- This doesn't mention "senior faculty," only "peer review." Correct, that was deliberate. Another part of the document gives power to senior faculty.
- *Will this tie the hands of the department, compelling them to tenure someone who is mediocre?* It might, but only if you have not taken the annual review process seriously.

**IV.8** Among the questions/points made concerning levels of review:

- *Why go forward with the promotion/tenure process, if it has been rejected at the departmental level*
and the objections are not procedural? Among the replies and comments:
  - Present rules allow the chair to decide, so if he/she says no, it stays in the department. The assumption that all chairs are fair is naive.
  - The review committees will have some sense of standards in other departments, and thus may have a better perspective to judge the decision process.
  - Department members or chair may just say "it is too early"—without any grounds or reasons. This process compells some explanation.
  - It will be good for smaller departments for negative decisions to go forward, since that will allow vindication of what may be interdepartmentally hurtful decisions.
  - The whole idea is to bring as much relevant information as possible into the process and to keep it open.
  - Why push it forward if chair and department agree? The vote may be divided. Current rules allow the chair to spin the recommendation too easily.
  - The current document, section 4D, calls for evaluation of every faculty every four years. This has never been done.

IV.9 Among the points made concerning notification schedule:
  - The whole process threatens to drag out too long. Why ten days? It is not ten working days; there needs to be sufficient time for decision and response, and also set an endtime.

IV.10 No objections to additions

IV.11 Comments/questions on the new structure.
  - What is the logic of the new level of oversight? Need process beyond the Dean, at more general level than first review cmte, which may have to deal with content issues, whereas latter will probably just deal with procedural matters. Note too (a) we are getting bigger, the two levels seems to fit new size of UNCW; and (b) new structure changes the order, since now have e.g. College RPT cmte->Dean->Uni RPT cmte.
  - The oversight committees work very differently for departments in the prof'l schools and the CAS, e.g. BIO vs. NUR, where BIO is big, and the review goes to a cmte with perhaps one BIO prof, but NUR is small, and goes to cmte with all NUR fac
  - Closer you keep the Dean to the Chair, the more likely Dean will assume responsibility that Departments are fair.
  - We really only need one university RPT cmte. If we have one at the College/Prof'l school level, why not eliminate the University level? We have to remember that we are members of the University Faculty; there must be some uniformity.

B1-4: Senior Faculty recommendation process.
  - CHM prefers one decision from the department, made by all the Senior Faculty. The chair has information that the faculty need to know, to make a sound decision.
  - This is a good idea. There can be problems between Senior Faculty and Chair, and this insures separate comment, since now the Chair need only consult the Faculty.
  - FLL is opposed to B1-4; Chair may be mentor of person; and whole department should see what Chair writes
  - Troubling that the Senior Faculty casts votes secretly. Does it have to be secret?
  - Faculty member needs to know who signs off on letters, including minority reports.
  - Committee reply: separation valuable to preserve balance between Chair, Faculty. Possibility of dictatorial Chair, who dominates Senior Faculty meeting, especially if votes not secret.
  - Isn't it time to stop?
The meeting was adjourned at 4:30.
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Roll Call

Absent: Byington (Fac Wel Com), Denny (SWK), Dodd (Fin Aid Com), Earney (Acc & Bus Law), Errante (MUS), Hayes (Curr St), Hines (Student Aff Com), Huntley (Pub Ser Com), Huntsman (Budget Cmte), King (MUS), Mintzes (Biology), Shay (IT Cmte), Sizemore (Eval Com), Tyndall (ITSD), Webster (BIO), White (CHM)

Individual Reports:

1. Chancellor Leutze
   - Addressed the issue of diversity.
   - Wants to see a more diverse university, and find new ways to address the issue.
   - There is a growing concern that the campus climate may not be attractive to minorities: 15% of 288 minority students surveyed said they had seen or experienced discrimination in the classroom; some Black faculty believe their colleagues do not always treat them fairly.
   - Doubts we have racist faculty or administrators, but noted that "If there is a perception that we have a problem, we have a problem."
   - Is having several former UNC system chancellors visit the university, and report on how we might do a better job in this area.
   - In response to questions, the Provost noted that he sets aside 2 development lines every year for recruitment of minority (Black or Hispanic) faculty; will add money in a competitive situation to hire minorities; will pay for part or all of the recruitment costs, depending on whether the person is hired.
   - Responded to a query about why senior UNC officials have not publicized the current fiscal crisis.
   - Explained that some of the $6.5 million dollars cut from the budget this year will be replaced by the tuition increase, but projections for next year include an additional 1-2% beyond the already determined 4% cut in permanent budget.
   - "At some point soon, we must say we are going to have to limit enrollment to the university."
   - Recognized the public relations problem, if (a) the university increases fees and at the same time lowers access, while (b) the public remains uninformed of the serious cuts being imposed.
At present, the Office of the President is negotiating with the Governor on the size of cuts, and
wants to wait until this issue is decided, before the issue is taken to the public.

2. President of the Senate Noland

- Introduced Mary Gornto, interim Vice Chancellor for Advancement, who expressed her
  happiness in being here, and indicated she would like to speak to the Senate again in the fall.

- Acknowledged Carol Ellis, retiring this year, for many years of service to the university and the
  Senate.

- Announced that after RPT Committee Chair Berkeley's brief introduction, the remainder of the
  meeting would be a "Committee of the Whole" to discuss the proposed changes in the RTP
  document.

3. RPT Committee Chair Berkeley

- Summarized the history of the committee's activities. These included: beginning in January,
  2001, met with Provost and Faculty Senate Steering committee to determine its charge in
  reviewing substantive and process issues; reviewed RPT documents in a wide array of
  universities in and out of the UNC system, particularly the newly revised one at NC State; held
  open meeting for the Faculty in March 01; gathered information from departments and other
  universities; and met over the fall and winter to formulate these recommendations. One
  untenured committee member emphasized that the committee had tried to examine the process
  from the point of view of the candidate, and ask whether the process was fair to them. The
  committee had been struck by the great diversity of standards and procedures in the different
  departments and schools; some seemed eminently fair and appropriate, others not.

The remainder of the meeting consisted in a Committee of the Whole, chaired by President Noland, with discussion
focused on the RPT committee report. Technically, the Secretary should not provide notes on such a meeting, but wait
until the end of the meeting, and the Committee of the Whole makes its report back to the reconvened Senate. [For
those who are interested, I did keep notes on the discussion, available at Notes.]

When the meeting reassembled, President Noland announced there would be an open meeting of the Faculty Senate on
April 30, to continue the discussion of the RPT committee report. All faculty are invited to attend.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30.
President Noland called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

Roll Call

Absent: Byington (Fac Wel Cmte), Errante (Admis. Cmte.), Garris (IS), Gowan (IS), Howe (Mgt.), Huntsman (Budget Cmte), Galbraith (Fin Aid Cmte), Gerard (Adv Cmte), Kiddle (Research Cmte), Leutze (Chancellor), McLaurin (UCC), Roer (Grad Sch), Shay (IT Cmte), Sizemore (Eval. Cmte.), Spears (St Affs Cmte), Tyndall (ITSD)

Approval of Minutes

The April minutes were approved.

Special Order of the Day

The Senate elected new officers: Vice-President, Mark Spaulding; Secretary: Tom Schmid; Members of the Steering Committee: Denise DiPuccio, Richard Olsen, Steven Dworkin, Richard Veit.

Individual Reports

1. Provost Hosier

- Reported on enrollment, other matters: freshmen 1646; transfers 989, total 9834, total grad students 925 (close to 10% goal), total 10,759. Increase of +89 over projections. SAT ave. 1106, 3.63 HSGPA (up from 3.42). Rentention rate very high 84%, yield also very high 50+%. 23 new faculty this fall, +39 since last fall.
- Said that he was "faculty-centered" and would meet regularly with his faculty advisory committee to work on faculty concerns
- Reported that the budget process looks better now than just a few weeks ago: -2.39% (rather than -3%), with a number of important programs, such as financial aid and enrollment increase $ very likely to be fully funded
- Noted there are several matters of local concern with the budget, including adjustments related to the $650,000 from the campus tuition increase, raising tenure track salaries to $40,000 minimum, funding technology and learning communities, etc.
- Said he recognizes the problem with increased class sizes, and that he intends to publicize the budget process, so that faculty will see clearly the choices that are involved.

2. President of the Senate Noland

- Welcomed new members to the Senate and welcomed back returning members
- Reported that he, Hathia Hayes, Richard Dillaman and Earl Sheridan are on the BOG Chancellor Search Committee, and that he believes it has an excellent chair, Larry Dagenhart, who will run an effective and open process.
- Announced **Chancellor Search Open Forums**, both on **Monday, Sep 23**, from 12-2, and from 5-7, in the Warwick Center.
- Reported on several upcoming deadlines relating to the Catalogue:
  - Sep 15: departments sent their portion to see if changes need to be made
  - Nov 3: materials due back to Academic Affairs for keying
  - mid-Jan: text sent to printer
  - mid-late Feb: galley proofs back to campus
  - mid-Mar: page proofs back to campus

**Committee Reports**

1. The **Faculty Senate Steering Committee** offered the following *amended* motion in support of the UNC Board of Governors Educational Planning Committee's **Resolution on Academic Freedom**, which **passed** *(03-1-1)*

   The UNCW Faculty Senate endorses the Resolution on Academic Freedom passed unanimously by the Board of Governors Educational Planning Committee, *and it urges the full board to adopt the resolution at its September 13, 2002 meeting.* *(Motion 03-1-1).*

2. The **Faculty Senate Steering Committee** offered the following motion, which was **returned** to the committee to review in the light of several issues raised in discussion *(03-1-2)*:

   The UNCW Faculty Senate asks the UNCW Chancellor Search Committee to seek the following qualities in their candidates for Chancellor:

   A commitment to scholarly values and the diverse missions of a public comprehensive university;

   Academic scholarship and teaching credentials, or professional credentials, that are tenurable at the level of full professor;

   Outstanding leadership qualities, including:

   - Successful leadership in higher education or professional administration
   - Personal integrity, intellectual curiosity, compassion, resilience and energy
   - Commitment to shared governance with faculty, staff and students
   - Collaborative leadership style that emphasizes openness and fairness
   - Demonstrated ability to secure funding from government and private sources;

   A commitment to equal employment opportunity and non-discriminatory practices. *(Motion 03-1-2; returned to committee).*

   Among the issues that were raised were:

   - Should the opening sentence include "with special emphasis on teaching"?
   - Should "professional credentials" be included in the second sentence, and what are the implications of "are tenurable"?
   - Should "collegiality" be included in the second bullet?
   - Should "compassion" be dropped from the second bullet?
   - Should the fifth bullet call for "major" funding, and add "for scholarship and the UNCW endowment"?
   - Should "demonstrated" be added to the final sentence?
   - Should we add another statement, "Continued commitment to UNCW's role in serving the needs of the SE North Carolina region, as well as the nation and the world"?
3. In the process of discussing motion 03-1-2, the following motion was made from the floor and passed (Motion 03-1-3):

The Faculty Senate endorses an open search that ensures the opportunity of each finalist in the Chancellor Search to meet with the Faculty and incorporate input from the Faculty (Motion 03-1-3).

Old Business

New Business

Announcements

After the meeting is adjourned, President Noland will give a brief orientation on Senate procedures to new members.
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President Noland called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

Roll Call

Absent: Adams (Nursing), Bechtel (Nursing), Byington (Fac Wel Cmte), Denny (Soc Wrk), Errante (Admis. Cmte.), Galbraith (Fin Aid Cmte), Gowan (IS), Herstine (HPER), McLaurin (UCC), Perko (HPER), Roer (Grad Sch), Shay (IT Cmte), Tenhuisen (Math), Tyndall (ITSD), Usilton (History), Walker (Cur. St.), Weber (Com.), Webster (Biology), White (Creative Wr)

Approval of Minutes

The September minutes were approved.

Individual Reports:

1. Chancellor Leutze

- reported on what UNCW is doing regarding the "campus climate" for Afro-Americans
  - four current and former UNC chancellors will study and report to the university on how it can address this issue; report will be made public October 28
  - assigned UNCW administrators to give a "campus climate" survey, and to hold sessions to gather information and report on the issue of campus climate
  - noted that the meaning of "diversity" is itself divisive, as some believe the focus should be broadened, others that this would dilute the effort on racial diversity
  - has encouraged Chancellor's Search Committee to include faculty in the search process; this is an important part of the UNCW campus culture, and the faculty had had a significant role in his selection
- responded, together with Provost Hosier, to questions about financial issues:
  - UNCW is attempting to balance the use of funds from the tuition increases to address merit issues and structural adjustments for inequity
  - "not all" UNCW senior administrators will be receiving salary increases during this year, when many faculty will receive no increases
  - agreed that the Legislature's decision not to contribute to the state employee pension fund is troubling
  - believes that, given the Legislature's continuing failure to increase funding for the system, UNCW will have to continue to raise tuition for several years, to a level at least $1500 higher; some of this money would have to be used to increase salaries
  - costs of health care are "going to break" the state budget within a decade; individual contributions will probably go up in excess of 20% next year
  - hopes the Legislature will be receptive to some forms of increase in faculty benefits; will rerequest to have faculty children admitted tuition free to the university system
2. Vice-Chancellor for Advancement Gornto

- Advancement reviewed their Stewardship plan last year, and revamped it to encourage more giving by providing enhanced benefits and raising the minimums, e.g. Chancellor's Club raised from $1000 to $2500
- over $5M was raised last year--"our best year ever"
- the total endowment declined 7%, due to the fallback in the stock market
- Departments seeking to raise funds for e.g. a lecture must work through Advancement, so the same donor is not approached repeatedly by different units of the university

3. President of the Faculty Assembly Veit

- although the Legislature did not allocate $ for faculty salaries, the university system did much better than other state agencies, thanks to the efforts of Vice President for Public Affairs J. B. Milliken, and his staff, who lobbied effectively on our behalf
- academic freedom controversy at CH embarrassing to the state and the BOG, but the latter 'righted itself' in the end
- UNCW is one of the stronger campuses in the system on the matter of shared governance

4. President of the Senate Noland

- Chancellor Search Committee meets this Thursday, 9-1, and will continue to make time for additional faculty input
- Ned Martin was elected in Div 2 to replace Bob Roer on the RPT committee
- Senate has fulltime secretary, Marla Trobough, who can help committees with their work

5. David Miller, Chair, Steering committee for the NCAA Division I Athletics Certification Self-Study

- 37 members of the study must submit their report this December
- report to be made available in November, and the committee will be looking for input, as broad participation in the process is mandated
- peer reviewers will visit the campus in February, who will make their report to the NCAA, at which time the university will be judged (i) in substantial conformity; (ii), in conformity "with conditions"; or (iii) will be denied re-certification
- UNCW went through the process in 1995 and came through in good standing

Committee Reports:

- The following motion from the Faculty Senate Steering Committee in support of a change in the By-Laws passed:

The By-Laws of the Faculty Senate shall be amended to include the Director of the General College as a non-voting, ex-officio member of the Academic Standards, Admissions, Financial Aid, and University Curriculum Committees. (Motion 03-2-3)

- The following slightly amended (deletions) motion from the Academic Standards Committee was passed (Motion 03-2-4):

The Academic Standards Committee wants to put forward the following Revisions to the Retention Policy as found on page 69 of the 2002-2003 Undergraduate Catalogue:

[Changes begin with paragraph five. Additions are bolded. Deletions are struck through: The order of the last two paragraphs has been switched since they discuss the first and second declarations of academic ineligibility.]
Any other student who does not meet the minimum grade point requirement for retention at the conclusion of the spring semester will be declared ineligible. The student will be allowed to make up deficiencies during this university’s summer sessions—immediately following the spring semester in which the ineligibility was declared. If such deficiencies are not removed after the completion of the summer sessions, the student will be suspended from the university and must sit out the following fall and spring semesters. A suspended student may apply for re-enrollment for the following fall semester. However, admission to re-enrollment is contingent upon the availability of space. Suspended students may enroll in any summer session. Applications for re-enrollment are available in the Admissions Office and should be filed as early as possible to ensure enrollment consideration. If a student is allowed to re-enroll, he/she must see an academic advisor before registering for classes.

Students may, through appropriate administrative review of mitigating circumstances be authorized. Students that have been declared academically ineligible to continue for the first time may seek appropriate administrative review of mitigating circumstances for authorization to continue with their studies on a conditional basis. Written permission must be obtained from the appropriate dean prior to the beginning of the semester in which such students wish to enroll.

A second declaration of academic ineligibility will result in dismissal from the university and is final unless eligibility for continued residence or for readmission is restored by completion of sufficient work only during summer sessions at the University of North Carolina at Wilmington.

3. Ronald Sizemore, Chair of the Evaluation Committee, reported on "reviewing the SPOT."

- The committee has tried to make the process easier, and eliminate paperwork by going electronic
- This has been possible in relation to SPOTS for online courses and evaluations of administrators, but committee has been unable, as yet, to find a model with sufficient safeguards of security and confidentiality, to create online SPOTS
- The committee will examine "use and abuse" of SPOTS this year, and is setting up an informational website
- They will be "revalidating" SPOTS this year, and submit a report to the Senate
- In response to a question about the "abuse" of SPOTS, referred to the Faculty Handbook, Appendix J, found at [http://www.uncwil.edu/fac_handbook/9.J.htm](http://www.uncwil.edu/fac_handbook/9.J.htm) especially "D. Warnings against Inappropriate Use of SPOT Results"

Old Business

1. The following motion (03-1-2) from the Faculty Senate Steering Committee was passed:

The UNCW Faculty Senate asks the UNCW Chancellor Search Committee to seek the following qualities in their candidates for Chancellor:

A commitment to scholarly values and the diverse goals of a public comprehensive university, as expressed in the university mission statement;

Academic scholarship and teaching credentials, or professional credentials, that are tenurable at the level of full professor;

Outstanding leadership qualities, including:

- Successful leadership in higher education or professional administration
- Personal integrity, intellectual curiosity, compassion, resilience and energy
- Commitment to shared governance with faculty, staff and students
- Collaborative leadership style that emphasizes openness and fairness
- Demonstrated ability to secure funding from government and private sources;

A commitment to equal employment opportunity and non-discriminatory practices.
New Business

None.

Announcements

None.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.
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Roll Call

Absent: Bechtel (Nursing), Byington (Fac Wel Cmte), Clark (Dean, Bus), Denny (Soc Wrk), Dockal (EarSci), Dutka (Lib), Errante (Admis. Cmte.), Galbraith (Fin Aid Cmte), Garris (Info Sys), Gowan (IS), Graham (Ec), Herstine (HPER), Hickman (Mus), Howe (Mrk/Mgt), Huntley (Eng), Leutze (Chan), McCall (Research), McNamee (Soc/CJ), Mintzes (Bio), Reeves (Chem), Roer (Grad Sch), Shay (IT Cmte), Sizemore (Evaluation), Tyndall (ITSD), Usilton (History), Webster (Biology)

Approval of October minutes

The minutes were approved, with the correction to David Miller's title in Individual Reports #5.

Individual Reports:

1. Larry Dagenhart, Chair, Chancellor Search Committee, Member, Board of Trustees

   • Welcomed the opportunity to address the Senate, and suggested that the Chair of the BOT might speak briefly to the Faculty Senate on an annual basis
   • Reviewed the Chancellor Search process:
     - The committee secured Shelly Weiss Storbeck as a Consultant in August
     - Under Hatha Hayes, completed Search Profile, now on the web and in the library
     - Now in outreach process--every US university president, provost contacted
     - Examine applicant pool in Dec, begin interviews in Jan, Feb recommends to BOT
     - BOT recommend 2-3 candidates to Pres. Broad early Mar, she recommends to BOG mid-Mar, Chancellor on board by Jul 1
   • Answered questions
     - "not sure" if there will be public process with candidates interviewed by faculty delegates; if there are sitting presidents as finalists, they often withdraw rather than be named publically, so it may be necessary to keep the process secret, utilizing a "shadow committee" of campus reps to interview privately
     - consultant has extremely wide knowledge of people in higher ed; role is to assist the committee, not to be a decision-maker
     - OP is involved in recruitment process, but it remains under direction of committee

2. Chancellor Leutze

   • Provost Hosier noted BD 119 will be signed by the OP on 11/15; faculty will receive letters of their new salaries from chairs after that date.
   • BOT is concerned about major issues facing UNCW, including:
     - growth to 12,500 by 2007: how can campus accomplish that, including how to get necessary future buildings in process now to have online then
3. President of the Faculty Assembly Veit

- BOG approved university's requests, which included 6% pay raise for each of next two years, but getting this through the legislature will require intense lobbying
- assembly meets on Friday; among the goals is to establish minimum standards of faculty governance for all campuses, many of which lag behind UNCW

4. President of the Senate Noland

- noted that the Faculty Senate will elect the President for next year in December
- introduced Patricia Turrisi, Director of the Center for Teaching Excellence, who presented on the Intercultural Week. The Senate voted a "sense of the Senate" declaration in favor of the program without dissent.

5. David Miller, Chair, Committee for the NCAA Division I Athletics Certification Self-Study

- report is being finalized, will soon be on Department of Athletics website and in the library
- the committee will welcome any responses to the report

Committee Reports:

1. The University Curriculum Committee submitted several motions, all of which passed:

I. Consent Agenda items for changes in the Catalogue (motion 03-3-5) was passed:

a. Basic Studies/Competency issues: That the following courses be approved for basic studies:

1. EVS 120 and EVSL120 under physical science. (These courses are already approved as GLY 120 and GLYL 120 for basic studies.)
2. EVS 195 under life sciences.
3. PAR 110 under philosophy.

b. Changes to Major and Minors: The committee recommends that these changes be approved.

1. Biological Sciences Change

(BIO 454 was deleted last year and no longer appears under the Biological Sciences course listings. Please delete it under Requirements for a Major in Biology for the B.A. degree, Option 2. Conservation Biology, p. 108 of current catalog so that option will read as follows.)

Option 2. Conservation Biology. 51 hours. BIO 335 and BIOL 335, BIO 356, BIO 366 and BIOL 366, BIO 466, 475. CHM 101-102 and 11 additional hours selected from BIO 345 and BIOL 345 or BIO 355, BIO 358 or 452, BIO 364, 375, 377 or 446, BIO 430, 435 or 436, BIO 456, 457 and BIOL 457, BIO 481....

(On p. 108 under Requirements for a Major in Biology for the B.S. degree, please add BIO 495 under that heading and remove it from under the Option 2 heading so that the text reads as below.)

Requirements for a Major in Biology for the B.S. degree: BIO 110, 205, and 206 which should be taken early in the program of study, BIO 335 and BIOL 335, BIO 495, and completion of the additional requirement for one of the options described below.

Option 1. General. 63 hours. BIO 345 and BIOL 345 or BIO 347 and BIOL 347 or BIO 355, BIO 366 and BIOL 366. CHM 101-102, CHM 211-....

(Under Option 2, p. 108 of current catalog please change number of hours from 65 to 63.)

Option 2. Premedical Sciences. 63 hours. BIO 315....

(On page 108 under the following heading, please make corrections to include BIO 471 so the text reads as printed below.)

Requirements for a Major in Marine Biology for the B.S. degree: 68-70 hours. BIO 110, 205, and 206, which should be taken early in the program of study; BIO 335 and BIOL 335, BIO 345 and BIOL 345 or BIO 347 and BIOL 347 or BIO 355, 362, BIO 366 and BIOL 366 and BIO 495. A minimum of 10 hours chosen from BIO 358, 380, 434, 446, 474 or 472, BIO 457 and BIOL 457, BIO 458, 462, 463, 468, 471, 481, BIO 483 and BIOL 483, BIO 486 (only 3 hours of 486 allowed toward the major), CHM 101-102; GLY 150; PHY 101-102 or 201-202; MAT 111-112 or 115-115 or a higher sequence. A minimum of 4 hours chosen from CHM 211-212 and CHML 211-212,
CHM 235, 255, 475, CSC 112, 121, GGY 333, GLY 101, 337, STT 215. A "C" (2.00) or better average is required on BIO courses above 299.

2. English

(Please replace the text under Individualized Option on p. 116 of the current catalogue with the text listed below.)

Individualized Option. This option allows students with a GPA of at least 3.0 to develop a plan of study tailored to their specialized academic interests and career goals. The plan must be approved by a committee composed of the student’s advisor, the departmental coordinator of undergraduate advising, and one other faculty member with interests of expertise relating to the student’s proposed focus, appointed by the department chair. The option is especially appropriate for a double major, an English major coupled with a minor in an area study (e.g., Women’s Studies or American Studies), or an English major in combination with another program (e.g., Honors) or degree (e.g., a BFA in Creative Writing). This option is also useful to students training for careers in law, international business or government, or the media (e.g., film or drama criticism, film or television production).

Requirements are ENG 204 or 205, 6 hours in literature, 6 hours in writing, 3 hours in the English language, and ENG 495 or 496. No more than 15 hours may be at the 200 level.

3. Sociology Change

(As in current catalogue)

Option 1. General Sociology: 39 hours. … A maximum of nine hours below the 300 level (including SOC 105) may be used to satisfy the above requirements.

(As in current catalogue)

Option 2. Applied Sociology: 39 hours. … Students who take SOC 496 must take 21 hours of Sociology courses in their concentration area. Students who take SOC 498 must take 21 hours of Sociology courses in their concentration area. Students must earn a C (2.00) or better in SOC 390 in order to take SOC 496 or 498. A maximum of nine hours below the 300 level (including SOC 105) may be used to satisfy the above requirements. The courses required for each concentration area are as follows:

(As in current catalogue)

Health and Aging: SOC 220, SOC 305, SOC 336 and SOC 337; and either two or three of the following courses (two if taking SOC 496, three if taking 498) SOC 340, SOC 345, SOC 349, SOC 365, SOC 366, SOC 418, SOC 433.

4. Foreign Languages and Literatures Change (editorial changes were made 11/7 by UCC/FLL to the requirements for the majors to include the fact that 36 hours are required by the major)

(On the top page 89, please change the sentence marked with an asterisk to read as follows.)

*Students who opt to waive the foreign language requirement rather than take a 300-level class and receive supplemental credit as described on p. 121, must make an appointment for a written assessment of language proficiency in Lakeside 275

(On page 121 of the current catalogue, please replace the 2nd paragraph under Foreign Languages and Literatures with the following text.)

Students who have taken French, German, Latin, or Spanish in high school must take a placement exam in that language. Placement in Italian, Japanese, and Portuguese is done through consultation with the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures. Students who have studied a language other than those offered at UNCW may enroll in the beginning level of any class without taking a placement exam.

Requirements for a Major in French for the B.A. degree: 36 hours, including 201-202 or the equivalent and thirty hours at the 300-400 level of which at least 6 must be at the 400 level. Only 3 of the hours at the 400 level may be obtained by means of a FRH 491 or 498. A grade of “C-” or better is required in each course counted toward the major and a “C” (2.00) average or better for all courses counted the major. Also required is a passing score on the departmental French oral proficiency exam. Recommended: HST 101 and 102.

Requirement for a Major in French for the B.A. degree with Teacher Licensure: (as in current catalogue)

Requirements for a Major in Spanish for the B.A. degree: 36 hours, including 201-202 or the equivalent and thirty hours at the 300-400 level of which at least 6 must be at the 400 level. Eight of the following courses: SPN 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 311, 312, 321, 322, 385, 386, and 387 of the following courses: SPN 401, 405, 411, 412, 421, 422, 425, 491, 495, 498 or 499. No more that 3 hours of SPN 491 or 498 credit combined may count toward major requirements.

A grade of “C-” or better is required in each course counted toward the major and a “C” (2.00) average or better for all courses counted the major. Recommended: HST 101 and 102.

Requirements for a Major in Spanish for the B.A. degree with Teacher Licensure: (as in current catalogue)

5. Parks and Recreation Management Change

(Page 128, add 371 and 382 or 382 to the requirements below.)


All students are required to complete REC 368, 370, 371, 380, 382 or 383, 468, 480; PED 216, ...
II. Extensive revision to Film Studies (motion 03-3-6). This motion, which represents a significant change in the Film Studies program, including deletion of the minor, was passed.

FILM STUDIES

(Interdepartmental)

http://www.unewil.edu/filmstudies

Dr. T. Berliner, Director

Mr. C. Hackler, Associate Director

Dr. G. Richardson, Academic Program Coordinator

Mr. F. Capra, Distinguished Visiting Professor

The College of Arts and Sciences offers an interdisciplinary major and minor in film studies. The major and minor are designed to provide students with the opportunity to develop analytical skills, creative abilities, and interdisciplinary perspectives in understanding film as artistic and cultural expression, visual text, rhetorical device, technical production, and commercial enterprise. Drawing upon the expertise of faculty in various departments in the College of Arts and Sciences, as well as in the Cameron School of Business, the Film Studies program offers a variety of courses in the art, history, and business of film. Drawing on the resources of the Wilmington film industry, the program also offers courses and internships in film production. The program also offers courses and internships in film production with professional filmmakers and using the resources of the Wilmington film industry. The primary purpose of all courses in film studies is to enhance students’ understanding and appreciation of the art of film.

Before they are admitted to the major, students must demonstrate their skills and dedication to the study of film by completing the required 9 hours in core courses in film studies with a minimum grade in each course of C- (1.67) and an overall grade point average of B (3.00) or better in the three courses. After successfully completing the three core courses, students must also submit an application for admission, which will be evaluated by Film Studies faculty. Successful applicants will then be admitted to the major. Students may at any time declare a pre-film studies major (PFST) in order to gain access to the core courses in film studies.

Students seeking admission to intermediate and advanced courses in film production must have completed at least 9 hours in film studies courses, have junior or senior standing, and submit a course application, available in the Film Studies office, that details previous work in film studies and specific interest in the production course being offered.

A student in Film Studies must complete all requirements for the major with an overall 2.00 GPA or better in order to be graduated.

Core Courses (9 hours): FST 201, FST 203 (ENG/THR 270), and either FST 204 or FST 205 (FLL 205)

Film History Courses (6 hours): from FST 225 (THR 225), FST 377 (ENG 377), and either FST 226 (THR 226) or FST 376 (ENG 376).

Foreign-language Cinema Course (3 hours): from FST 205 (FLL 205), FST 386 (GER 385), FST 387 (FRH 385), FST 388 (SPAN 385), FST 480 (FLL 480), or FST 485 (GER/SPAN/FRH 485)

Film Production Courses (6 hours): from FST 220 (ART/CSC 220), FST 318 (COM/CRW 318), FST 320 (ART/CSC 320), FST 395, FST 396, FST 397, FST 398, FST 399, FST 418, FST 419, FST 495, FST 497, FST 498, COM 280, THR 230, or THR 335.

Critical Studies Course (3 hours): from FST 366 (ENG 366), FST 367, FST 368, FST 369, FST 376 (ENG 376), FST 377 (ENG 377), FST 386 (GER 385), FST 387 (FRH 385), FST 388 (SPAN 385), FST 440, FST 480 (FLL 480), FST 485 (FRH/GER/SPAN 485), or FST 496.

Seminar (3 hours) FST 495 or FST 496.

Elective Courses (12 hours) from courses with FST prefix.

Core Requirements: 24 hours from ST 201 (COM 201), 203 (ENG/THR 270), and either FST 204 or FST 205 (FLL 205); 6 hours from FST 225 (THR 225), FST 377 (ENG 377), and either FST 226 (THR 226) or FST 376 (ENG 376); 3 hours from FST 206 (FLL 206), FST 386 (GER 385), FST 387 (FRH 385), FST 388 (SPAN 385), FST 495 or FST 496 (GER/SPAN/FRH 485), or FST 485 (GER/SPAN/FRH 485); 6 hours from FST 318 (COM/CRW 318), 395, 398, 498, COM 280 or THR 230 or THR 335; 3 hours from FST 366.
III. Changes in the University Curriculum Committee's Duties (motion 03-3-7) was passed.

That the duties and procedures of the University Curriculum Committee be **changed** in the By-Laws as follows: That the paragraph:

i. Duties. To review all proposals for the following: the establishment, dissolution, division, or consolidation of academic departments or other degree-granting entities; the establishment, dissolution or revision of academic degrees, including majors, minors, and certificate programs; policies for maximum and minimum hours required for majors, minors, and certificates; total number of hours requirements; university-wide competency requirements; course prefixes; any curricular conflicts between schools and/or colleges; and other general curricular policies which have total university impact. The committee shall submit all such proposals, along with the committee’s recommendations, to the Senate for consideration.

be replaced by the following:

i. Duties. To review all proposals for the following: the establishment, dissolution, division, or consolidation of academic departments or other degree-granting entities; the establishment, dissolution or revision of academic degrees; the establishment or dissolution of majors, minors, and certificate programs; policies for maximum and minimum hours required for majors, minors, and certificates; total number of hours requirements; university-wide competency requirements; course prefixes; any curricular conflicts between schools and/or colleges; and other general curricular policies which have total university impact. The committee shall submit all such proposals, along with the committee’s recommendations, to the Senate for consideration.

Note: The change is in boldface. The words in the first are replaced by the words in the second.

1. The two motions from the **Academic Standards Committee** were passed, with part of the first returned to committee for restatement (03-3-8, -9):

The Committee asks the Faculty Senate Steering Committee to charge another committee to look at providing statements in the Faculty Handbook strengthening the notion that submitting all grades on time is a major responsibility of each faculty member and failure to do so should be met with some appropriate admonition. Also, to determine the appropriate section of the Faculty Handbook for 1b.

1. Late Grades (03-3-8)

The following motion was **approved**, with the deleted (strike-through) section returned to the committee for revision. During discussion it was noted (i) that this is a genuine problem (with 100+ NR grades each semester); (ii) that faculty who fail to turn in their grades on time are not fulfilling their contractual duties to the university; (iii) that as stated recommendation (b) does not indicate who should report the information, or how it should be part of the evaluation process.

a. NR Grade

On page 65 of the 2002-2003 Undergraduate Catalog change the description of the Z grade from Unreported Grade to Not Reported. Add above the Z grade an NR Grade with 0.00 Grade Points and a description of Not Reported by Faculty.

b. Removal of NR Grades

In the Faculty Handbook, in either IV.A.13.e Assigning Grades or IV.A.13.f Changing Grades, should be placed the following paragraph:

NR grades must be removed by the instructor by filling out the Change of Grade form, which needs to be signed by the Department Chair. Occurrences of NR grades will be reported to the faculty member’s Chair and such information will be made available at the time of Annual, RPT, and Post Tenure reviews.
c. Deadline Reminder

Global announcements of 1) the beginning of the grading period, and 2) the last 24 hours before the end of the grading period need to be made as reminders to faculty of the strictness of the grade submission deadlines.

2. Participation in Commencement (motion 03-3-9)

The following motion was approved:

On page 69 of the 2002-2003 Undergraduate Catalog, at the end of the section Requirements for Graduation, add the following paragraph:

Students may be allowed to participate in the graduation ceremony if they have completed requirements for graduation or if they are expected to meet the graduation requirements with the completion of one course of up to four hours during the term immediately following the graduation ceremony. Students who are one course short must notify the Registrar two weeks prior to Commencement of their intent to participate in the ceremony. Their names will not be published in the Commencement Program.

3. The following motion from the Faculty Welfare Committee was returned to committee (03-3-10):

During discussion, it was stated (i) that the resolution was formed on May 3, and that members of the committee were no longer sure it was the best way to address equity issues; (ii) that there was more faculty input on same campuses of the UNC system concerning how equity issues might be addressed than at UNCW; (iii) that this was an issue which the Faculty Welfare Committee should discuss further and present recommendations to the Faculty Senate.

Resolution Pertaining to Faculty Salary Competitiveness

Whereas, the University of North Carolina Board of Governors has authorized the delegation of management flexibility to appoint and fix compensation for faculty to institutional Boards of Trustees; and

Whereas, the UNC Wilmington Board of Trustees has instructed the administration to prepare and submit a proposal to the Board of Governors requesting such delegation of authority to appoint and fix compensation for faculty beginning with Academic Year 2002-2003; and

Whereas, the Faculty Welfare Committee of the UNCW Faculty Senate has reviewed the institution's annual faculty salary analysis by discipline and rank and found its methodology to reflect sound and contemporary human resources principles for establishing and maintaining faculty salary relationships by discipline and rank in relation to market value; and

Whereas, performance salary increase funds represent the principal means by which the institution recognizes the quality of teaching, research, and public service (and that the use of such funds to achieve or maintain labor market competitiveness by discipline or rank dilutes the purpose of such funds to recognize individual performance); and

Whereas, the University of North Carolina at Wilmington has initiated a campus-based tuition increase which has been approved by the Board of Governors and which (if approved by the NC General Assembly) would provide additional funding designated for faculty salaries;

Now Therefore Be It Resolved that the Faculty Welfare Committee hereby recommends to the Faculty Senate, the Provost, the Chancellor, and the UNC Wilmington Board of Trustees that performance increase funding appropriated by the NC General Assembly continue to be allocated to recognize individual factors such as performance, rank, or longevity, while UNCW tuition-based faculty salary funds be allocated exclusively to address labor market competitiveness by discipline and rank until all academic disciplines and all ranks within disciplines average 100% of market value in relation to UNCW Wilmington's peer institutions -- as documented by special faculty salary studies from the College & University Professional Association for Human Resources.

Old Business

None.

New Business

None.

Announcements
The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.
Faculty Senate Minutes

Tuesday, 18 March 2003 2:30 p.m. Dobo 103

Roll Call

Absent: Adams (Nurs), Byington (Fac Wel Cmte), Cami-Vela (FLL), Clark (Dean, Bus), Denny (Soc Wrk), Dockal (ES), Durako (HPER), Errante (AdmisCmt), Evans (Soc), Gamble (ES), Garris (Info Sys), Gill (SpecS), Graham (Ec/Finan), Hunt (M&M), Jones (Cur.S), McCall (Research), McCartney (Biology), McLaurin (UCC), Narayan (CompuSci), Roer (GradS), Rosen (InfoSys), Seaton (Chm), Shay (IT Cmte), Sizemore (Evaluation), Tenhuisen (Math), Tyndall (VCITSD), Usilton (Hst)

Approval of February minutes.

Minutes were approved as posted, with the correction that one of the questions to Larry Dagenhardt read "some" rather than "many" faculty objected to the secrecy of the Chancellor selection process.

Individual Reports

1. Chancellor Leutze.

- Noted that there is an "open invitation" to the UNCW Community to the reception for the new Chancellor, this Friday at 4:30 pm. at the Warwick Center. He also asked faculty to welcome and be supportive of the new Chancellor, just as they had been with him.
- Reviewed the state and university financial situation.
  - UNCW has done fairly well in the past few years, given the dire state financial situation: we have been able to balance cuts with tuition increase and other funds, so as to stay level--though this does not account for the increased enrollment and added teaching loads; will admit 85 more students next fall.
  - Hopeful concerning next year that we will get enrollment increase and repair/renovation funds, as well as a 1.6% salary increase; state will know more about its finances after April 15
  - Agreed in Q&A that the impact of increasing health care premiums and copayments will be felt most severely on staff in $15-20,000 salary range; but there is little the University can do unless the state and/or federal government comes to grips with the health care crisis.
- Remarked that this was a "portentious time" for the country, and is concerned about the war, particularly the alienation of allies and the doctrine of preemptive attack. Urged faculty to hold teach-ins, and engage the students on the war and the possibilities of terrorism. Faculty noted the March 27 panel forum on "Resiliency and Coping with War" mentioned in Announcements at the end of the minutes.
- Said that he was unhappy about the "Ludacris" situation, and does not subscribe to the attitudes in his music, but he also does not believe the University should censor student speech/art performances. There will be an area set aside for protestors.
- Provost Hosier was asked to discuss the new building, to be located north of SBS. There were concerns about closing one of the few "open spaces" on campus, and the minimal involvement of the faculty B&G committee in the decision process. In response, he noted that the siting was
consistent with the concept of an "Enclosed Campus Space" around the lake area, and with the need to reduce distances between classes. He acknowledged that the planning/building process had often bypassed faculty in the past, but this would no longer be the case; faculty and "all constituencies" will be involved in the "Master Plan" now in construction. VC Jordan also stated that the University was now committed to an open process. Chancellor Leutze commented that the new building was quite beautiful, and he expected most people would be pleased when they see it.

- **Chancellor Leutze** expressed his thanks for all the support he had received from the faculty over the years of his chancellorship, and sat to a round of applause.

### 2. Senate President Noland

- Noted that the members of the Chancellor Search Committee had not been unanimous about making the process secret, and that he realized that faculty would feel little connection to the choice--but added that if we do not make an effort to welcome the new Chancellor, this might decrease the likelihood that person will feel closely allied to the faculty.
- With no objections, reported that he would invite the new Chancellor to the April meeting.

### 3. Director of the General College Kemille Moore

- Gave a brief overview of the Learning Communities Project, including:
  - introduction of the steering committee
  - summary of the program for next fall: 9 LCs, 225 students, all 1st semester freshmen, self-selected, 25 per course; students live in new residence hall; each LC with 8 credit hours = two 3 credit courses + one 2 credit Uni course
  - it is a "pilot", not in the catalogue, without ongoing funding--but they hope it will continue
- Q&A: want to expand beyond freshman year, but not necessarily increase size of program; are working now on assessment with people from Evergreen State who will do site visit in fall, assess progress

### Committee Reports

#### 1. Senate Steering Committee motion (3-7-25) was passed:

That the Faculty Senate Standing Rules be revised as follows (deletions, additions), effective July 1, 2003:

**Faculty Senate Standing Rules**

Regular meetings of the UNCW Faculty Senate are held at 2:30 p.m. on a Tuesday of each month from September through April, as scheduled by the president in consultation with the Steering Committee. The scheduled meeting dates of the Senate and the Steering Committee for the current academic year shall be published with the September agenda.

1. Separate seating shall be provided for voting senators and for non-voting senators and visitors.
2. The Senate normally shall adjourn no later than 4:30 p.m. on a Tuesday of each month from September through April, as scheduled by the president in consultation with the Steering Committee. The scheduled meeting dates of the Senate and the Steering Committee for the current academic year shall be published with the September agenda.
3. Election of the president-elect shall be a Special Order of the Day on the agenda of the December meeting.
4. Election of all other officers shall be a Special Order of the Day on the agenda of the September meeting. Those officers shall take office immediately upon election.
5. All motions pending at the conclusion of the last regular Senate meeting shall be carried over to the next academic year.
2. **Academic Standards Committee** motion (3-7-26) was passed:

That the first two paragraphs of the section "Repeating of Courses" on page 68 of the 2002-2003 Undergraduate Catalog be revised as follows (deletions, additions). Subsequent paragraphs of the section are not changed.

Students who receive a grade of "C-" or better in a course may not repeat the course but may audit without credit. Students who repeat a course in which they have earned credit or for which transfer credit has been awarded will have the status changed to audit during the term the course is repeated.

Students who receive a grade of "D" (including "D+" or "D-") or "F" below a "C" (2.00) in a course taken at UNCW may repeat the course at UNCW. The first five times a student repeats courses the previous grade and hours of credit for the repeated course will not be used in calculating the student's grade point average and hours toward graduation. All grades shall remain on the student's transcript.

**Old Business**

1. **Academic Standards Committee** motion (3-5-21), concerning **Admissions-Unclassified Students**, as amended by Russell Herman and Richard Veit, passed.

   a. That the section UNCLASSIFIED ENROLLMENT PERMISSION on page 35 of the 2002-2003 Undergraduate Catalog be replaced with the following:

   **UNCLASSIFIED ENROLLMENT PERMISSION**

   Applicants who are denied regular admission to the university may be considered for enrollment as unclassified students under special circumstances. No student who has graduated from high school less than two years prior to application may be considered for unclassified status. Unclassified status does not constitute admission to any degree program at the university. An unclassified student may enroll in up to 18 credit hours of courses in a semester but may attempt no more than a cumulative total of 30 credit hours while unclassified. If the student does not qualify for degree status after 30 credit hours have been attempted, the student’s enrollment will end and the student may not reapply for admission. Unclassified students are subject to all applicable academic regulations of the university. Unclassified students are not eligible for federally funded financial-aid programs. See also Conversion from Unclassified Status in this Catalog.

   b. That the following section be added on page 62 of the 2002-2003 Undergraduate Catalog:

   **CONVERSION FROM UNCLASSIFIED STATUS**

   An unclassified student who has not previously attended another college or university and has met all requirements for admission as a degree candidate may apply to convert to degree status upon completing a minimum of 15 credit hours with a "C" (2.00) average or better on all work attempted. This minimum 15 credit hours must include English 101 and three hours of basic mathematics with a grade of "C" (2.00) or better in each of these courses.

   An unclassified student who has previously attended another college or university and has met all requirements for admission as a degree candidate may apply to convert to degree status if the student has completed English 101 and three hours of basic mathematics with a "C" (2.00) or better in each of these courses and if the student has achieved a grade point average of at least 2.00 on all work attempted at all institutions attended.

   Unclassified students intending to pursue a degree are advised to apply for degree status prior to the application deadline established for the semester. Acceptance into certain degree programs will depend on the student's prior college performance. See also Degree Programs and Requirements in...
New Business

There was no new business.

Announcements

There is a "University Community Reception" for the new Chancellor, Friday, March 21 at 4:30 p.m. in the Warwick Center.

There will be a panel forum on "Resilience and Coping with War," sponsored by the Cape Fear Psychological Association, held in Dobo 132 at 7 pm, Thursday, March 27.

The meeting was adjourned at 4 p.m.
Faculty Senate Minutes

Tuesday, 21 January 2003  2:30 p.m.  Dobo 103

Roll Call

Absent: Byington (Fac Wel Cmte), Cami-Vela (FLL), Clark (Dean, Bus), Counts (Soc), Denny (Soc Wrk), Dockal (EarthS), Errante (AdmisCmt), Evans (Soc), Galbraith (FinAidCmt), Garris (Info Sys), Graham (Ec/Finan), Harper (Advancement), Herstine (HPER), Hickman (Music), Hunt (Mrk/Mgt), Huntley (Eng), Leutze (Chan), McCall (Research), McCartney (Biology), McElheny (Art/Th), Meinhold (PoS), Narayan (CompuSci), Perko (HPER), Shay (IT Cmte), Sizemore (Evaluation), Snowden (Budget), Tenhuisen (Math), Webster (Biology)

Approval of December minutes

Minutes were approved as posted.

Individual Reports

1. Provost Hosier had announcements, made a presentation on UNCW growth and answered questions.

   • Announced:
     • the proposal for a university Smoking Policy has been completed and is being forwarded to the Building and Grounds Committee
     • many faculty have noted the troop movements; UNCW policy grants tuition refunds to students who are called up/or their spouses if they need to withdraw from classes, and will give prorated room and board; textbooks are not covered
     • UNCW plans to grow to 12,500 students by 2010 using the following strategies:
       • increase: the freshman class size annually to 1800 by 2006; the number of transfer students; graduate student enrollment; the number of extension and distance learners; take advantage of: the trend toward 2 yr institutions; our Community College Articulation (CAA) agreements
     • UNCW seeks to reduce the funding gap through the following strategies:
       • support campus-initiated increase as soon as allowable by BOG; increase transfer enrollments, taking advantage of the formula funding model for it; support full legislative funding for enrollment increases, student aid, faculty salary increases and other items on the BOG's Schedule of Priorities; oppose further cuts in the university's budget' encourage the Governor to fund the utility shortfall in the continuation budget' continue to increase revenues from contracts and grants, auxiliary services, etc.; sustain and develop plans to enhance our image and quality
     • Reduce the future space shortage by the following strategies:
       • seek support for a second round of university construction; propose and begin planning for 1-2 additional buildings to be constructed by 2010 (Nursing/Natural Sciences); support a "Centennial Campus" or "Research Park" concept for UNCW
     • External factors include:
       • changing NC demographics; perceived migration of students from private to public universities; apparent migration from 4 to 2 year schools; excellent public image and
UNCW's tuition proposal and plans for the 5 year, $300 yearly increase.

Answers to questions:
- merit $ increases depend on legislature, though UNCW will use some equity $ to keep "highly productive faculty" (he realizes this is "harmful to morale");
- growth does not increase or reduce the funding gap, thus we need tuition increase;
- BOG may allow different sized tuition increases for different campuses;
- if we can decrease the funding gap, we will increase $ for faculty positions;
- shift to Delaware model for all funding may actually benefit us;
- OP realizes that faculty are concerned about benefits, esp. health insurance;
- Why should UNCW keep cooperating/growing, when state/UNC system refuses to address the gap? -- we must continue to grow, if we do not want to lose out to other growing UNC schools (e.g ECU, ASU, UNCC);
- University Relations working on a single "clear message" to symbolize UNCW;
- "gap" came about over a long period, despite UNCW efforts, largely through politics (SENC vs. western NC, vs. "flagships", vs. traditionally black institutions);
- it should be an issue brought up to future chancellor candidates;
- UNCW to see new programs, incl. 2 master's programs and a B.S. in Nursing
- UNCW growth plan depends on increased funding, if state/legislature continues to cut funding, it will have to be redone;
- modest increase in growth of freshman class planned for next year

2. President of the Senate Noland

- Athletic Department decided not to make a presentation to the Senate on the CHAMPS courses, but is pursuing developing courses with the former HPER, now Health and Applied Sciences (HAS) department.
- the new calendar has been approved and the University will go to a one week shorter semester, beginning next fall
- Human Relations reports that all retiring faculty receive the same benefits, including a library card; free parking; email; and 1/2 price tickets on relevant events; there are no additional benefits for emeritus professors; he invites the departments to discuss (a) whether there should be a uniform process to nominate and receive emeritus status, and (b) whether there should be additional benefits for emeritus professors
- Faculty Senate President is on the agenda of the BOT, and faculty are invited to let him know if there are items of concern they would like to see him bring up before the BOT
- Dr. Reeves of Chemistry announced that he was on the Task Force for Diversity, that there will be a survey targeted for faculty, and that if faculty have questions or comments, they should email him at "Reeves"

3. Vice Chancellor Tyndall, with Steve Perry, Bobby Miller, and Beverly Vagnerini, offered an overview of the ITSD's principles and efforts over the past few years, responded to questions.

- 7 principles of UNCW IT development and ways in which these principles have been implemented.
- Chancellor-appointed IT related committees
- ITSD organizational structure
- history of Outlook migration and Web Presence
- campus Web Committee charge
- Web Committee membership
- minimal standards for UNCW Divisional, School, Department and Organization web sites

Steve Perry, Bobby Miller and Beverly Vagnerini answered specific questions:

- several concerning the use of Outlook, noting that there would be both introductory and advanced
training sessions in Outlook this spring, as well as training sessions for students beginning in the fall
- web site standards needed to promote recognition of university
- standards, which do not apply to individual faculty websites, but to divisional, school, department,
  and organization sites, at http://www.uncwil.edu/admin/style.html, to be implemented over next 9-12
  months
- ITSD will provide assistance both online and individual, if needed
- faculty with IT questions should begin by calling the helpdesk at x4357, or emailing tac@uncw.edu;
  they should be forwarded to the appropriate people

VC Tyndall wants to know if faculty are being helped or not being helped

Committee Reports

1. After several concerns were raised, discussion of the Academic Standards Committee motion (3-5-21),
   concerning Admissions-Unclassified Students was postponed until the February meeting.

   This Unclassified Student classification needs to be reserved for mature nontraditional students who cannot get into
   UNCW but want to try to establish a record and fully intend to enroll at a future date. Also, this statement would
   provide more guidance on what it means to be an unclassified student and would specify minimal class work in
   English and Mathematics.

Replace the UNCLASSIFIED ENROLLMENT PERMISSION section in the 2002-2003 Undergraduate
Catalog, p. 35 with the following modification of the 1990-1 Policy.

ADMISSIONS-UNCLASSIFIED STUDENTS

Individuals may enroll in the university as unclassified students by meeting the
requirements as stated below. Unclassified enrollment permission does not constitute
admission to the university, and students intending to pursue a degree must apply for
admission to the university.

1. A transfer student who has not been enrolled in an institution of higher education for
   at least one year and who has not been academically suspended within the last three
   years may apply for enrollment as an unclassified student.

2. A high school graduate who has not attended an institution of higher education and
   has been graduated at least two years may apply for enrollment as an unclassified
   student. GED candidates must have been out of school two full years since their class
   graduated.

3. Official college transcripts (transfers) and high school transcript or GED (transfers
   and freshmen) must be sent to the Office of Admissions by the application deadline
date.

   Students who enroll as unclassified students may take any undergraduate course as long
   as the prerequisite listed in the course description is honored. An unclassified student may
   enroll in up to 15 semester hours in a regular semester. An unclassified student may apply for
   admission as a degree candidate upon completing a minimum of 15 semester hours with a “C”
   (2.00) average or better on all work attempted. The student must complete English 101-201
   and three semester hours of basic mathematics with a “C”(2.00) or better before being
   considered for admission as a degree candidate. An unclassified transfer student who has
   completed English 101-201 and three semester hours of basic mathematics with a “C”(2.00) or
   better will be considered as having met this requirement. However, requirements for transfer
students to become degree candidates will vary depending on the previous college performance.

To avoid delay in having applications considered for change-over admission to degree candidates, unclassified students are advised to apply prior to the application deadline established for the semester. The maximum number of hours allowed students in the unclassified category is 30 semester hours. When this limit is reached, the students must be eligible to apply for admission consideration as degree candidates or terminate their enrollment at the university.

Unclassified students are subject to the academic regulations of the university as applicable. Unclassified students are not eligible for some federally funded financial aid programs. Students who are denied regular admission to UNCW may not apply to be enrolled as unclassified.

Old Business

There was no old business

New Business

There was no new business

Announcements

The meeting adjourned at 4:30.
Faculty Senate Minutes

Tuesday, 18 February 2003  2:30 p.m.  Dobo 103

Roll Call

Absent: Byington (Fac Wel Cmte), Bechtel (Nurs), Byington (FacWel), Clark (Dean, Bus), Clifford (Eng), Denny (Soc Wrk), Errante (AdmisCmt), Evans (Soc), Feng (Mat), Garris (Info Sys), Graham (Ec/Finan), Hosier (Provost), Leutze (Chan), McCall (Research), McCartney (Biology), Narayan (CompuSci), Roer (Dean, Grad), Seaton (Chm), Shay (IT Cmte), Sizemore (Evaluation), Snowden (Budget), Tenhuisen (Math), Tyndall (VCITSD)

Approval of January minutes

Minutes were approved as posted.

Individual Reports

1. Chancellor Search Committee Chair Larry Dagenhart

   • Report:
     - committee is working harmoniously together, expects to find excellent candidates for position
     - began with 135 nominations, 117 candidates from 36 states/2 foreign countries, 20% presidents or chancellors, 40% provosts or VCs, 20% deans/dept. heads; 20% from private or nonacademic; 20% women; 10% minorities
     - 15 quarterfinalists screened in January, 5 presidents, 5 VCs/Provosts, 5 other positions in higher education, 3 women, 2 minorities
     - will identify 4-6 for interviews; have a "confidential search" since many do not want to be identified; they come to campus, meet VCs, deans, new faculty interview group (Badarinathi, Berkeley, Bomar, Cody, Galizio, Moore, Ward) and Search Committee have agreed not to publicize interviewees
     - recommend 2, possibly 3 to President Broad in early Mar, she does further interview, makes rec to BOG fairly soon afterward

   • Q&A
     - can names be ranked to Pres Broad? not officially, though expects she would consult
     - confidential agreements with interviewers/ees means cannot release identifying information; names will never become public, except for Pres Broad's choice
     - bothers many of us process is secret? mood has shifted, 8/9 UNC searches that way; unless we do that, we eliminate many of the best candidates; but our method involves large and diverse representation, and this time UNCW BOT reps and faculty are getting along well
     - Pres Broad does not have the authority to just name who she wants; she must name one of the 2/3 nominees

2. President Noland

   • Richard Veit reelected by the UNCW faculty to a 3-year term as a delegate to the Faculty Assembly.
• Ad hoc RPT committee will be bringing motions to the floor this spring, beginning with simplest, e.g. changes in tenure clock timetable, process of formal notification, etc.; more controversial issues of collegiality and external review will probably be proposed as matters to be decided upon at the departmental level
• introduced Allison Cavenaugh, representative to the Senate from the SGA, who announced the Tuesday Tea Meet and Greet faculty/student gathering in Cameron lobby, Tuesday Mar 4, 2-3:30.

3. Sharon Boyd gave a brief overview of the Chancellor's Parking, Traffic and Transportation Committee's recommendations, including:

• Slide presentation on:
  - guidelines of ample parking, value priced; on campus parking for residents; parking not too distant from campus center; safety; minimal environmental impact; blend with campus design
  - challenges of space; roads at/over capacity (e.g. 12,000 daily capacity on Randall, now at 15,000), safety, traffic; continual increase in permits (~7700 in 1998-99, ~9600 now; with 95% optimal capacity, we now are at 99% and have a 600 space shortfall)
  - goals of 95% utilization (this is where faculty spaces are at now); alternative transportation modes; distribute visiting parking; parking deck; assigned parking lots

• Q&A
  - why no parking deck in parking east of Dobo? too far from academic areas where demand is
  - are shuttles necessary/safe? plans to move on own paths (perhaps with bikes) or onto roadways, but off walkways
  - why 70% increase in faculty parking? can't see we have gotten anything for it? $45 due to court case possibly reverting fine $ to schools; need to build more lots for students, faculty; need to increase enforcement to keep students from parking
  - thoughts about towing? moving toward locks, towing, esp. for repeat non-decal violators
  - separate faculty/staff lots? not efficient
  - traffic problems on Randall will be partly solved with zone-assigned parking
  - need oncampus resident parking to retain growth in residential housing
  - email concerns, questions to boyds@uncwil.edu

4. Associate Vice Chancellor McLaurin and Vice Chancellor Howard-Vital

• Remarks:
  - Diversity Taskforce does not have predetermined outcomes: we are in data-gathering stage; want to examine Blue-Ribbon report; engage dialogue on campus; make recommendations/report in early April, not so much specific recommendations as broader ones, with alternative options
  - If you want to have input, fill out the online Diversity survey. Faculty/staff-- whatever your view -- are encouraged to fill out, through Feb 25. So far 184 faculty, 957 students; 165 staff.

• Q&A
  - who wrote the survey and have you heard of self-selective bias? several subcommittees, yes, realize it is not random, not perfect, but need input for meaningful report, better than Blue Ribbon report which did not survey.
  - it takes a while to fill out but it is (a) important; (b) your chance for feedback--and it will be made known.
  - Reid Counts spoke on her research, having to do with diversity efforts in higher ed, which typically amount in reality to affirmative action for minority enrollment, but UNCW cannot win that battle in NC vs. TB schools, Duke, etc. We are ignoring opportunity to make real difference by extending diversity to unserved groups, e.g. disabled. Melton McLaurin answered that agrees this diversity effort emphasizes race/ethnicity, other diversity issues should be explored, but we can take actions to improve # of minorities on campus, incl Hispanics.
  - The survey is anonymous! Melton added that, while some are unnecessarily worried about
this, many with "politically incorrect opinions" have not been shy about signing their names, which he thought was a good sign.

Committee Reports

1. The University Curriculum Committee submitted the following motions (3-6-22, -23, -24):

   a. Consent agenda motion recommending approval of PAR 211 as a basic studies course under Humanities/Philosophy was passed (3-6-22).

   b. Motion recommending approval of the establishment of a Department of Film Studies was passed (3-6-23).

       The University Curriculum Committee recommends the creation of a Department of Film Studies.

       Todd Berliner spoke in favor of the proposal, citing (1) course scheduling problems for 200+ majors; (2) teacher expertise issues when faculty are in other depts, e.g. no film studies Ph.Ds; (3) hiring, RPT issues, when not in film studies dept. For more, see departmental proposal.

   c. Motion recommending approval of the establishment of a Department of Environmental Studies was passed (3-6-24).

       The University Curriculum Committee recommends the creation of a Department of Environmental Studies.

       Jack Hall spoke for the proposal, noting same problems Todd mentioned, 260+ majors, administrative problems; spoke to EarSci concerns about this 'thinning the CAS pie', effects on other depts growth, FTEs, question about how interdisciplinary faculty can professionally evaluate people outside their field. Also supported by the Biology Department. For more, see departmental proposal.

Old Business

1. Academic Standards Committee motion (3-5-21), concerning Admissions-Unclassified Students. Discussion of this motion is postponed until the March meeting.

New Business

Announcements

President Noland remarked that this is an appropriate time for the university to reflect on different possibilities for the kind of university it seeks to be in the future, as many senior academic positions will be filled with new people in the next two years.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:15.
Faculty Senate Minutes

Tuesday, 10 December 2002 2:30 p.m. Dobo 103

Roll Call

Absent: Byington (Fac Wel Cmte), Benedetti (Lib), Cami-Vela (FLL), Clark (Dean, Bus), Counts (Soc), Denny (Soc Wrk), Dutka (Lib), Elikai (Acct.), Garris (Info Sys), Gill (Spec.S), Harper (Advancement), Howe (Mrk/Mgt), Hunt (Mrk/Mgt), Huntley (Eng), Jones (Cur. S), Lee (CreWr), Leutze (Chan), McCall (Research), Mintzes (Bio), Narayan (CompuSci), Roscher (Acct), Scheuring (Nurs), Seaton (Chm), Shay (IT Cmte), Sizemore (Evaluation), Tyndall (ITSD), Usilton (History), Weber (Com St.)

Approval of minutes

The November minutes were approved.

Special Orders of the Day:

- **Election of Faculty Senate President:** Re-election of Dan Noland by acclamation.
- **Nomination of Candidates for Faculty Assembly Representatives:** Nomination of Elizabeth Hines, Lynne Snowden, Mark Spaulding, Richard Veit.

Individual Reports

1. Provost Hosier

   - Congratulated Robert Roer, who has been named to become Dean of the Graduate School, effective pending BOT/BOG approval
   - The idea of a Research Office is on hold for the time being
   - Reported on a variety of matters concerning the budget:
     - consensus is there will not be further budget cuts this year
     - BOG may freeze tuition; this adversely affects faculty raises, some budget matters
     - 4% over median number of students expected; should get new positions next year
     - OP lists a variety of items being proposed to the Legislature, including improving the university's flexibility to manage personnel, improving optional retirement programs, increasing the employer contribution rate to retirement; setting up a competitive tuition rate for UNC universities at military bases; improving health insurance options; reducing employees contribution to state retirement; and asking the legislature to fully fund enrollment increases
     - Legislature expected to continue to criticize, and decrease funding for the University
   - A laptop computer requirement seems timely, with the prospective opening of new buildings on campus. It will be necessary to increase support to CTE to prepare faculty to utilize laptops in the classroom.
   - Responded to several questions:
     - he did not know if President Broad had recommended the tuition freeze, as reported in the
paper, but assumed if she did, it was for political reasons.
- acknowledged that a tuition freeze would mean UNCW could not address the deficiencies in the way in which the "equity adjustment" was handled this year
- UNCW would propose a tuition increase, in order to continue the equity/adjustment process and provide needed funds to the university
- acknowledged that student fees are high, and a laptop requirement would add to student expenses, but the University had to raise funds, and could address some of the hardships caused by changes in financial aid

2. President of the Faculty Assembly Veit

- Faculty Assembly voted to support a pay increase for SPA employees
- Faculty Assembly urged the legislature to restore the money that the state did not pay into the State Retirement Program this year, and to resume payments next year to insure the solvency of the program.

3. President of the Senate Noland

- Noted that the report in the Star-News today on the Chancellor Search was accurate, and that the four faculty members were pleased with the process so far. Several of the 48 in the first "cut" asked that their names be kept confidential, at least until the final stage; so we will not know until later if and how public interviews may be done on campus.

Committee Reports

1. The following items from the University Curriculum Committee were voted on (3-4-11, 12, 13, 20):
   a. the Consent Agenda items passed (03-4-11)
      1. For Computer Competency:
         a. Add CHM 101-102: General Chemistry, for Chemistry.
         b. Delete CHM 255: Introduction to Computer Applications and Chemical Literature.
      2. For Basic Studies:

   CHM 105: Basic Concepts of Chemistry (3): A terminal, relatively non-mathematical one-semester course in chemistry for the nonscience major. Topics include atomic and molecular structure as a basis for a general understanding of chemical reactions, reaction dynamics, environmental problems, energy resources, food additives, and nuclear power. Three lecture hours each week. May not be taken for credit after CHM 102 has been passed.

   b. The supplementary mathematics credit proposal was approved. (3-4-12)

   Supplementary Mathematics Credit Proposal

   Students who complete MAT 161 with a grade of C (2.00) or better and who receive no AP credit, no transfer credit, and no prior credit at UNCW in mathematics will receive credit for MAT 115. Students who complete MAT 162 with a grade of C (2.0) or better and who receive no AP credit, no transfer credit, and no prior credit at UNCW in mathematics will receive credit for MAT 161. Students who complete MAT 261 with a grade of C (2.00) or better and who receive no AP credit, no transfer credit, and no prior credit at UNCW in mathematics will receive credit for MAT 161 and 162.

   c. The Mathematics and Statistics Degree Program and catalogue change was approved (3-4-13)
The UCC recommends approval of the following Degree Program in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, which has been approved by the Graduate Council.

Bachelors/Masters Degree Program

This Bachelors/Masters degree program is designed to provide a student in Mathematics a means to complete the requirements for both degrees in a period of 5 years. The key feature of the program is that a student can count up to 12 hours of graduate level courses satisfying requirements for the B.A. or B.S. toward the M.A. or M.S. in Mathematics.

Guideline

A. Students in the B. A. or B.S. program in Mathematics who have:

1. Completed a minimum of seventy-five (75) and a maximum of ninety-eight (98) credit hours in their undergraduate programs in mathematics, including credits earned from advanced placement if they started at UNCW or are Transfer students and have completed a minimum of two semesters as a full-time student at UNCW, a minimum of 24 hours

2. Completed a minimum of nine (9) hours of 300-400 level mathematics or statistics courses.

3. A minimum accumulated grade point average (GPA) of 3.0/4.0 and minimum grade point average (GPA) of 3.0/4.0 on all 300-400 level mathematics or statistics courses at UNCW

may apply to the Department Chair for permission to apply up to 12 credit hours of graduate level course work during their senior year toward their future masters degree.

B. In his/her senior year, the student must submit the standard application for admission to the Graduate School including: an application form, application fee, transcripts, and GRE scores. In addition, a Graduate Degree Plan, signed by the prospective student, the Department Chair, and Graduate Coordinator must be submitted before the end of the senior year. Departmental permission to apply to the Bachelor's/Master's degree program does not guarantee admission to the Graduate School. Admission is contingent on meeting eligibility requirements at the time of entering the graduate program.

C. The Graduate Degree Plan for the Master's degree must clearly indicate:

- Courses (maximum of 12 graduate credit hours) that will be double-counted for both Bachelor's and Master's degrees;

- Additional Graduate courses that will be taken but not counted toward the Bachelor's degree;

- Courses that will be taken after matriculation into the graduate program;

- Intended graduation date for the Master's degree.

D. Upon review of the submitted materials by the Graduate School, a letter of acceptance (or denial) to the Master's program, will be sent to the student and copied to the Department Chair and the Graduate Coordinator. Acceptance will be provisional and contingent on meeting specified degree requirements, including completion of the Bachelor's degree.

E. Any changes in the Graduate Degree Plan must be submitted in writing and approved by the Department Chair. A student who is ineligible to participate or continue in, or withdraws from the Bachelors/Masters program can not double count any courses for both Bachelor's and Master's degrees.

To implement the program UCC recommends the following change in the Undergraduate catalogue:

On page 93 of the 2002-2003, change the sentence

“Graduate courses taken under this provision may not be used to fulfill baccalaureate degree requirements.”

read

“Graduate courses taken under this provision may not be used to fulfill baccalaureate degree requirements unless the student is enrolled in an approved Bachelors/Masters Degree Program.”
d. The Senate voted to postpone discussion of the NCAA/Life Skills courses until the January meeting (motion 3-4-20).

There was considerable discussion of the Athletic Department proposal to institute three new courses similar to UNI 101, designed especially for athletes, CHAMPS/Life Skills 201: Second/Personal Development Issues (1); CHAMPS/Life Skills 301: Junior Seminar/Leadership and Community Service (1); and CHAMPS/Life Skills 401: Senior Seminar/Career and Life Readiness (1). These courses were not recommended for approval by the UCC. Director of Athletics Bradley-Doppes made a presentation in support of the courses, as part of UNCW's process of responding to NCAA mandates, and said that the Athletics Department would pay for the courses, even if non-athletes enrolled in them. Professor McLaurin of the UCC noted that the UCC had had some concern about the academic content of the courses, who would teach them, and whether they would isolate athletes. It was noted that the Senate could not vote approval of the courses, without course descriptions and further information, at which time the motion to postpone discussion was offered and approved.

2. The following motions from the Academic Standards Committee were voted on (3-4-15, 16, 17, 18, 19):

a. Late Grades motion (3-4-15) was approved as amended:

The instructor must remove NR grades by filling out the Change of Grade form, which needs to be signed by the Department Chair. The Registrar's Office will report occurrences of NR grades to the faculty member's Chair and Dean such information will be made available by the Chair at the time of Annual, RPT, and Post Tenure reviews. The determination as to whether discipline is to be imposed is governed by existing policies.

There was considerable debate of this motion. Though it was generally agreed that failure to carry out this responsibility was a breach of contractual obligations and professional duty, it was also argued that this was an issue which Deans and Chairs could publicize and handle more forcefully themselves, without involving this disciplinary issue in the RPT process.

b. Revised description of Z grade was approved (3-4-16).

Change the description of Z from Not Reported to grade Under Appeal.

c. Graduate courses taken to fulfill undergraduate requirements was approved (3-4-17). The following wording is to be placed in the Graduate Course section of the undergraduate catalog (2002-2003 Undergraduate Catalog):

Graduate courses at UNCW or other accredited institutions may be used to fulfill undergraduate requirements if approved by the student's academic advisor, department chair and the undergraduate dean. All other transfer credit policies apply.

d. The motion concerning unappealed grades was approved (3-4-18). The following sentence is be added to Grade Appeal/Grades and Reports (pages 64-65, 2002-2003 Undergraduate Catalogue) after "Grades awarded at the end of a term may be appealed only through the end of the next succeeding regular semester." add

Grades not appealed by that time become permanent.

e. The motion to modify the Retention policy was approved (3-4-19). The Retention policy on page 70 of the 2002-2003 Undergraduate Catalogue is to be modified as follows:

All freshmen, regardless of the semester enrolled, will be given one semester (fall or spring) past the warning period to remove any deficiencies--have three semesters to meet the academic retention standard of the university. However, freshmen whose grades fall below the retention standard at the end of their second semester will be allowed to register for a third semester only with permission of the Director of the General College. If such deficiencies are not removed, the student will be suspended from the university for one semester. Suspended students must reapply for re-enrollment for fall or spring semesters and may register for classes only with permission of the Director of the General College. Applications for re-enrollment are available in the Admissions Office and should be filed as early as possible to ensure enrollment consideration. Readmission is contingent upon availability of space. Suspended students may re-enroll in any summer session.

3. Committee of the Whole. Discussion of retirement/emeritus policy will be addressed in the January meeting. Currently this is decided at the departmental or school level. At issue are such questions as whether emeritus status is to be awarded only to a few or a normal consequence of retirement; what
privileges, if any, are to be offered to all retirees; and whether there should be a university wide policy, or recommendation from the Senate.

**Old Business**

There was no old business.

**New Business**

There was no new business.

**Announcements**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.
Faculty Senate Minutes

Tuesday, 15 April 2003
2:30 p.m. 
Dobo 103

Roll Call

Absent: Byington (Fac Wel Cmte), Cami-Vela (FLL), Caropreso (Cur.St.), Denny (Soc Wrk), Dockal (ES), Durako (HPER), Dworkin (Psych), Errante (AdmisCmt), Evans (Soc), Feng (Math), Garris (Info Sys), Gill (SpecS), Harper (M&M), Hines (EarSci), Jones (Cur.S), McCall (Research), Mintzes (Bio), Myers (Psych), Perko (HPER), Rosen (InfoSys), Seaton (Chm), Shay (IT Cmte), Sizemore (Evaluation), Tenhuisen (Math), Tyndall (VCITSD), Weber (PubSvr), Webster (Bio), Wilcox (A&T)

Approval of Minutes

March minutes were approved as posted.

Special Order of the Day (honorary degree nomination was voted on)

Individual Reports

1. Chancellor Leutze

- Prior to the Chancellor's remarks, President Noland showed a slide of faculty protesting the attempt, in 1990, to impose a non-academic chancellor on the university. He then said:

  As we can see from this photography published in the Wilmington Star on May 31st, 1990, Jim Leutze had stirred UNCW's campus community up even before he became Chancellor. This was the finest hour of the UNCW faculty, as we arose to declare that we would not accept anyone as Chancellor who was not committed to faculty governance and a deep respect for academic values. Perhaps one of the best indicators of Jim Leutze's accomplished tenure here is the fact that the recently completed search to find his successor, even though closed, ran much more smoothly. The friendly relations we now enjoy between faculty and administration are in large measure a result of the way Chancellor Leutze approached his job. From the beginning he proposed his own initiatives, solicited and actually heard faculty views, and often simply got out of the way so the ideas already fermenting here could brew healthily.

  We are now a genuine university, larger, more diverse, more cosmopolitan and global, reputable: an outstanding institution attractive to, among others, an impressive student body and an impressive faculty. So, it is with sincere appreciation that, speaking for the UNCW Faculty Senate and on behalf of the whole UNCW faculty, I offer you our thanks for a job laboringly, lovingly, and very well done. Thank you, Chancellor Leutze.

  These remarks were followed by a standing ovation.

- Chancellor Leutze then spoke, beginning with the story of the convocation tradition: faculty first assumed that he had ordered it would occur, rather than suggested it; when they learned this was his wish, and depended on our consent, we voted in favor of it. He said that he thought his success here had been due in large part to the fact that he respected the faculty and believed in the values faculty espoused, and he said that he expected to remain in Wilmington, and hoped to teach and continue to promote the interests of UNCW. Then he offered these comments.
I would like to offer you, as my "final charge", the hope that the UNCW faculty will continue to work to serve the needs of the Southeastern North Carolina region. A thriving university is vital to progress in this area, particularly to progress in the rural counties. This is a region undergoing rapid change, immigration, and the risk of economic decline as manufacturing jobs in textiles and other industries are moving offshore, tobacco allotments no longer supplement incomes, and farming continues to be a hard way to make a living. We need to study the region and its needs, and help design ways to improve it. I hope you will commit yourselves to that endeavor.

2. Senate President Noland

- Reminded Senators to have their departments elect Senators for next fall, and that faculty should look for the Bob Fry email concerning autonomous committee preferences.
- At that point it was noted that Bob Fry would also be retiring this year, and he was given a round of applause.
- Said that there had been a good exchange with Chancellor-designate DePaolo on Monday, and she looked forward to more interaction with the faculty
- With the consent of the Senate, indicated that the Steering Committee would like to have volunteers who would then be appointed to be chairs of Senate committees, who would then be ready to lead them in the fall; if active Senate committees have elected chairs, they should let him know
- Thanked all Senators for participating and voting throughout the year
- Recognized Patty Turrisi, Director of the CTE and member of the Evaluation Committee, which is reviewing, among other things, the role of SPOTs in evaluation. She said that the committee was examining the role of peer evaluation, as one way to balance student evaluations of teaching, and were attempting to catalogue some "best practices" for departmental use. There will be a dinner and meeting on May 12 at 6 pm in the Madeleine Suite, to which all faculty are invited, to participate in the formulation of recommendations. Contact her at 7392 or 3034.

3. Richard Veit, Faculty Assembly report

- Noted that the last meeting of the Faculty Assembly will be next Friday; anyone with concerns should contact him. He did not run for a third term, and Jeff Passe of UNC-Charlotte will be the new chair of the Faculty Assembly.
- Added to the comments by President Noland, that he had learned, in his several years as chair of the Faculty Assembly, how good our campus faculty/administration relations are, compared to those on many other campuses in the system.

    Faculty governance is a reality here, which we take for granted. But this is not true elsewhere, and for that, Jim Leutze is due much of the credit. He respects faculty, and the result is that there is high morale on this campus, a reservoir of good will which will greet the new Chancellor. Thank, you, Chancellor Leutze.

4. Lynne Snowden, Chair, Budget Committee

- Offered both a summary of the Budget Committee's efforts over the past year, and suggested it might serve some of the less active Senate committees as a "best practices" model for their efforts:
  - Two goals: (1) reinvigorate the committee; (2) provide faculty input to the budget and its process
  - Met with key people in the budget process, Tim Jordan, Kay Ward
  - Held monthly meetings and kept minutes (often not done in Senate committees)
  - Each faculty member chose an area of special concern
  - Held meetings with the Provost, will be on-site when the process occurs in the summer, and, at the invitation of the Provost Hosier, will attend the meetings with the Deans when monies are allocated
- In Q&A, mentioned that the "slick" (thin) Budget document is on reserve, and the "thick" (full) document is also available, through the Office of Business Affairs. Provost Hosier noted that faculty would probably need some guidance in working with the thick document, since it is so detailed.
Committee Reports

1. University Curriculum Committee motions that these programs be approved passed (3-8-27, 3-8-28):

   a. Proposal for a Certificate in Geographic Information Science (see April agenda) was passed (3-8-27)

   b. Proposal for a baccalaureate program in German Studies at UNCW (see April agenda) passed (3-8-28)

Old Business

New Business

- Kenneth Gurganus, on behalf of the Senate Steering Committee, offered the following resolution, which was slightly amended and passed unanimously:

  WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees of the University of North Carolina at Wilmington has a special responsibility to ensure that the history of the University shall serve as a prelude and inspiration to its future, and

  WHEREAS, the Chancellor Search Committee appointed by the Board of Trustees on July 1, 2002 has met this responsibility by acting in the best interests of the University, thinking and acting constructively in consultation with a broad array of university and community constituents: NOW, THEREFORE:

  BE IT RESOLVED by the Faculty Senate of the University of North Carolina at Wilmington, that the Faculty commends the Chancellor Search Committee, individually and collectively, for its diligent work and conduct, and

  BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the University of North Carolina at Wilmington especially recognizes and commends Larry J. Dagenhart, Chair of the Chancellor Search Committee, for his significant contribution as the Committee's representative to the University and the Faculty Senate.

- Edward Graham, speaking from the floor, remarked that he hoped that the search for the next Provost would include public on-campus interviews, at least with the last group of finalists. President Noland indicated that, on behalf of the Senate, he would make this wish known to the new administration.

Announcements

- James Reeves, speaking for the UNCW Task Force on Diversity, announced that results of the Diversity Survey could be found at his homepage at http://aa.uncwil.edu/reeves/Diversity%20Survey/index.htm. He also noted:
  - There is little support for an Associate Provost of Diversity, considerable for a Commission on Diversity
  - Faculty do not want minority faculty put in the position of being overburdened with service/committee obligations, because of their minority status
  - Faculty accept the idea that minority candidates, given market concerns, might be hired at a higher salary than other candidates; they strongly reject the idea that they should be brought in at a higher level (e.g. associate vs. assistant) or that minority status should play any role in RPT decisions
  - Students and faculty perceive minority students as being underrepresented on campus

There were none.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45.
Secretary's note: I have posted information provided by Richard Veit on student tuition and fees and AAUP-reported faculty salary increases at UNC-system schools under "Outside Links" off the Senate index page. It seems UNCW salaries continue to remain lower than averages in comparable schools in the system, e.g. ASU, ECU, UNC-C, UNC-G, and that our increases were lower than at ASU, the school with salaries most comparable to ours.
Roll call

Absent: Byington (Faculty Welfare Committee), Clements (Psychology), Errante (Admissions Committee), Evans (Sociology), Feng (Mathematics), Galbraith (Financial Aid Committee), Perko (HAHS), Reeves (Chemistry), Shay (Information Technology Committee), Sizemore (Evaluation Committee), Walker (Curricular Studies), Weber (Public Service Committee), Webster (Biology), White (Creative Writing)

Approval of minutes

April minutes were approved as posted.

Special order of the day

1. Senate officers were elected for 2003-2004:
   - Vice-president: Mark Spaulding, History
   - Secretary: Richard Veit, English
   - Steering committee:
     - Susannah Benedetti, Library
     - Reid Counts, Criminal Justice
     - Steven Dworkin, Psychology
     - Rick Olsen, Communication Studies
2. Two candidates were nominated for Faculty Assembly delegate:
   - Steven Dworkin, Psychology
   - James Reeves, Chemistry

Individual reports

1. Chancellor Rosemary DePaolo reported as follows:
   - Governance: Her review of recent Senate minutes has shown her that shared governance is healthy on this campus; she applauds the faculty for a process that functions well.
   - Faculty: Our faculty have impressed her as both active and serious about teaching. She will work to remedy factors causing morale problems.
   - Financial issues: Lack of resources caused by our 13% budget cut is a major concern. We must look to increase revenues. We are assembling "compelling data" in an effort to change the equity funding model, which disadvantages UNCW compared to other UNC schools. We hope to include rewards for performance, such as retention and graduation rates, which would benefit us. We also seek to raise the 18% cap on out-of-state students in areas such as nursing and education, where the state faces shortages.
   - Diversity: Although we have increased African-American faculty and students this year, we need still greater diversity. She will appoint a Diversity Council charged to devise a strategic plan. [In response to a question, she stated that diversity should include a range of minorities, including Hispanics.]
   - Curriculum: Basic Studies have not had a comprehensive review in many years. We must ask why we are educating students and what skills, knowledge, and abilities we want them to have. She hopes we will look at structures as well as courses: for example, should Basic Studies be spread out over four years instead of two? She is also creating an International Task Force to expose more students to an
international perspective.

- **The student experience**: She has charged Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Patricia Leonard to review the entire student experience. In addition, she has asked Vice Chancellors Leonard and Hosier to examine the first-year experience.

- **Administration**: We are searching for two administrators: a Vice Chancellor of Business Affairs with broad experience and an open, collegial style; and a Vice Chancellor for Public Service and Continuing Studies.

- **Benchmarking**: We are comparing ourselves to comparable institutions by collecting data from 33 schools (with focus on six) in 114 categories. Two open forums will be held for us to examine the numbers and discuss our core values, issues, goals, strategies, and required resources. Dates: September 24 and October 13, from 3-5 p.m. in the Warwick Center Ballroom.

- **A physical master plan** will be created with as much involvement as possible from university constituents.

2. **Senate President Daniel Noland** reported as follows:

   - UNCW has a strong tradition of shared governance. We are responsible for the university's curriculum. Any changes to Basic Studies and policies of reappointment, promotion, and tenure come before the Senate and require our approval.
   - Election results for autonomous committees (Hearings, HPRC, RPT) will soon be announced.

3. **Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Rebecca Porterfield** reported as follows:

   - **New hurricane policy**: When a voluntary evacuation of the beaches is declared, students cannot be penalized for missing classes. When a mandatory evacuation is declared, classes will be cancelled and the university shut down.

**Committee reports**

1. Richard Veit of the **Faculty Handbook Committee** reported as follows:

   - The Senate's Steering Committee appointed him editor charged with drafting a revised Faculty Handbook. The revision was to bring the Handbook up to date and to be in a form appropriate for a web document. His additional goals were to make it as helpful as possible to new faculty in orienting them to the university and to make it as informative, accessible, and convenient as possible for all faculty.
   - He presented the revision that he produced. The Senate will be asked to approve it as the official Faculty Handbook at its October meeting. In the meantime, he urges all faculty and administrators to review the new Handbook and provide feedback.
   - Links: [Current Faculty Handbook](#); proposed [revised Faculty Handbook](#); comments to [Richard Veit](#).

2. The following motions of the **Academic Standards Committee** were approved:

   a. **(Motion 04-01-01; revise "Degrees with Distinction"; carried as revised)**

      That the section [Degrees with Distinction](#) on page 66 of the 2003-2004 Undergraduate Catalogue be revised as follows [addition is underlined]:

      Three degrees with distinction are granted to graduating students based on all work attempted in meeting requirements for the degree as follows:

      - **Cum Laude** for an overall average of 3.50
      - **Magna Cum Laude** for an overall average of 3.70
      - **Summa Cum Laude** for an overall average of 3.90

      Degrees with distinction are granted to transfer students under the following conditions:

      (1) The student must have the required overall average on all work attempted (including all transfer courses attempted).
(2) The student must have the required average on work attempted at the University of North Carolina at Wilmington.

Grades issued by a foreign institution are not calculated into the UNCW grade point average in determining degrees with distinction.

Students who complete the Departmental Honors Program satisfactorily will be graduated "With Honors" in the discipline in which the special work is undertaken.

Students who complete the University Honors Program will have the additional designation "University Honors."

[Note: The wording of the new sentence was changed via a motion.]

b. (Motion 04-01-02; institute pass/fail courses; carried)

That the following section be added to the Enrichment Courses and Programs section on pages 96-101 of the 2003-2004 Undergraduate Catalogue:

PASS/FAIL COURSES

Students who have a cumulative grade point average of 2.0 or higher and who have successfully completed 45 hours, with at least 12 hours at UNCW, may take up to 9 hours of elective courses on a pass/fail basis. The intent of this option is to encourage students to explore areas of interest beyond their major or minor without concern about compromising their academic record. Students should be selective in choosing such courses. A change of major might mean that a course taken on a pass/fail basis must later be retaken for a grade. In addition, graduate and professional schools and future employers may evaluate such course work differently from graded courses. The following restrictions apply.

- A student may enroll in a course on a pass/fail basis only with the permission of the instructor.
- No more than one course may be taken on a pass/fail basis in a semester or summer session.
- Courses used to fulfill Basic Studies requirements or the requirements of the student’s major, minor, or certificate program may not be taken on a pass/fail basis. Courses repeated to replace a grade may not be taken on a pass/fail basis.
- Students may not change the designation (from graded to pass/fail or from pass/fail to graded) after the drop/add period.
- Pass/fail students are required to complete all course work and examinations and are graded as if they were taking the course for a grade. Students who achieve a passing average receive a grade of “P” for the course.
- Credit hours in courses for which a student has earned a “P” are counted toward the hours required for graduation but are excluded in the computation of the student’s grade point average. Grades of “F” are included in the computation of the grade point average.

Adjournment

Minutes by Richard Veit, Senate Secretary
Roll call

**Absent**: Dodd (Biology), Elikai (Accounting), Graham (Economics & Finance), Harper, (University Advancement Committee), Hickman (Music), Huntley (English), McCall (Research Committee), Perko (HAHS), Rishel (Information Systems), Tenhuisen (Mathematics), Usilton (History), Vetter (Information Technology Committee), Wilcox (Art & Theatre)

Approval of minutes

September minutes were approved as posted.

Individual reports

1. **Chancellor Rosemary DePaolo** reported as follows:
   - **Ranking**: UNCW was ranked #35 in *Kiplinger's* listing of best values in public colleges and universities.
   - **Management**: UNC administrators expect increased scrutiny following the accounting scandals at ECU. We still expect our request to the Board of Governors for increased management flexibility to be approved.
   - **Out-of state students**: Chapel Hill is seeking to raise the 18% cap on out-of-state enrollment. They are focusing on top students. We favor an approach that would bring in more nursing and education students —areas where our state has deficiencies—and believe our approach is the more politically viable.
   - **Faculty salaries**: Faculty salaries in the UNC system lag 12.8% behind the national average. To correct this would cost $55 million annually. To raise all EPA employees to the national average would cost $147 million, which would equate to a $1000 tuition increase.
   - **Equity funding**: UNCW would receive an additional $18 million annually if we were funded equitably vis-a-vis the other UNC campuses. She has asked Assistant to the Chancellor Mark Lanier to put together a compelling case, and we expect support from many on the Board of Governors.

2. **Senate President Daniel Noland** reported as follows:
   - **RPT**: The ad hoc committee considering revision to RPT procedures has ceased to function. Members have been asked to submit proposals to the Steering Committee so that they can be brought to the Senate as motions.
   - **Basic Studies**: He is asking senators from each department to have their departments nominate one tenured faculty member for a committee which will examine Basic Studies and, if they deem it fitting, submit proposals for revision to the Senate. From these nominees, a nine-member committee will be appointed.
   - **Bookstore**: Bookstore representatives met with the Steering Committee to discuss pricing and availability of sufficient textbooks. They are seeking to adjust their formulas so that sufficient books are available for all classes. Comments can be addressed to bookstore manager Andy Shaffer at shaffera@uncw.edu.

Committee reports

1. The following motion from the **Steering Committee** carried [**Motion 04-02-03; commend student-athlete graduation rates; carried**]:
Whereas, UNCW has the highest graduation rate of student-athletes among all non-football-playing Division I colleges and universities in the United States; and
Whereas, UNCW has the country’s fourth highest graduation rate of student-athletes among all Division I colleges and universities, behind only Bucknell, Davidson, and Notre Dame; therefore,

Be it resolved, that the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Wilmington commend the University’s student-athletes, its coaches, and its athletic director Margaret Bradley-Doppes for this remarkable achievement and for their commitment to academic as well as athletic excellence.

The vote was followed by applause for Athletic Department representatives Greg Dalton and Sandy Morrison, who were in attendance.

2. The following motion from the Faculty Handbook Committee carried [Motion 04-02-04; approve revised Faculty Handbook; carried]:

That the Faculty Senate:

i. approves the revised version of the UNCW Faculty Handbook to replace the current version of the Handbook; and
ii. recommends that a link to the Faculty Handbook be featured prominently at the top of the Faculty & Staff page of the UNCW web site.

The vote was followed by applause for Handbook editor Richard Veit.

3. The following motions from the Faculty Welfare Committee carried:

a. [Motion 04-02-05; end faculty/staff parking fees; carried]

Whereas, North Carolina’s public colleges and universities are the only employers in the state known to charge their own employees a fee for coming to work and parking their cars in employer-owned lots; and
Whereas, lack of raises, decreased benefits, and increased fees have caused the take-home pay of most UNCW faculty and staff to decline during the past three years; and
Whereas, the University should be seeking ways to increase the incomes and morale of its employees; therefore,

Be it resolved, that, beginning with the 2004-2005 academic year, the University cease to charge its employees for parking at their workplace.

The motion was amended from the original proposal by unanimous consent, removing an erroneous statement that parking fees had increased this year. The motion underwent considerable debate. Among observations were the following: Students would pay a higher cost for parking, but the amount would mean a small percentage increase in their college costs. Free parking would encourage more faculty and staff to park on campus. Students might object to faculty receiving free parking. We pay our parking on a pre-tax basis. The current parking-fee structure lacks options.

b. [Motion 04-02-06; commend lunch buffets; carried]

Whereas, opportunities for faculty from across the university to meet in social situations are valuable but rare; and
Whereas, the longstanding Tuesday/Friday luncheon buffets had been suspended this semester but have now been resumed; therefore,

Be it resolved, that the Faculty Senate commends Auxiliary Services and Aramark for resuming the Tuesday/Friday luncheon buffets.

4. The following motion from the University Curriculum Committee carried [Motion 04-02-07; approve new Basic Studies courses]:

...
That the following existing courses be approved for Basic Studies:

i. WMS 210, under Interdisciplinary Perspectives

**WMS 210. Introduction to Women's Studies** (3) An introduction to the study of women from an interdisciplinary perspective. Through readings, participation at extracurricular events, presentations, and other assignments, students will examine the status of women from a variety of historical, economic, cultural, and theoretical perspectives and trace the development of organized women's social movements. May be team taught.

ii. CRW 202, under Fine Arts

**CRW 202. Explorations in the Creative Process** (3) Exploration of the creative writing process informed by a variety of allied arts including, but not limited to: music, painting, sculpture, theater, dance and film. Includes lectures, readings, and creative exercises.

5. The following motion from the Academic Standards Committee carried [Motion 04-02-08; clarify GPA calculation]:

That the following passage on page 68 of the 2003-2004 Undergraduate Catalogue after the grade table be changed as follows [additions, deletions]:

The quality point ratio grade point average (GPA) is determined by dividing the accumulated number of grade points (quality points) earned by the accumulated number of quality hours. Hours for which a grades of "F" or "WF" have been assigned are included in the calculation of the GPA. Grades of “I”, “IP”, “W”, “NR”, “Z” and “P” are not included in the calculation of the GPA.

Adjournment

Minutes by Richard Veit, Senate Secretary
Vice-president Mark Spaulding presided.

Roll call

Absent: Applefield (Curricular Studies), Caropreso (Specialty Studies, Evaluation Committee), Dodd (Biology), Elikai (Accounting), Emslie (Biology), Hickman (Music), Kanoy (Nursing), Noland (English), Roer (Graduate School), Roscher (Accounting), Schmid (P&R), Seaton (Chemistry), Tenhuisen (Mathematics), Usilton (History), White (Creative Writing), Whitehead (Economics & Finance), Wilson (P&R)

Approval of minutes

October minutes were corrected and approved.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor Rosemary DePaolo reported as follows:
   - Endowed chair: The Kenan Charitable Trust granted UNCW $667,000 to fund the William R. Kenan, Jr. Distinguished Chair in Marine Science. The gift is eligible for a state matching grant of $333,000, which would give us our first million-dollar chair. This is the first grant from the Kenan Trust to support a chair in a specific discipline.
   - Board of Governors meeting: This week the Board considers two issues affecting us: raising the 18% cap on out-of-state students and equity funding. The latter could bring us great benefit. What actions the Board will take is uncertain.
   - Merit scholarships: These are the paramount fundraising priority. Cohort schools to whom we compare ourselves on average give merit scholarships to 21% of first-year students (we give to 3%), with an average grant of $3200 (our average is $1200). We are not competitive and lose many of our best applicants. To give the average grant of cohort schools, we would need to add $20 million to our endowment.
   - Naming of buildings: She believes that, in future, the naming of buildings, like honorary degrees, should come before the Faculty Senate for a vote of recommendation. The Senate needs to work out such a process.
   - Introspection: Having conducted a series of forums on benchmarks comparing us to cohort schools, she has asked the University Planning Council to consider the results of discussion on the questions Who are we? and What are our core values?
   - Task forces: Various bodies have begun work or will shortly: a diversity committee, a first-year-experience committee, a Basic Studies committee, an international task force, and a physical-master-plan committee.
   - Parking fees: The Senate's motion requesting free parking for faculty and staff is under consideration.

2. Marquita Lewis, SGA vice-president for multi-cultural affairs, commended recent efforts to improve diversity and hopes for sustained efforts following the report of the diversity task force.

3. Assistant Vice Chancellor for Admissions Roxie Shabazz reported on admissions, including the following:
   - We had 8902 applicants for our current freshman class, a big increase.
• We accepted 51%, a very competitive percentage.
• 1772 students enrolled, for a yield rate of 39% (the latter is average).
• The SAT range for the middle 50% of our freshmen was 1060-1220; their high school GPA range was 3.7-4.0.
• Composition of our current freshman class: 87% from North Carolina, 60% from our 8-county region, 64% female, 36% male, 8% athletes, 12% minorities (up from 8%), 5% African-American (a slight increase), 77% stating UNCW was their first choice (up from 74%)
• Applications are up an additional 18-20% for next year's class.
• She seeks to involve faculty in the admissions process; faculty volunteers will read applications from 3000 students.

4. Senate Vice-president Mark Spaulding reported as follows:

• RPT review: The Steering Committee is taking over the task of RPT overhaul. The first recommendations will be presented to the Senate in December.
• Basic Studies review: The following have been appointed to an ad hoc Basic Studies Review Committee: Kemille Moore (A&T), Ken Gurganus (MAT), Andrea Deagon (FLL), Tom Schmid (P&R), Pat Lerch (SOC), Mike Wentworth (ENG), Tim Ballard (BIO), Brad Walker (EDN), Luther Lawson (E&F), and one member of the University Curriculum Committee.

Committee reports

1. The following motions from the Academic Standards Committee carried:

   a. [Motion 04-03-09; revise retention policy; carried]:

      That the last two paragraphs under RETENTION, DISMISSAL AND READMISSION on page 73 of the 2003-2004 Undergraduate Catalogue be changed as follows [additions, deletions]:

      Only Sstudents within 12 hours of graduating that have been declared academically ineligible for the first time may seek appropriate administrative review of mitigating circumstances for authorization to continue with their studies on a conditional basis. Written permission must be obtained from the appropriate dean prior to the beginning of the semester in which such students wish to enroll.

      A second declaration of academic ineligibility will result in dismissal from the university, and is final unless eligibility for continued residence or for readmission is restored by completion of sufficient work only during the summer sessions at the University of North Carolina at Wilmington.

      The motion carried after debate about whether all students should have the right to appeal a declaration of ineligibility.

   b. [Motion 04-03-10; revise residency requirement; carried]:

      That the following passage on page 72 of the 2003-2004 Undergraduate Catalogue be changed as follows [additions, deletions]:

      RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT

      To qualify for the bachelor's degree, students must complete at least the following through coursework offered by through the University of North Carolina at Wilmington: (1) the final 20 semester hours of credit, (2) the final 15 semester
hours in the major at the 300-400 level, and (3) a total of 31 semester hours. Exceptions to requirements (1) and (2) may be made only with the approval of the department chair and the appropriate dean and the vice chancellor for Academic Affairs. Requirement (3) (2) may not be waived.

The revised policy will, for example, allow students who have completed their major requirements to study abroad during their senior year and still receive their UNCW degree.

2. The following motion from the Steering Committee carried after the original proposal was amended [Motion 04-03-11; define emeritus status and criteria; carried]:

Whereas, emeritus status at UNCW is currently undefined, and selection criteria are currently unspecified and, consequently, vary considerably from department to department; and

Whereas, both consistent definition and uniformity of criteria across the campus are desirable; and

Whereas retirement under honorable circumstances should be an occasion for honoring a colleague and not for subjecting that person to an additional process of evaluation; therefore,

Be it resolved that the section “Emeritus faculty” in the Faculty Handbook be revised as follows [additions, deletions]:

Emeritus faculty

Emeritus status is an honor accorded to retired faculty in recognition of their distinguished and sustained service to the university. Retiring tenured faculty members who hold retire at the rank of assistant professor or higher with a minimum of eight years of service at UNCW are eligible for emeritus status in the rank held and in the department served at the time of retirement. All recommendations for emeritus appointments must be initiated at the department level. Following consultation with and approval of the departmental faculty, the chairperson shall submit a recommendation to the appropriate dean who shall recommend to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The Provost shall recommend to the Chancellor, who shall, in turn, recommend to the Board of Trustees for approval.

Emeritus faculty are (1) invited to formal convocations and general faculty events, (2) listed in the Undergraduate Catalogue and University Telephone Directory, (3) accorded library privileges, e-mail, free ID cards, and free parking, if requested, and (4) admitted to athletic and cultural events at faculty rates. Emeritus faculty are not eligible to hold office or to vote in faculty elections.

The Senate debated whether emeritus status should be a courtesy routinely granted to retirees or a more significant honor accorded to selected retirees, and the latter view prevailed. Following an amendment changing criteria from "satisfactory service" to "distinguished and sustained service," the motion carried.

Adjournment

Minutes by Richard Veit, Senate Secretary
Roll call

Absent: Counts (Sociology), DePaolo (Chancellor), Emslie (Biology; Buildings & Grounds Committee), Gamble (Earth Sciences), Myers (Psychology), Olsen (Communication Studies), Perko (HAHS), Seaton (Chemistry), Walker (Curricular Studies), Webster (Biology), White (Creative Writing), Whitehead (Economics & Finance)

Approval of minutes

February minutes were approved.

Individual reports

1. Special Assistant to the Chancellor Max Allen reported on the upcoming Installation of Chancellor DePaolo:
   - The Installation will take place Friday, April 16; classes are cancelled from 9 a.m. to noon so that students and faculty can attend.
   - The cost, approximately $85,000, is less than usual for such events and is entirely paid for by sponsors and private donations; no university funds are being spent.

2. Provost Paul Hosier reported on the budget:
   - At the request of OP, we admitted more in-state and fewer out-of-state students, with an adverse impact on this year's revenues. We have identified sources of funds to cover all but $400,000 of the deficit, which we will eliminate with temporary SPA hiring freeze and similar reductions.
   - We have been asked to plan for next year with scenarios including 1%, 2%, and 3% reductions. We hope that a rebounding economy and increased state revenues will eliminate the need for reductions.

Old business

1. Steering Committee motions 04-06-17, -18, -19, -21, and -22 below were passed by the Senate (with amended language printed in blue below); motion 04-06-20 was returned to committee for revision.

   a. [Motion 04-06-17; revise the RTP process document; carried] That the RTP process document in the Faculty Handbook be revised as marked below [additions, deletions] to effect the following:
      - require a vote of senior faculty and require the numerical results to be recorded with the chairperson's recommendation.
      - allow a majority of senior faculty, at their option, to forward a separate recommendation if they disagree with the chairperson's recommendation.
      - provide for the forwarding of negative as well as positive RTP recommendations. Currently a single negative recommendation can stop the process.
      - require timely notification to the faculty member of the recommendation at each level.
      - change the order of recommendations to: chair > dean > CRTP > Provost > Chancellor > BOT. Currently, deans recommend after the CRTP. The change brings consistency by making university-level recommendations subsequent to more local recommendations. Also, the recent granting of "management flexibility" to UNCW means final approval now rests with the Board of Trustees (previously the Board of Governors gave final approval).
specify who may not participate in deliberations and recommendations.

---

**RTP process**

**Timetable**

Typically, candidates for tenure and promotion are reviewed in the fall, and candidates for reappointment are reviewed in the spring. However, an individual hired with a start date in January may be reviewed no later than the semester mandated for reappointment in the fall or for tenure and promotion in the spring if that semester is the mandatory final semester for review. All mandatory reviews are scheduled as follows:

- An assistant professor with an initial 4-year contract must be reviewed for reappointment no later than early in the 6th semester of employment.
- An assistant professor with a second 3-year contract must be reviewed for tenure and promotion no later than early in the 3rd semester of that contract (11th semester of employment).
- For an assistant professor who previously held the rank of instructor at UNCW, the mandatory review period is the same as for other assistant professors, except that it is measured from the first semester of employment as instructor.
- An associate professor with an initial 5-year contract must be reviewed for tenure no later than early in the 7th semester of employment.
- Discretionary reviews, whether for tenure (with or without promotion) after the required two-year probationary period but prior to the mandatory time for review or for promotion of a tenured faculty member, may be conducted either fall or spring semester.

Academic Affairs distributes a description of the RTP process and a calendar of the process to all faculty at the beginning of the fall semester. Academic Affairs convenes and charges the Committee on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (CRTP) during the first three weeks of the fall semester.

**Process for faculty RTP applications**

Except in the case of a recommendation for promotion or tenure an RTP application of a department chairperson or of a faculty member of the School of Nursing or of Randall Library, recommendations for promotion or tenure, reappointment, tenure, or promotion are initiated by the department chairperson after consultation with the assembled senior faculty of the department involved. Procedures vary across departments and schools, but in each case, there must be some assembly of and consultation with senior faculty the chairperson, prior to writing an evaluation, must assemble, consult with, and take an advisory vote of the senior faculty. Along with writing a detailed evaluation of the candidate, the chairperson must report the numerical results of the vote and state the chairperson's recommendation for or against the RTP action. At least five business days prior to forwarding the candidate's dossier to the dean, the chairperson must notify the senior faculty, by either written or electronic means, whether the recommendation is for or against the action. If a majority of the department's senior faculty disagree with the recommendation of the chairperson, they have the option to submit a separate elaborated recommendation. Only one such recommendation from senior faculty may be submitted, and it must be signed by a majority of the department's senior faculty. The chairperson's recommendation and a separate senior-faculty recommendation, if any, are forwarded as part of the faculty member's RTP dossier.

Neither the faculty member nor any person related to or having a romantic relationship with the faculty member may deliberate or recommend on an RTP action. Other persons may also recuse themselves if they believe their relationship with the faculty member prevents them from fair and objective consideration of the application.

Positive recommendations are transmitted by the chairperson to the appropriate dean, by the deans to
the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and by the Provost to the university-wide faculty Committee on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (CRTP). The CRTP forwards its unelaborated recommendations (without supporting documentation) to deans (with a copy to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs); deans forward their recommendations, reasons for the recommendations, and supporting documentation to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The faculty member's RTP dossier consists of the application, supporting documentation, and the recommendations of the deliberative entities. Dossiers are evaluated and recommendations made in the following sequence: the faculty member's chairperson; [for the Cameron School of Business only: a school RTP committee]; the appropriate dean; the university-wide faculty Committee on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (CRTP); the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; the Chancellor; and the Board of Trustees. Prior to evaluation by the CRTP, the dean transmits all materials to Academic Affairs, which is responsible for ascertaining that the applications are complete, that the required format has been used, and that dossiers are present for all faculty mandated for review. Academic Affairs then transmits copies of the dossiers to the CRTP.

All recommendations, whether positive or negative, are forwarded to the next deliberative entity. However, if the majority vote of the senior faculty and the recommendations of both the chairperson and the dean are all negative, the process stops and the faculty member's RTP application is denied. The faculty member may withdraw the application at any stage of the process. The chairperson and dean must elaborate the reasons for their recommendations, but subsequent deliberative entities may forward their recommendations with or without elaboration, except that any negative recommendation that follows a positive recommendation at the previous level must be elaborated. The chairperson, dean, and Provost must each transmit written notification of their recommendations to the faculty member within ten business days of the recommendation. All such communications become part of the candidate's RTP dossier and are available to subsequent deliberative entities in the process.

**Process for Nursing faculty RTP applications**

Recommendations for promotion or tenure Applications for reappointment, tenure, or promotion of a faculty member of the School of Nursing follow the same process as for other faculty except that recommendations are initiated by a School of Nursing RTP committee appointed by the Dean of the School of Nursing, which shall consist of the senior faculty of the School of Nursing and such other faculty as the Dean of the School of Nursing shall appoint. The numerical results of a vote of the Nursing RTP committee must be reported along with its recommendation. Positive recommendations, whether positive or negative, follow the same route, described in the preceding paragraph, as those forwarded by a department chairperson. However, if the majority vote of the Nursing RTP committee and the recommendation of the dean are both negative, the process stops and the faculty member's RTP application is denied.

**Process for Randall Library faculty promotion applications**

Applications for promotion of a tenured faculty member of Randall Library follow the same process as for other faculty except that recommendations are initiated by a Randall Library promotion committee, which shall consist of the tenured faculty of Randall Library and such other senior assistant librarians and associate librarians as the University Librarian shall appoint. The numerical results of a vote of the Randall Library promotion committee must be reported along with its recommendation, whether positive or negative, to the University Librarian. If a majority of the Randall Library promotion committee disagrees with the recommendation of the University Librarian, they have the option to submit a separate elaborated recommendation to the university-wide faculty committee on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (CRTP). However, if the majority vote of the Randall Library promotion committee and the recommendation of the University Librarian are both negative, the process stops and the faculty member's promotion application is denied.
**Process for Cameron School of Business faculty RTP applications**

Applications for reappointment, tenure, or promotion of a faculty member of the Cameron School of Business follow the same process as for other faculty except that at the school level the dean, prior to writing an evaluation, must assemble, consult with, and take an advisory vote of the committee of senior Cameron faculty elected by tenured Cameron faculty. The dean shall report the numerical results of any vote. If a majority of the school’s committee disagrees with the recommendation of the dean, they have the option to submit a separate elaborated recommendation to the university-wide faculty committee on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (CRTP). The school will establish and publish a process to assure completion of this additional step within the time frame set for submission to the CRTP.

**Process for department chairperson RTP applications**

Recommendations for promotion or tenure Applications for tenure or promotion of a department chairperson follow the same process as for other faculty except that recommendations are initiated by the chairperson's dean after consultation with the assembled senior faculty of the department involved. The dean must report the numerical results of the senior-faculty vote along with the dean's recommendation. A majority of the department's senior faculty may, at their option, submit a separate elaborated recommendation, according to the procedure stated above. Positive recommendations are transmitted by the dean to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and by the Provost to the CRTP. The CRTP forwards its unelaborated recommendation to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Recommendations, whether positive or negative, then follow the same route route as for other faculty. However, if the majority vote of the senior faculty and the recommendation of the dean are both negative, the process stops and the chairperson's RTP application is denied.

**Final action**

The Provost forwards recommendations to the Chancellor. Following this, recommendations for reappointment, tenure, or promotion are forwarded to the Board of Trustees and then to the Office of the President for final action; recommendations for reappointment are forwarded to the Board of Trustees for final action. The Chancellor transmits written notification of his or her recommendation to the faculty member within ten business days. The Provost provides the faculty member with timely written notification of the final action.

A description of this process and a calendar of the process are distributed to all faculty at the beginning of the fall semester.

---

b. [Motion 04-06-18; revise Policies of Academic Freedom and Tenure; carried] That Section IV of the Policies of Academic Freedom and Tenure be revised as marked below [additions, deletions] so as to accord with changes in motion 04-06-17 (above):

**Policies of Academic Freedom and Tenure**

Section IV. Policies on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

B. Probationary Service

2. Length and Number of Appointments in the Probationary Period

   g. If the department chairperson is being considered for promotion and/or permanent
tenure, the appropriate dean shall evaluate his/her performance after consulting with and taking an advisory vote of the assembled senior members of the department. A positive recommendation, with written justification, is transmitted by the dean to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and by the Provost Academic Affairs to the university-wide faculty Committee on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (CRTP). The CRTP forwards its unelaborated recommendation directly to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

4. Notice of Nonreappointment

a. The decision not to reappoint a faculty member when a probationary term expires shall be made by the appropriate dean after receiving the recommendations provided above and in Section IV.C. The dean's decision not to reappoint, if it accords with negative recommendations by both the department's chairperson and the majority vote of the department's senior faculty, is final except as it may be later reviewed in accordance with the provisions of Section V. The dean shall notify the faculty member of the decision by a simple, unelaborated written statement that the faculty member will not be reappointed. Each decision not to reappoint shall be communicated for information through the administrative channels prescribed for review had the decision been to reappoint.

C. Procedures for Evaluation and Documentation

1. The gathering of information for an evaluation for reappointment, promotion, or tenure shall be the responsibility of the department chairperson or appropriate dean. If the department chairperson is being considered for promotion, the appropriate dean shall be responsible for evaluating his/her performance after consulting with and taking an advisory vote of the assembled senior members of the department.

2. A Faculty Committee on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion to be composed of eight permanently tenured faculty members shall be elected by the faculty to review requests for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The committee members shall be elected for three-year terms, which terms shall be staggered. The committee shall be composed of two members from each of the four divisions designated in the "Official Senate Election Procedures for Autonomous Faculty Committees." The committee will elect its own chairperson. A quorum is a simple majority of the total committee membership. If a member of the RTP Committee is a candidate for review by that committee or has a spouse who is under review by that committee, he or she shall be replaced on the committee by a substitute during that semester. The Senate Steering Committee shall name a substitute.

3. It shall be the responsibility of the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and the deans of the professional schools to forward to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs review the departmental recommendations for reappointment, promotion, and tenure following the evaluation process as required by Section IV.B.2. The deans forward their recommendations to Academic Affairs.

4. The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall convene the Faculty Committee on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion for the purpose of organization and shall present the submitted recommendations for reappointment, promotion, and tenure.

5. Except in the case of promotion or tenure of a department chairperson, the chairperson of the Faculty Committee on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion shall submit the committee's recommendations to each appropriate dean and shall at the same time forward a copy of the committee's recommendations to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. In the case of promotion or tenure of a department chairperson, the committee's recommendations are submitted directly to the Provost and
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

6. Unless the appropriate dean decides a reappointment shall not be made in accordance with Section IV.B.4, he/she shall forward the recommendation to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. An information copy shall be sent to the Chancellor and to the chairperson of the Faculty Committee on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion. The chairperson, the dean, and the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall each transmit written notification of their recommendations to the faculty member within ten business days of the recommendation.

7. Any faculty member having suffered an adverse recommendation shall receive a written unelaborated notice of that fact from the appropriate dean indicating the origin of the decision. An information copy shall be sent to the Chancellor and to the chairperson of the Faculty Committee on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion.

8. If the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs recommends reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion of a faculty member or if, in a personnel action not involving reappointment, he/she recommends that promotion or tenure not be given, he/she shall forward the recommendation to the Chancellor. If he/she decides that the faculty member should not be reappointed when a probationary term expires, that decision is final except as it later may be reviewed in accordance with the provisions of Section V.

9. If the Chancellor decides not to recommend reappointment, promotion, or permanent tenure, he/she shall give the faculty member being considered a simple, unelaborated, written statement of the decision. The decision not to reappoint is final except as it may later be reviewed in accordance with Section 501C(4) 604D of the Code. If the Chancellor concurs in a recommendation that will confer permanent tenure, he/she shall consult with the Board of Trustees and, unless dissuaded, forward the recommendation to the President and Board of Governors for final approval. All other favorable recommendations by the Chancellor in regard to appointments, reappointments, and promotions shall be forwarded by him/her to the Board of Trustees for final approval unless that board delegates the authority to give final approval.

10. Appropriate individuals involved in the recommending process and the Faculty Committee on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion may exchange information for the purpose of resolving differences.

c. [Motion 04-06-19; adjust length-of-service requirements for RTP; carried] That the Criteria for Reappointment, Promotion, and Award of Tenure be revised as marked below [additions, deletions] to effect the following:

- provide a consistent policy about minimum length of service before a faculty member can apply for an RTP action. Currently three university documents (Policies of Academic Freedom and Tenure; Criteria for Reappointment, Promotion, and Award of Tenure; and Recommendations for RTP: Instructions) make contradictory statements about length of service before a promotion or tenure decision can be made.
- recognize that statements in the Policies of Academic Freedom and Tenure, approved by the Board of Governors, must take precedence over the other two documents. The Policies of Academic Freedom and Tenure states that “Except for full professors . . . , no one may be granted permanent tenure who has not completed at least two (2) years of probationary service” but otherwise states no minimum time in rank (e.g., “Before the end of the second year of the second three-year appointment, the department chairperson or school dean shall, in the same manner, recommend that the assistant professor be either reappointed with permanent tenure, at the same or higher rank, or not reappointed”).
- revise the Criteria document accordingly. That document currently states that "no definite time for serve at any level has been established." The Recommendations document (to be revised in motion 04-06-20 below) currently states that candidates applying before the maximum length of service are applying "early."
[Proposed revision to the Criteria for Reappointment, Promotion, and Award of Tenure document]:

A. Length of service

A faculty member hired as an assistant or associate professor must complete at least two years of probationary service before being considered for tenure. No definite other minimum time requirement for service at any given level has been established. The decision shall be based entirely on the cumulative achievement of the individual concerned faculty member.

d. [Motion 04-06-20; revise the RTP Instructions document; returned to committee] That the Recommendations for RTP: Instructions document in the Faculty Handbook be revised as marked below [additions, deletions] so as to accord with motions 04-06-17 and 04-06-19 (above):

Recommendations Applications for RTP: Instructions

[Approved by the Faculty Senate April 1998; revised February 2004]

I. Timing

A. Recommendations Applications for reappointment should be submitted one and one-half years before the end of the first contract.

B. Recommendations Applications for promotion and/or tenure should be submitted no later than two years before the end of the second contract period.

C. Recommendations Applications for tenure at the assistant professor rank should state the extraordinary circumstances that justify that action.

D. Candidates for an early promotion/tenure decision (i.e., before a decision is mandatory) must state the extraordinary circumstances or the exceptional quality of the submission by showing that they not only meet but substantially exceed the established criteria. A faculty member hired as an assistant or associate professor must complete at least two years of probationary service before being considered for tenure. No other minimum time requirement for service at any level has been established. Applications for tenure before a decision is mandatory must demonstrate that special circumstances or exceptional productivity have provided sufficient evidence that the faculty member has met the qualifications for that action.

1. For faculty (assistant professors with an initial three-year contract) hired prior to 1995 who have not had previous tenure-track appointments on other campuses or comparable experience in research, teaching, or professional settings: "Early" means coming forward prior to the fifth year of appointment. Recommendations should be based solely on exceptional faculty performance.

2. For faculty hired since 1995 who have not had previous tenure-track appointments on other campuses or comparable experience in research, teaching, or professional settings, and who had completed all requirements and been awarded the terminal degree before beginning service at UNCW: "Early" means coming forward prior to the sixth year of appointment. Recommendations for promotion/tenure should be based solely on exceptional faculty performance.

3. For faculty hired since 1995 who had not completed all degree requirements upon beginning service at UNCW and whose initial service was at the rank of instructor: "Early" means coming forward prior to the mandatory time for review, with the instructor period counting as probationary service. Recommendations for promotion/tenure should be based solely on exceptional faculty performance.

4. For assistant or associate professors who have had previous tenure-track appointments on other campuses or comparable experience in research, teaching, or professional settings:
"Early" means coming forward after the required two-year probationary period but prior to the mandatory time for review—i.e., before the sixth year for an assistant professor or the fourth year for an associate professor. In considering an early review, faculty, departments, and deans should not assume an automatic addition of years for previous service elsewhere to the years of experience at UNCW, and any candidate forwarded for such a review should be demonstrably exceptional.

II. Content

B. A. Instructions to the RTP candidate.

1. Compose the application to include the first six Roman-numbered sections specified in the prescribed format. Beginning with section IV, all required subcategories must be included as numbered.
2. Whenever it is appropriate to list items by date, use reverse chronological order (most recent first).
3. There are typically two parts to an RTP candidate's dossier: the recommendation application (to which is appended the chairperson's recommendation) and the supporting documentation.
   a. The recommendation application format should consist of (1) a narrative specifically prepared for the personnel action being recommended and (2) lists of accomplishments. The recommendation application should be self-contained, since it is typically read in its entirety by RTP Committee members before supporting documentation is consulted. The recommendation application must be prepared in the prescribed format.
   b. Supporting documentation
      i. Supporting documentation must include:
         1. all of the candidate's SPOT summaries—the printouts summarizing results of all 16 evaluation questions—over at least the most recent two-and-one-half years, as well as copies of the Question 16 Section Summaries and frequency graphs over the same period. All SPOT results should be organized in reverse chronological order. (See Guidelines for the Administration, Use, and Interpretation of the "Student Perception of Teaching" (SPOT) Evaluation, especially Section B4.)
      2. all refereed publications published since the candidate was appointed at the present rank. A "selected" sub-collection of those publications is not sufficient, nor is a collection of photocopies of titles pages or tables of contents. Copies of publications will be returned to the candidate when the review process is completed.
      ii. A table of contents or explanation of the organization of the supplementary documentation is helpful.
      iii. The supporting documentation normally can be presented in one, or perhaps two, three-ring binders. It is not necessary or desirable to submit boxes of voluminous files.

A. B. Instructions to the administrator responsible for initiating the making the initial recommendation.

1. No later than four weeks prior to submission of a recommendation forwarding an application, request from the Office of Institutional Research a "Report of SPOT Question 16 by semester" for each RTP candidate in time to include that report with the recommendation Section IV of the application.
2. Assemble, and consult, and take an advisory vote of the senior faculty of the school or
3. Prepare, sign and date the Chair's Evaluation (Section VII of the recommendation application).

4. Complete the Certification section (Section VIII of the recommendation application).

5. Compose the recommendation to include Verify that the application includes the eight Roman-numbered sections specified in the prescribed format. Beginning with section IV, all required subcategories must be included as numbered. Any optional subcategories may be omitted, but those included should be numbered sequentially.

6. Verify that all courses taught by the RTP candidate during the preceding two and one-half years are listed on that report, and sign the report to that effect.

7. Notify the senior faculty of how the chair is recommending and append a separate senior-faculty recommendation, if any [see the process for such recommendations in the RTP Process document].

8. Number the pages of the recommendation application.

9. Submit 10 copies, each stapled or bound in some manner.

Footnote
[1] Normally, this is the department chairperson.

- In the case of the School of Nursing, it is the chair of the School of Nursing Committee on RTP.
- In cases where the department chair is being recommended, the administrator responsible for initiating the making the initial recommendation is the college or school dean.

[The motion was returned to the Steering Committee for revision and resubmission in April. Senators wanted the Timing section to specify the deadline by which an untenured associate professor must apply for tenure and to state that an untenured assistant or associate professor may not apply for promotion without also applying for tenure.]

e. [Motion 04-06-21; revise the RTP Format document; carried] That the Recommendation for RTP: Format document in the Faculty Handbook be revised as marked below [additions, deletions] so as to accord with motions 04-06-17 and 04-06-19 (above):

**FORMAT**

Recommendation for Reappointment, Promotion, and/or Tenure
Application for Reappointment, Tenure, and/or Promotion

[Approved by the Faculty Senate 4/98; revised 3/04]

See Instructions for RTP Recommendations Applications

Name of RTP candidate: __________________________________________

Department: ____________________________________________________

Type of recommendation Personnel action applied for: __________________

For example, Promotion to Professor, or Promotion to Associate Professor and award of tenure, or Reappointment at the rank of assistant professor, etc.

Effective date: _____ End of current contract period
End of current academic year

VII. Chair's Evaluation

A. Required subcategories:
   1. Summary and evaluation of teaching that includes both student and peer evaluation of teaching as well as all other aspects of evaluation so that no single component of teaching evaluation is overweighted
   2. Summary and evaluation of research, scholarship, and artistic achievement that includes a critical assessment of the value to the discipline of the applicant's contributions
   3. Summary and evaluation of service

B. Optional subcategories:
   1. An explanation of any special circumstances that, in the chair's opinion, justify variation from the standards for promotion and/or tenure stated in the Faculty Handbook
   2. A statement describing the level of support within the senior faculty
   3. Comments submitted by senior faculty (Paraphrased comments may be used at the discretion of the chair. Neither quoted comments nor the identity of the source may be included without the permission of the senior faculty member being quoted.)

VIII. Certification

The evaluating officer shall:

1. Certify the names of senior faculty who were assembled and consulted for this recommendation.
2. State the department's current definition of "senior faculty" as determined by the chair and members of the department in consultation with the dean (a copy of which must be on file in the dean's office).
3. Indicate whether the department's policy is to have the senior members vote on personnel recommendations, and if so, whether it is the policy of the chair to report that vote, and whether it is the policy of the chair to indicate whether the vote is unanimous when that occurs. State the numerical vote of the assembled senior faculty (the number for/against/abstaining; the officer shall not identify how individual faculty cast their votes).

f. [Motion 04-06-22; revise Criteria for RTP document; carried] That the Criteria for Reappointment, Promotion, and Award of Tenure document be revised as marked below [additions, deletions] to effect the following:

- encourage the mentoring of junior faculty
- provide a candid assessment to junior faculty in annual evaluations of their progress toward tenure and promotion
- require the chairperson to provide the department's senior faculty with a summary of the chairperson's assessment of the progress of junior faculty toward tenure and promotion

and that the Evaluation Committee be requested to submit to the Senate revisions to the annual evaluation page in the Faculty Handbook to accord with these changes.

III. Guidelines for mentoring junior faculty
The hiring of each faculty member is an investment in the university's future. The university hires promising faculty in the hope and expectation that they will successfully complete a probationary period, achieve tenure, and provide the university with years of estimable service. Accordingly, it is in the university's interest that each academic department provide continuous mentoring of its untenured assistant professors (junior faculty) from the time of hiring until a tenure decision is made. Departments are encouraged to assign one or more senior faculty mentors to each member of the junior faculty to advise them and guide their professional development in teaching and research.

The outcome of a reappointment or tenure decision should not be a surprise to either the department or the candidate. Department chairpersons are obligated to provide junior faculty, at the time of hiring, with clear indications of the criteria necessary for achieving tenure and promotion. As part of the annual evaluation process, the chairperson or other immediate supervisor must give each junior faculty member a candid written assessment of that person's progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure and promotion, as well as practical guidelines for meeting those requirements. The department's senior faculty play a central role in the mentoring of junior faculty, and the chairperson is required annually to provide the senior faculty with a summary of the assessments that the chairperson has given to junior faculty of their progress toward tenure and promotion. When the faculty member is subsequently considered for tenure and promotion, the chairperson's recommendation should normally be consistent with the assessments the faculty member has received in annual evaluations. When the chairperson's recommendation differs from those prior assessments, the chairperson should explain what circumstances have arisen to cause the discrepancy.

IV. Guidelines regarding length of service and maintenance of full records ...

IV. Guidelines for tenure and academic rank ...

V. Guidelines for educational accomplishment and academic rank ...

Committee reports

1. [Motion 04-07-24; approve new minors; carried] The Senate adopted the motion by the University Curriculum Committee to approve the following programs:

a. An Asian Studies Minor, proposed by the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures:

Requirements for a Minor in Asian Studies: A minor in Asian Studies requires a total of 21 credit hours, distributed as 12 hours of core courses and 9 hours of designated electives. The core consists of the following courses: HST 103, PAR 232, PLS 339, and 3 hours of a foreign language (either JPN 101 or transfer credit of study of another Asian language). The remaining 9 hours may be chosen from GGY 181, GGY 388, HST 360, HST 361, HST 363, HST 365, HST 366, HST 497, JPN 101, JPN 102, JPN 201, JPN 202, JPN 211, PAR 246, PAR 247, PAR 248, PAR 370, and PLS 317. At least six credits of the total 21 must be taken at the 300-level or above.

b. An Oceanography Minor, proposed by the Department of Earth Sciences:

Requirements for a Minor in Oceanography: 21-22 hours. GLY 150, 350, and three courses selected from: BIO 362; CHM 475; GLY 450, and PHY 475; and two courses selected from: BIO 236, GGY 333, GGY 422, GLY/PHY 420, GLY 458. Students must have an overall “C” (2.00) average in courses counted toward the minor.
c. **A B.S. in Clinical Research**, proposed by the School of Nursing:

**Description of the Program**: The purpose of this undergraduate program will be to prepare health science professionals to participate in the science and business of developing health care products and protocols, from discovery to market and human utilization. The four year undergraduate program includes a didactic curriculum and a mentored experience or internship in clinical research during the senior year. The Basic Studies, Collaterals, and Electives (64 hours) and Core Curriculum (62 hours) is designed to provide competency in methodologies, including protocol development and regulatory compliance; data collection, analysis and synthesis derived from human oriented research; research ethics; assessment and evaluation of the safety and efficacy of investigational products; application of knowledge and skills to clinical situations; oral and written scientific presentation; and collaborative team membership. Courses will be Web enhanced. The clinical research program will be the only program at UNCW, and within the UNC System, that prepares graduates for careers in health science research.

**Justification of the Program**: The School of Nursing was approached by Pharmaceutical Product Development, Inc (“PPD”) to develop the program. Authorities from the North Carolina Biotechnology Center reports the industry employs about 18,500 residents. The Center provides support for the state’s 150 biotechnology companies, 74 contract research organizations, such as PPD, and numerous other companies providing support services to the industry. Consultants report a need for formalized academic training in the principles of clinical research. Marketing strategies will target high school students, undecided campus majors, pre health career designees, and nurses without a baccalaureate. Entry level employment opportunities will include such roles as project managers, study coordinators, clinical research associates or monitors, data managers, and communication associates.

**Faculty**: The Coordinator of the program has been hired. With program growth over the next four years, there will be a need for a half-time assistant, one additional full time faculty, and two part-time faculty. Industry experts, those with backgrounds in clinical trials and product development, with approved credentials, will be asked to provide clinical seminars. Department Chairs in Biology, Chemistry, and Psychology have been consulted regarding course selections. UNCW Faculty with exemplary scholarship will be utilized; for example, Dr. Dan Baden has agreed to provide students research mentoring experiences with National Institute of Health (NIH) funded faculty. A partnership with New Hanover Regional Medical Center has potential to offer supervised clinical research opportunities in cancer studies. The Bolton Health and Wellness Center, managed by UNCW School of Nursing, under the direction of Dr. Perri Bomar, will be used for designed protocols in a rural African American community.

**Budget**: Sum total of Budget Years 1, 2, and 3 is $419,328.00. The grant award from PPD was $300,000.00. An additional amount of $119,328.00 comes from reallocation of institutional resources and one new allocation based on projected enrollment increase.

2. **[Motion 04-07-25; delete 3-semester retention rule for freshmen; carried]** The Senate approved the motion by the Academic Standards Committee that the following passage from page 73 of the 2003-2004 Undergraduate Catalogue be changed as follows [additions, deletions]:

All freshmen, regardless of the semester enrolled, have three semesters to meet the academic retention standard of the university. However, freshmen whose grades fall below the retention standard at the end of their second semester will be allowed to register for a third semester only with permission of the director of the General College. If such deficiencies are not removed, the student will be suspended from the university for one semester. Suspended students must apply for re-enrollment for fall or spring semesters and may register for classes only with permission of the
director of the General College. Applications for re-enrollment are available in the Admissions Office and should be filed as early as possible to ensure enrollment consideration. Readmission is contingent upon availability of space. Suspended students may re-enroll in any summer session.

Any other student who does not meet the minimum grade point requirement for retention at the conclusion of the spring semester will be declared ineligible.

New business

1. **[Motion 04-07-26; allow ID photo access & e-mail forwarding; carried]** The Senate approved a motion by Roger Lowery, Political Science, that ITSD be requested:

   - to allow faculty to cut and paste student ID photos from the Pipeline class photo rosters (so that faculty can more efficiently create photo-enhanced seating charts); and
   - to allow students to forward their e-mail messages from their UNCW student e-mail accounts on OWA (Outlook Web Access) to their off-campus e-mail accounts (so that faculty-to-student e-mail messages get read by students in a more timely manner).

   [The motion engendered considerable discussion. ITSD said it has blocked copying of student photos pending a ruling on privacy issues. University attorney Eileen Goldgeier stated her opinion that faculty use of student photos for seating charts would be a legitimate educational use of student data and would not violated the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). Regarding mail, ITSD gave a presentation on why it discourages forwarding of student e-mail, although the practice is technically possible. One concern is that communication to students may be lost and students can claim they were not notified. Associate Provost Becky Porterfield stated that the new catalog will contain a notification that the official university communication point with students is their UNCW e-mail account; consequently, students who do not check their e-mail cannot claim lack of notification as an excuse. The motion carried as an advisory to Provost Hosier and Vice-Chancellor Tyndall.]

2. **President Noland** explained that our policies require Senate approval of all changes to majors and minors, upon recommendation from the UCC. However, often such changes are minor (such as changes to course numbers) and should not take up UCC and Senate time. Consequently, the Steering Committee will likely propose a motion next month that in the case of non-substantive changes to a major or minor, the Senate delegates power of approval to the chair of the UCC and the Senate president. In the meantime, Environmental Studies has proposed incidental changes to its major. Since a catalog deadline looms, he asked for unanimous content to approve the changes. No objections were raised, and approval was granted.

Adjournment

Minutes by Richard Veit, Senate Secretary
Roll call

Absent: Adams (Nursing), Cami-Vela (FLL), Clark (Business), Clifford (English), DePaolo (Chancellor), Emslie (Biology; Buildings & Grounds Committee), Ervin (Research Committee), Frankel (Social Work), Perko (HAHS), Rosen (Information Systems; Admissions Committee), Scheuring (Nursing), Walker (Curricular Studies), Webster (Biology), Wilcox (Art & Theater)

Approval of minutes

December minutes were approved.

Special order of the day

Rebecca Lee (Creative Writing) was elected as Vice President for the remainder of the 2003-2004 academic year.

Individual reports

1. Senate President Daniel Noland reported as follows:
   - The Ad Hoc Basic Studies Committee chaired by Tim Ballard has been charged by the Chancellor.
   - A Q&A session for junior faculty on RTP will be held Monday, 26 January, at 4 p.m. in Cameron Auditorium.
   - Motion to revise RTP procedures will be presented to the Senate in February.

2. Faculty Assembly delegate Jimmy Reeves reported on the debate about using campus-based tuition increases for salary increases. This creates a dangerous precedent, with the state shirking its traditional responsibility to support the university and placing that burden on students. Increasingly private funds are being used to support public higher education. Lack of raises and shrinking benefits are causing faculty to leave and hindering recruitment. Provost Hosier stated that his policy is to adjust salaries of highly productive, mobile faculty. The Faculty Assembly is to consider salaries and campus-based tuition on January 23 [see Assembly motions].

Committee reports

1. Pam Seaton of the CAS Dean search committee reported that 99 applications were evaluated, 11 candidates were given telephone interviews, and 5 of 6 candidates have accepted invitations for on-campus interviews. Interview schedules will be announced in Campus Communique.

2. An ad hoc committee to revamp the Campus Communique is considering ways to make campus information more accessible to faculty and staff and to end e-mail notification of events. A trial publication tentatively called @UNCW is undergoing usability testing. Comments can be sent to UNCWrelations@uncw.edu.

3. University General Counsel Eileen Goldgeier reported that the Ad Hoc Intellectual Property Committee has recommended that the Board of Governors policy on patents and copyrights be adopted verbatim as UNCW's policy (see draft policy). The BOG has stipulated that not less than 15% of royalties from inventions shall go to
the inventors. Under UNCW's proposed policy, 40% of royalties will go to inventors, 30% to the inventors' local unit (usually the department), and 30% to a Chancellor's trust fund to support faculty research.

4. The following motions from the Steering Committee were adopted after amendment:

a. [Motion 04-05-14; adopt mediation policy; carried] That the following documents be amended as follows [additions, deletions] to bring UNCW policies into accord with new Board of Governors policies 101.3.1 and 101.3.2:

i. Insert the following as a new section V of Policies of Academic Freedom and Tenure (subject to Board of Governors approval), with current sections V–XI renumbered accordingly:

V. Mediation of Faculty Grievances

The university encourages faculty to resolve grievances in an amicable fashion whenever possible. As a result, the university provides faculty the opportunity to participate in mediation conducted by trained mediators. In order to learn more about the mediation services and to access those services, a faculty member should contact the Provost, the president of the Faculty Senate, the chair of the Faculty Professional Relations Committee, or the chair of the Faculty Hearings Panel for the name of a contact person at the approved mediation company that the university has contracted with to perform such services. Upon the filing of a grievance, the chair of the Faculty Professional Relations Committee, or in the case of a request to review a nonreappointment decision, the chair of the Faculty Hearings Panel shall determine whether the faculty member has considered mediation as an alternative dispute-resolution process and provide information about this process for the faculty member to consider. Entering into mediation will suspend the time limitations for the filing and/or the formal resolution of the grievance or a hearing for the duration of a mediation being conducted.

The university shall pay for the mediation services, without charge to the faculty member, the department, or any individual administrator who is a party to the mediation. Mediation is voluntary, and both parties must agree to participate in order for mediation to proceed. The decision not to participate in mediation by either party will not be held against that party in any way, and no blame will attach to either party if mediation does not produce a settlement. At any time during the process, any party may withdraw and the mediation will end. If at any time during the process it becomes evident to the mediator that the parties cannot reach an agreement, the mediator may discontinue the process.

The mediation is confidential to the extent allowed by law. If both parties agree, the parties may each have an advisor present. If mediation is successful and results in an outcome acceptable to both parties, neither party may pursue a pending grievance or a hearing or at a later date file a grievance or request for a hearing on the matters addressed in the mediation. A successful mediation may result in a written agreement signed by both parties. Any mediation which results in an agreement that obligates the university must be signed by a university official with the authority to bind the university concerning the particular agreement. No record of a failed mediation will be produced by the mediator other than a statement written to either the chair of the Faculty Professional Relations Committee or the chair of the Faculty Hearings Panel, as appropriate, that mediation was attempted but settlement was not reached. Within five days after an unsuccessful mediation, the faculty member has the responsibility to notify the pertinent chair that he or she desires to pursue the grievance. The grievance will then be reviewed by either the Faculty Professional Relations Committee or the
Faculty Hearings Panel as appropriate and in accordance with the relevant policy. The parties must agree that the mediator will not be called as a witness in any subsequent proceeding and that anything done or said by either party during a mediation process may not be used against a party in any subsequent proceeding.

ii. Revise the current section V.D. (to be renumbered as VI.D.) of Policies of Academic Freedom and Tenure (subject to Board of Governors approval) as follows:

**D. Request for Review by Hearing Committee; Scope of Review**
Within five days after the faculty member receives notice of an unfavorable action resulting from the conference with the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, he/she may seek to mediate the matter or request that the Faculty Hearings Panel review the decision.

iii. Revise section V.2.b.i., "Faculty Professional Relations Committee," of the Faculty Senate Bylaws as follows:

i. **Duties.** To fulfill the duties defined in Section 607 of the Code. The Committee shall be authorized to hear, mediate, facilitate mediation, and advise with respect to the adjustment of grievances of members of the faculty.

b. [Motion 04-05-15; specify right to appeal grievance and nonreappointment decisions; carried] That Policies of Academic Freedom and Tenure be amended (subject to Board of Governors approval) as follows [additions, deletions]:

i. Revise part G of section V: Nonreappointment Hearings Procedure (to be renumbered as section VI by the previous motion):

**G. Procedure after Hearing**
If the Hearings Committee determines that the faculty member's contention has not been established, it shall, by a simple unelaborated statement, so notify the faculty member, the appropriate dean, and the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Such a determination confirms the decision not to reappoint. If the Hearings Committee determines that the faculty member's contention has been satisfactorily established, it shall so notify the faculty member, the appropriate dean, and the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs by a written notice that shall also include a recommendation for corrective action by the dean.

Within five days after receiving such a recommendation, the dean shall notify the faculty member, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the chairperson of the Hearings Committee what modification, if any, he/she will make with respect to the original decision not to reappoint.

If the dean fails to make a recommended modification in the original decision, the Hearings Committee shall submit a report to the Chancellor containing the committee's findings and recommendation and what it considers to be appropriate action by the Chancellor to resolve the matter.

The faculty member has the right to appeal the Chancellor's decision not to reappoint in accordance with Board of Governors policy 101.3.1.

ii. Insert the following as a new part E of current section VI: Faculty Committee to Hear Grievances (to be renumbered as section VII by the previous motion):

**E. A faculty member has the right to appeal any grievance decision in accordance with Board of Governors policy 101.3.2.**

**Announcements**
Faculty are requested to announce details of the Undergraduate Research Fellowship Competition in their classes.

Adjournment

Minutes by Richard Veit, Senate Secretary
Roll call

Absent: Chen (History), Collins (Curricular Studies), Dodd (Biology), Emislie (Biology; Buildings & Grounds Committee), Gamble (Earth Sciences), Hurdle (Social Work), Monahan (Film Studies), Seiple (CAS), Simmons (Anthropology), Tan (Political Science), Usilton (History), Walker (Curricular Studies), Webster (Biology)

Approval of minutes

January minutes were approved.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor Rosemary DePaolo reported as follows:
   - Proposed campus-based tuition increases were the main topic at last week's Board of Governors meeting. Students, while opposing the increase, also lament the budget cuts that are affecting their education. She is making the student-published booklet "Personal Stories" available to faculty through Senate President Noland.
   - The Board is very receptive to the need for faculty salary increases. Chair Brad Wilson delivered an address on the need for increases that was "one of the most powerful talks I have ever heard." The Board believes that the state should be supporting us more, but that maintaining quality is paramount. The Board will consider the increases next month.
   - UNCW student government opposes our tuition-increase request. She agrees with their contention that students should have been consulted earlier in the process of deciding on the increase. She is instituting an ongoing tuition committee with significant student representation.
   - The view of many politicians who oppose greater funding for the university is that higher education is a private benefit rather than a public good. This view is mistaken and shortsighted. She agreed with a questioner that the pay increase recently given to most chancellors (not her) did not help the cause.
   - UNCW has lost $17 million in state funding the last few years and may have to revert 2% this year.
   - Repair funds have been held back; we hope $7 million will be released to us for that purpose.
   - She has asked Vice Chancellor for Information Technology Bob Tyndall to analyze Public Service & Extended Education, which seems to be the division with the least coherence. It will undergo major reshaping both to increase UNCW's public-service contribution and to expand extended education. UNCW-TV will also be examined. Once the study is completed, we will hire a new vice chancellor. Advancement is also being asked to plan the restructuring of that division.

Committee reports

1. Director of Budgets Bob Russell gave a presentation for the Budget Committee explaining the budget process. This and other explanations of UNCW's finances are available on the Web.

2. The University Curriculum Committee report resulted in the passing of two motions:
   a. [Motion 04-06-16; approve course for Basic Studies; carried]: That MUS 106 (Exploring Music) be approved for Basic Studies under Fine Arts.
b. **[Motion 04-06-23; refer CHAMPS courses to CAS Curriculum Committee; carried]**: That the three CHAMPS/Life Skills courses proposed by HAHS (HEA 292, 303, 402) be referred to the College of Arts and Sciences Curricular Committee for action.

[In discussion, it was remarked that Athletics proposed these NCAA-mandated courses last year, but the Senate requested a revised proposal with these courses offered by an academic department which would select faculty and ensure academic standards. That having now been done, the CAS curriculum committee is the appropriate body to decide whether to authorize them.]

3. The following motion by the **Steering Committee** was amended by the addition of the section marked in blue below, but final action on the entire motion (and subsequent motions in the agenda) was postponed until the March meeting:

   a. **[Motion 04-06-17; revise the RTP process document; deferred to March]** That the RTP process document in the Faculty Handbook be revised as marked below [additions, deletions] to effect the following:

   - require a vote of senior faculty and require the numerical results to be recorded with the chairperson's recommendation.
   - allow a majority of senior faculty, at their option, to forward a separate recommendation if they disagree with the chairperson's recommendation.
   - provide for the forwarding of negative as well as positive RTP recommendations. Currently a single negative recommendation can stop the process.
   - require timely notification to the faculty member of the recommendation at each level.
   - change the order of recommendations to: chair > dean > CRTP > Provost > Chancellor > BOT. Currently, deans recommend after the CRTP. The change brings consistency by making university-level recommendations subsequent to more local recommendations. Also, the recent granting of "management flexibility" to UNCW means final approval now rests with the Board of Trustees (previously the Board of Governors gave final approval).
   - specify who may not participate in deliberations and recommendations.

---

**RTP process**

**Timetable**

Typically, candidates for tenure and promotion are reviewed in the fall, and candidates for reappointment are reviewed in the spring. However, an individual a faculty member hired with a start date in January must may be reviewed no later than the semester mandated for reappointment in the fall or for tenure and promotion in the spring if that semester is the mandatory final semester for review. All mandatory reviews are scheduled as follows:

- An assistant professor with an initial 4-year contract must be reviewed for reappointment no later than early in the 6th semester of employment.
- An assistant professor with a second 3-year contract must be reviewed for tenure and promotion no later than early in the 3rd semester of that contract (11th semester of employment).
- For an assistant professor who previously held the rank of instructor at UNCW, the mandatory review period is the same as for other assistant professors, except that it is measured from the first semester of employment as instructor.
- An associate professor with an initial 5-year contract must be reviewed for tenure no later than early in the 7th semester of employment.
- Discretionary reviews, whether for tenure (with or without promotion) after the required two-year probationary period but prior to the mandatory time for review or for promotion of a tenured faculty
Academic Affairs distributes a description of the RTP process and a calendar of the process to all faculty at the beginning of the fall semester. Academic Affairs convenes and charges the Committee on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (CRTP) during the first three weeks of the fall semester.

**Process for faculty RTP applications**

Except in the case of a recommendation for promotion or tenure an RTP application of a department chairperson or of a faculty member of the School of Nursing, recommendations for promotion or tenure reappointment, tenure, or promotion are initiated by the department chairperson after consultation with the assembled senior faculty of the department involved. Procedures vary across departments and schools, but in each case, there must be some assembly of and consultation with senior faculty, the chairperson, prior to writing an evaluation, must assemble, consult with, and take an advisory vote of the senior faculty. Along with writing a detailed evaluation of the candidate, the chairperson must report the numerical results of the vote and state the chairperson's recommendation for or against the RTP action. At least five business days prior to forwarding the candidate's dossier to the dean, the chairperson must notify the senior faculty, by either written or electronic means, whether the recommendation is for or against the action. If a majority of the department's senior faculty disagree with the recommendation of the chairperson, they have the option to submit a separate elaborated recommendation. Only one such recommendation from senior faculty may be submitted, and it must be signed by a majority of the department's senior faculty. The chairperson's recommendation and a separate senior-faculty recommendation, if any, are forwarded as part of the faculty member's RTP dossier.

Neither the faculty member nor any person related to or having a romantic relationship with the faculty member may deliberate or recommend on an RTP action. Other persons may also recuse themselves if they believe their relationship with the faculty member prevents them from fair and objective consideration of the application.

Positive recommendations are transmitted by the chairperson to the appropriate dean, by the deans to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and by the Provost to the university-wide faculty Committee on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (CRTP). The CRTP forwards its unelaborated recommendations (without supporting documentation) to deans (with a copy to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs); deans forward their recommendations, reasons for the recommendations, and supporting documentation to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; The faculty member's RTP dossier consists of the application, supporting documentation, and the recommendations of the deliberative entities. Dossiers are evaluated and recommendations made in the following sequence: the faculty member's chairperson; the appropriate dean; the university-wide faculty Committee on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (CRTP); the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; the Chancellor; and the Board of Trustees. Prior to evaluation by the CRTP, the dean transmits all materials to Academic Affairs, which is responsible for ascertaining that the applications are complete, that the required format has been used, and that dossiers are present for all faculty mandated for review. Academic Affairs then transmits copies of the dossiers to the CRTP.

All recommendations, whether positive or negative, are forwarded to the next deliberative entity. However, if the majority vote of the senior faculty and the recommendations of both the chairperson and the dean are all negative, the process stops and the faculty member's RTP application is denied. The faculty member may withdraw the application at any stage of the process. The chairperson and dean must elaborate the reasons for their recommendations, but subsequent deliberative entities may forward their recommendations with or without elaboration. The chairperson, dean, and Provost must each transmit written notification of their recommendations to the faculty member within ten business days of the recommendation. All such communications become part of the candidate's RTP dossier and are available to subsequent deliberative entities in the process.
Process for Nursing faculty RTP applications

Recommendations for promotion or tenure Applications for reappointment, tenure, or promotion of a faculty member of the School of Nursing follow the same process as for other faculty except that recommendations are initiated by a School of Nursing RTP committee appointed by the Dean of the School of Nursing, which shall consist of the senior faculty of the School of Nursing and such other faculty as the Dean of the School of Nursing shall appoint. The numerical results of a vote of the Nursing RTP committee must be reported along with its recommendation. Positive recommendations, whether positive or negative, follow the same route, described in the preceding paragraph, as those forwarded by a department chairperson. However, if the majority vote of the Nursing RTP committee and the recommendation of the dean are both negative, the process stops and the faculty member's RTP application is denied.

Process for Cameron School of Business faculty RTP applications

Applications for reappointment, tenure, or promotion of a faculty member of the Cameron School of Business follow the same process as for other faculty except at the school level the dean, prior to writing an evaluation, must assemble, consult with, and take an advisory vote of the committee of senior Cameron faculty elected by tenured Cameron faculty. The dean shall report the numerical results of any vote. If a majority of the school’s committee disagrees with the recommendation of the dean, they have the option to submit a separate elaborated recommendation to the university-wide faculty committee on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (CRTP). The school will establish and publish a process to assure completion of this additional step within the time frame set for submission to the CRTP.

Process for department chairperson RTP applications

Recommendations for promotion or tenure Applications for tenure or promotion of a department chairperson follow the same process as for other faculty except that recommendations are initiated by the chairperson's dean after consultation with the assembled senior faculty of the department involved. The dean must report the numerical results of the senior-faculty vote along with the dean's recommendation. A majority of the department's senior faculty may, at their option, submit a separate elaborated recommendation, according to the procedure stated above. Positive recommendations are transmitted by the dean to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and by the Provost to the CRTP. The CRTP forwards its unelaborated recommendation to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Recommendations, whether positive or negative, then follow the same route route as for other faculty. However, if the majority vote of the senior faculty and the recommendation of the dean are both negative, the process stops and the chairperson's RTP application is denied.

Final action

The Provost forwards recommendations to the Chancellor. Following this, recommendations for reappointment, tenure, or promotion or tenure are forwarded to the Board of Trustees and, then to the Office of the President for final action; recommendations for reappointment are forwarded to the Board of Trustees for final action. The Chancellor transmits written notification of his or her recommendation to the faculty member within ten business days. The Provost provides the faculty member with timely written notification of the final action.

A description of this process and a calendar of the process are distributed to all faculty at the beginning of the fall semester.

[An amendment to the preceding motion that would require deliberative entities subsequent to the dean to elaborate their recommendations was being considered when time expired and the meeting was adjourned.]
Adjournment

Minutes by Richard Veit, Senate Secretary
Tuesday, 9 December 2003

Roll call

Absent: Adams (Nursing), Bingham (Physics), Clark (Business), Clifford (English), DePaolo (Chancellor), Dipuccio (FLL), Dworkin (Psychology; Bookstore Committee), Elikai (Accounting), Ervin (Research Committee), Graham (Economics & Finance), Hickman (Music), Hosier (Provost), Kyzer (HAHS), Lee (Creative Writing), Miller (Sociology), Monahan (Film Studies), Olsen (Communication Studies), Roer (Graduate School), Roscher (Accounting), Rosen (Information Systems; Admissions Committee), Scheuring (Nursing), Snowden (Budget Committee), Weber (Communication Studies; PSEE Committee), Wilson (P&R)

Approval of minutes

November minutes were corrected and approved.

Special order of the day

Senate President Daniel Noland was reelected for the 2004-2005 academic year.

Individual reports

1. Senate President Daniel Noland reported as follows:
   - He commended Professor Carl Lundeen of Biology upon his upcoming retirement. Lundeen has been on the faculty since 1972 and was the first president of the Faculty Senate.
   - He is gratified that searches for both a new Vice Chancellor of Business Affairs and a new Human Resources Director have involved participation by a wide range of people from the university, including faculty. He commends President DePaolo for her furthering of "transparency" even at the highest levels of administration.
   - He has asked Tim Ballard of Biology to chair the ad hoc Basic Studies review committee, and he has asked Gur Adhar to serve on the committee. As a member of the University Curricular Committee, Adhar will enable communication between those closely related committees.
   - UNCW will need to revise its grievance policies to align with changes enacted by the Board of Governors. See OP flowcharts showing the new paths of RTP appeals and other work-related grievances. Faculty should also review and comment on the draft of a new policy on mediation, prior to its being voted on by the Senate.
   - The Steering Committee will bring forth proposals to revise RTP policies. Three such proposals are currently available in draft form (RTP proposals); all faculty are asked to review them and offer comments.

Committee reports

1. The following motions from the University Curriculum Committee were approved:
   a. [Motion 04-04-12; make various curricular changes; carried]: That the following curricular changes be approved:
A. Basic Studies/Competency issues:
   1. Drop the asterisk from GLY 120 (cross-listed as EVS 120). GLY 120 is a three-hour course that does not include a laboratory.
   2. Add GLYL 120 (cross-listed as EVSL 120) to catalogue with asterisk. GLYL 120 is a stand alone, one-hour laboratory course that, in combination with GLY 120, fulfills the Basic Studies laboratory requirement.
   3. Course number changes:
      - BIO 110 to BIO 204
      - BIO 234 to BIO 150
      - BIO 235 to BIO 160
      - BIO 236 to BIO 170
      - BIO 237 to BIO 180
      - BIO 238 to BIO 190
   4. That SED 411 satisfy the oral competency requirement for the Special Education program (to separate the Special Education internship from EDN 411, an existing oral competency course for Education majors).
   5. That ART 260 and ART 360 satisfy the computer competency requirement for the B.A. in Art.

B. Prefix Changes:
   1. REC 368 to RTH 368
   2. REC 369 to RTH 369
   3. REC 370 to RTH 370
   4. REC 480 to RTH 480

b. [Motion 04-04-13; change hours for various majors; carried] That the following changes to major requirements be approved:

A. Biological Sciences
   1. Requirements for a Major in Biology for the B.S. degree: Increase required hours from 63-65 to 70
   2. Requirements for a Major in Marine Biology for the B.S. degree: Increase required hours from 68-70 to 74-75

B. Computer Science
   1. Requirements for Major in Computer Science for the B.S. degree:
      i. Option 1: Increase required hours from 65 to 68
      ii. Option 2: Increase required hours from 67 to 70

C. Health and Applied Human Sciences
   1. Requirements for the B.A. Degree in Athletic Training: Increase required hours from 73 to 74
   2. Requirements for a Major in Parks and Recreation Management for the B.A. degree: Increase required hours from 63 to 66
   3. Requirements for a Major in Therapeutic Recreation for the B.A. degree: Increase required hours from 62 to 70

Motion b. provoked much discussion about the trend of major requirements to grow and whether that trend was compromising the goal of the university to provide undergraduates with a broad liberal education. Others pointed out that all the proposals were under the maximums allowed by university policy. A motion to postpone action on motion 04-04-13 failed, and the motion carried.

Adjournment

Minutes by Richard Veit, Senate Secretary
Roll call

Absent: Adams (Nursing), Cami-Vela (FLL), Chen (History), Clark (Business), Clements (Psychology), Collins (Curricular Studies), Conner (Art & Theater), DePaolo (Chancellor), Dworkin (Psychology; Bookstore Committee), Hosier (Provost), Hurdle (Social Work), Kubasko (Specialty Studies), Maume (Sociology & Criminal Justice), McGiboney (FLL), Olsen (Communication Studies), Rishel (Information Systems), Roer (Graduate School), Seaton (Chemistry), Seiple (CAS), Simmons (Anthropology), Usilton (History), Walker (Curricular Studies), White (Creative Writing), Whitehead (Economics & Finance), Wilson (Philosophy & Religion)

Approval of minutes

April 20 minutes were approved.

Old Business

In this special session, the Senate considered and passed one motion (04-08-29, below) revising the current SPOT instrument and procedures. The Senate first acted on the following amendments to the motion:

I. Amendments [insertions, deletions]

1. [Amendment carried:] Change the final question (Q16) as follows: "Rate your instructor’s overall teaching effectiveness in making this course a valuable learning experience for you."
2. [Amendment failed:] Delete the final question (Q16).
3. [Amendment failed:] Change the final question (Q16) from a 7-point to a 5-point scale.
4. [Amendment carried:] Invert response scales for all 16 questions so that the positive responses, such as "strongly agree" and "highly effective," will appear on the right, rather than the left, of the instrument.
5. [Amendment carried:] Revise Q10 as follows: "The instructor made appropriate use of educational resources (for example, field experiences, library, technology) to promote learning."
6. [Amendment failed:] Delete hyphens in "well-organized" (Q2) and "well-explained" (Q3).
7. [Amendment carried:] Revise Q14 as follows: "Grading policies were clearly explained and uniformly applied."
8. [Amendment failed:] Add new question: "I was fairly graded."
9. [Amendment carried:] Add new question, numbered as Q15: "Course policies were uniformly applied."
10. [Amendment failed:] Remove the Q number from the final question (Q16) so that it appears as an unnumbered question.
11. [Amendment failed:] Add new question: "The instructor was knowledgeable about the subject matter of the course."
12. [Amendment failed:] Require that full implementation of the revised SPOT survey be delayed until the survey instrument’s validity and reliability have been assessed, and that the required use of the SPOT for the full faculty only follow an analysis of the results from the pre-tests.

II. The main motion, as revised above, then carried without a dissenting vote:

[Motion 04-08-29; revise SPOTs; carried] That the following changes in the SPOT instrument and guidelines be adopted for implementation in the Fall Semester 2004:
I. Changes to the SPOT instrument

Replace the current instructions and Questions 1-16 by the following:

To the student: Please respond honestly and fairly. Your responses to these questions will be combined with perceptions of other students to identify your instructor’s teaching strengths, to suggest ways your instructor might improve his or her teaching, and to provide information that is used to evaluate faculty teaching performance.

Special instructions: To ensure anonymity, please do not identify yourself by name or number on any part of this questionnaire. This form is already precoded with your course and section numbers and with your instructor’s name. Your instructor will not receive results of this evaluation until after final grades are turned in, and will not be present when you complete this survey.

Think about each of the instructor’s practices as it contributed to your learning in this course.

Organization and Clarity

1. The instructor gave clear explanations.
   
   Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree    Strongly agree    Not applicable

2. The course was well-organized.
   
   Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree    Strongly agree    Not applicable

3. The objectives of the course were well-explained.
   
   Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree    Strongly agree    Not applicable

4. The instructor’s teaching methods were effective.
   
   Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree    Strongly agree    Not applicable

Interest in the Subject

5. The instructor helped to make the subject matter interesting.
   
   Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree    Strongly agree    Not applicable

6. The instructor showed enthusiasm when teaching.
   
   Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree    Strongly agree    Not applicable

Learning

7. The instructor motivated me to learn in this course.
   
   Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree    Strongly agree    Not applicable

8. The course materials helped me understand the course concepts.
   
   Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree    Strongly agree    Not applicable

9. The instructor provided sufficient feedback in this course.
   
   Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neither agree nor disagree    Agree    Strongly agree    Not applicable
10. The instructor used appropriate educational resources to promote learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Instructor Interaction with Students**

11. The instructor was concerned with whether or not the students were learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. Questions were answered satisfactorily by the instructor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. Assistance from the instructor outside of class was readily available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. Grading policies were clear.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. Course policies were uniformly applied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Overall Evaluation**

16. Rate your instructor’s overall teaching effectiveness in this course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very ineffective</td>
<td>Very effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background Information**

Delete these questions and renumber the remaining questions as necessary:

- Q 22. What percentage of class meetings did you attend?
- Q 23. How many hours per week did you devote to this course outside of class?

**Comments:** The comments section is unaltered.

**II. Changes in the Faculty Handbook** [insertions, deletions]:

**Guidelines for the administration, use, and interpretation of the "Student Perception of Teaching" (SPOT) evaluation**

Revised by the Faculty Senate spring 2000 and spring 2004

The reliability of data gathered by way of student evaluation instruments depends, in part, on the establishment of a set of common practices for administration and use. The following statements constitute a set of guidelines for the administration and use of SPOT.

**A. Administration**
1. Administration of the instrument shall ordinarily be conducted during the last ten class days of the semester (last five class days in a summer session) at a time convenient to the instructor. Administration at other times will be determined by agreement of the dean, the department chairperson and the faculty member. Days when tests are being given or returned shall be avoided when possible.

2. SPOT shall ordinarily be used by all instructors in all courses every semester including summer sessions. Paper versions of SPOT will be used in traditional classroom settings, and online courses will use an online version of SPOT. Recognizing, however, that some courses rely heavily on specialized, non-classroom learning experiences (e.g., field-based; hospital-based; laboratory-based; performance-based), exceptions may be established at the departmental level by mutual consent of a faculty member and the appropriate chairperson. In such cases, some method of student evaluation shall be implemented by the department chairperson.

3. Should departments wish to use additional evaluation instruments, these departmental instruments shall be administered after the administration of SPOT.

4. Administration of the paper SPOTs shall be delegated to an individual other than the instructor. That individual may be a student or another faculty member.

5. A brief standardized statement of instruction shall be presented to each class prior to the administration of SPOT.

6. During the administration of the paper SPOTs, the instructor shall leave the classroom and its vicinity.

7. Departments shall avoid practices which compromise student anonymity (i.e., student names and/or identification numbers shall not appear on evaluation forms).

8. Following administration of the paper SPOTs, the evaluation forms shall be sealed in an envelope and returned immediately to the departmental office. Department chairpersons will keep these secure and will forward them for processing. **No analysis or interpretation is to be made by anyone prior to processing of the SPOT forms by Computing Services.**

B. Analysis and reporting

1. Academic departments/units shall deliver the administered forms, with blank forms removed, to the Office of Computing and Information Systems (OCIS) Operations, Hoggard Room 206, Computing Services by the last working day of final exams (within one week of final exams for summer sessions) for analysis. The analysis will not be done until after all grades have been submitted to the registrar.

2. Three copies of a course section summary (for each instructor, if team-taught) shall be prepared; one for the instructor, one for the department chairperson, and one for the instructor's dean. This summary shall contain, for each item Q1 through Q16 and for any optional supplemental items the percentage of responses in each response category. For Q16 the summary shall contain the individual's response mean, the individual's response standard deviation, the individual's minimum and maximum responses, the number of students enrolled in the section, the number of students responding, the departmental response mean, and the departmental response standard deviation. In addition, the instructor shall receive one copy of the response frequencies of all SPOT items, including the demographic information.

3. **OCIS Computing Services** shall also provide to each instructor and his or her department chairperson and dean a Question 16 Section Summary for each section evaluated by SPOT. That summary shall contain:
   1. course and section number, instructor's name, and semester (or summer session);
   2. the section mean on Question 16;
   3. quintiles for the distribution of Question 16 section means within the instructor's department or comparable academic unit (provided that section means for at least ten courses and/or course sections are available), within the instructor's college or school, and campus-wide for that semester or summer session (these quintiles should be
4. a verbal characterization of the student responses, that recognized the imprecision of the evaluation instrument and incorporates an objective interpretation of the Question 16 mean and the standard error of student responses;
5. a histogram of the responses to Question 16 by students in this section.

4. Every personnel action recommendation for reappointment, promotion, or tenure or post-tenure review should contain a summary, in a standard format, of the individual's SPOT results for Q16 (at least) over the most recent two-and-one-half years, together with a visual representation of trends and the relevant departmental and university quintiles. (An accumulation of Question 16 Section Summaries over that period would accomplish this.) All RTP recommendations shall include a qualitative interpretation of SPOT results by the department chairperson, and may include—at the individual's discretion—the individual's own qualitative interpretation. All statistical calculations and quantitative analysis processed by anyone other than OCIS Computing Services (which is discouraged) must be clearly identified as such.

C. Guidelines for appropriate use of SPOT results

1. Data from individual faculty gathered through the use of SPOT shall be treated with confidentiality and with recognition of the need for continued study of the meaning and validity of these data. The data shall not be released by anyone other than the faculty member to anyone who is not directly involved with evaluation for the purpose of reappointment, promotion, tenure, post-tenure review, or annual departmental review, or to anyone who is not directly involved with the development of norms, without the written permission of the faculty member. Each department shall use a release form that will enable instructors to designate other individuals or groups who may have access to evaluation information. In addition, quantitative data shall not be released from the department, or comparable administrative unit, without an accompanying written interpretation of the data by the appropriate evaluating officer and, if he/she chooses, by the faculty member. The evaluating officer's interpretation shall explain how an instructor's scores compare with peers in the same department, discipline, or course assignment, as appropriate. Because numerous studies have indicated that both peer and student evaluations are necessary for the equitable evaluation of teaching effectiveness, it is strongly suggested that peer and student evaluations be given similar emphasis in personnel recommendations.

2. The Evaluation Committee of the Faculty Senate is charged with regularly reviewing both student and peer evaluation procedures, and with reporting and making recommendations for improvement to the Senate.

3. Instructors shall be given no access to individual response forms prior to submission of grades and completion of processing by OCIS Computing Services.

4. In the case of a formal appeal of a reappointment, promotion, or tenure, or post-tenure review recommendation, all parties involved directly in the appeal process shall be allowed access to the archived data pertinent to that case.

5. Individual SPOT results, when combined with qualitative interpretation by the department chairperson and with peer evaluations of teaching, can contribute to measuring an individual's teaching effectiveness and to identification of areas of strength and areas where improvement is possible. Under those conditions, SPOT results are appropriately used for annual merit evaluation summaries, consideration for salary raises and, RTP, and post-tenure review decisions.

D. Warnings against inappropriate use of SPOT results

1. Standard deviations that are reported by section (resp., department) for each item measure the...
extent to which student responses are "scattered" within that section (resp., department). They do not measure the manner in which instructor means are distributed, hence should not be used to conjecture what percentile an instructor's mean score represents (or even how good or how bad a mean score is). Quintiles as described in Item 11 Section B are used for that purpose.

2. Means for the sixteen SPOT items must not be "averaged" to produce a "combined SPOT score." (There are lots of reasons for this. Among them are: Question 5 and 6 have a different response scale, campus-wide means are not the same for each item and so they are not weighted properly when averaged, etc.)

3. Mean scores for two or more courses must not be averaged to obtain a "semester SPOT score" for an individual. (Again, there are many reasons. Responses in different courses measure different things, it ignores class size, and it can be used to obscure instances of particularly good or poor performance.)

4. Averaging SPOT scores from several different courses across several semesters to obtain an "overall individual SPOT score" is improper.

5. Direct comparisons of ratings from the version of SPOT used from fall 1992 through summer 2004 to ratings from the revised version implemented in fall 2004 are not appropriate.

E. Guidelines for interpretation of SPOT results

Guidelines for SPOT ratings collected 1992-2004:

1. There is strong evidence that the SPOT questions as a whole give a valid measure of characteristics of effective teaching, and that the results are reliable. Moreover, there are ample reasons to support the use of the Question 16 section mean as the best single measure of student perception of teaching.

2. SPOT scores should, whenever possible, be viewed in the context of the immediately preceding five semesters. Comparisons should be general and should not ascribe meaning to the precision with which means are reported. (For example, a mean of 4.22 on Question 16 for a certain course might properly be described as lying in the second highest quintile of UNCW Question 16 scores, but should not be viewed as different from a score of, say, 4.18.)

3. The receipt of a Q16 section mean in the lowest quintile is not necessarily an indication of poor teaching. Only 2.6% of student responses campus-wide to Question 16 are "poor", and if every student were to answer "average" to Question 16, the mean (3.00) would lie in the lowest quintile. However, receipt of Question 16 means in the lowest quintile over a period of several semesters may indicate an opportunity for improvement. Examination of results of other SPOT items, consultation with the department chairperson, and peer evaluations may reveal ways to improve student perception of an individual's teaching.

Guidelines for SPOT ratings collected from the revised version implemented in fall 2004:

Revised SPOT questions have been selected from reliability-tested instruments at UNCW and other institutions, and have been edited by the best judgment and experience of UNCW faculty. Revisions to the 1992-2004 SPOT instrument have been made in every case to improve the philosophy of the survey as a whole, the survey questions themselves, and the quality of the information collected.

III. Review of SPOT revisions

The Faculty Senate Evaluation Committee is charged to perform statistical reliability and validity tests on SPOT data collected for the 2004-2005 academic year (using the newly revised version of SPOT) and report their findings to the Faculty Senate in spring 2006. At that time, the Evaluation Committee shall also recommend to the Senate guidelines for interpretation of SPOT to be posted in the Faculty
Handbook, and to be applied in all uses of SPOT for faculty evaluation. The Evaluation Committee is further charged with making recommendations not later than spring 2006 for specific ways to balance student evaluation of teaching with peer evaluation of teaching in the evaluation of faculty.

Adjournment

Minutes by Richard Veit, Senate Secretary
Roll call

Absent: Clark (Business), Collins (Curricular Studies), Dodd (Biology), Dworkin (Psychology; Bookstore Committee), Hickman (Music), Kyzér (HAHS), Perko (HAHS), Roer (Graduate School), Scheuring (Nursing), Simmons (Anthropology), Usilton (History), Webster (Biology), Whitehead (Economics & Finance), Wilcox (Art & Theater)

Approval of minutes

March minutes were approved.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor Rosemary DePaolo reported on her first year in office:
   - In a busy first year, she initiated a series of task forces and a process of benchmarking, the results of which have now come together in this university's first strategic plan. It is a long-term plan and for its completion will require detailed strategies and the alignment of the budget with the plan. She does not see the plan as overly ambitious but as the natural extension of what we are already doing.
   - Two task forces were concerned with the community:
     - The "Paint the Town Teal" Committee has been much fun, and its members, including many alumni in the community, have shown great enthusiasm for developing plans to have Wilmington show its support for UNCW. Students in the fall will be greeted with visible expressions of community support.
     - The Community Relations Task Force aims to improve relations with the city and our close neighbors, and the latter have been grateful for the chance to be heard on their concerns. This will be an ongoing committee.
   - Internally, the Diversity Task Force has reported in impressive detail, and the International Task Force has also reported specific, doable recommendations. The First-Year-Experience Committee and the Basic Studies Task Force have been active but are not yet ready to report.
   - We have hired a firm to take us through the master planning process. They want to start now, but she wants much input and has asked them to do preliminary data gathering this summer and do the real work in the fall when faculty return.
   - Many construction projects are in various stages. The new education building will be one of only two in the country designed specifically for an education school. It will be an impressive, architecturally distinctive building.
   - In response to questions from senators:
     - The Board of Governors asked the legislature for a 6% raise for faculty; she thinks it is realistic to expect some raise, perhaps 2-3%.
     - We received over 9500 applications for 1800 spots in the freshman class; our popularity grows.
     - Transfer students have had a success rate comparable to that of freshmen. One problem is the lack of classes available for new transfers.

2. President Daniel Noland reported that the Chancellor is seeking faculty input in the search for a new Vice Chancellor for Public Service and Continuing Studies. He finds this an encouraging development and asks that faculty interested on being on a committee to interview finalists to e-mail him.
3. **Faculty Assembly delegate Richard Veit** reported that the Assembly conducted a survey on the degree to which faculty share in university governance on each of the sixteen UNC campuses. UNCW stacks up well, especially compared to several campuses with authoritarian administrations.

**Committee reports**

1. The following motions by the **Steering Committee** carried:

   a. **[Motion 04-08-27; expedite minor revisions to majors/minors; carried]**
      Whereas Senate approval is required for all revisions to majors, minors, and certificate programs; and
      Whereas the intent of this policy is for the faculty to exercise diligence in determining the university's curriculum; and
      Whereas some revisions involve no significant changes to the curriculum, such as changes to course numbers and minor additions or substitutions from lists of courses that fulfill requirements; therefore,
      Be it resolved, that the Senate delegates authority jointly to the chair of the University Curriculum Committee and to the president of the Faculty Senate to determine whether a proposed change to a major, minor, or certificate program is minor and non-substantive, and, if so and if both agree, to approve the change on behalf of the Faculty Senate; and
      Be it further resolved, that the Senate president shall notify the Senate of any such approvals at its next meeting.

   b. **[Motion 04-08-28; further revise Policies of Academic Freedom & Tenure; carried]** That Section IV of the **Policies of Academic Freedom and Tenure** be revised as marked below [additions, deletions]:

   **B. Probationary Service**

   2. **Length and Number of Appointments in the Probationary Period**

      b. An assistant professor shall be appointed to an initial term of four years. Before the end of the third year of this appointment, the department chairperson or school dean, after consulting with members of the department's or school's faculty as is required in the case of instructors and reviewing the evidence provided by the evaluation process, shall recommend that the assistant professor be either reappointed for a second term of three years or not reappointed. Before the end of the second year of the second three-year appointment, the department chairperson or school dean shall, in the same manner, recommend that the assistant professor be either reappointed with permanent tenure, at the same or higher rank and promoted to associate professor, or not reappointed. An assistant professor who has been reappointed at that rank with permanent tenure shall be reviewed for promotion at least once every four years:

      c. An associate professor promoted to that rank from within this institution shall have permanent tenure. One coming to that rank from outside the institution shall be appointed to an initial term of five years; and in such cases, before the end of the fourth year, his/her department chairperson or school dean, after consulting with other members of the department's or school's faculty as required in the case of an instructor, shall recommend that the associate professor be either reappointed with permanent tenure at the same or higher rank, or not reappointed. An associate professor who has been reappointed at that rank with permanent tenure shall be reviewed for promotion at least once every four years:

   c. **[Motion 04-06-20; revise the RTP Instructions document; carried]** That the **Recommendations for RTP: Instructions** document in the Faculty Handbook be revised as marked below [additions, deletions; an addition proposed in the original motion but deleted by an amendment is marked in **blue**]:

   **Recommendations Applications for RTP: Instructions**
I. Eligibility and timing

A. Recommendations for reappointment should be submitted one and one-half years before the end of the first contract.

B. Recommendations for promotion and/or tenure should be submitted two years before the end of the second contract period.

C. Recommendations for tenure at the assistant professor rank should state the extraordinary circumstances that justify that action.

D. Candidates for an early promotion/tenure decision (i.e., before a decision is mandatory) must state the extraordinary circumstances or the exceptional quality of the submission by showing that they not only meet but substantially exceed the established criteria:
   1. For faculty (assistant professors with an initial three-year contract) hired prior to 1995 who have not had previous tenure-track appointments on other campuses or comparable experience in research, teaching, or professional settings: "Early" means coming forward prior to the fifth year of appointment. Recommendations should be based solely on exceptional faculty performance.
   2. For faculty hired since 1995 who have not had previous tenure-track appointments on other campuses or comparable experience in research, teaching, or professional settings, and who had completed all requirements and been awarded the terminal degree before beginning service at UNCW: "Early" means coming forward prior to the sixth year of appointment. Recommendations for promotion/tenure should be based solely on exceptional faculty performance.
   3. For faculty hired since 1995 who had not completed all degree requirements upon beginning service at UNCW and whose initial service was at the rank of instructor: "Early" means coming forward prior to the mandatory time for review, with the instructor period counting as probationary service. Recommendations for promotion/tenure should be based solely on exceptional faculty performance.
   4. For assistant or associate professors who have had previous tenure-track appointments on other campuses or comparable experience in research, teaching, or professional settings: "Early" means coming forward after the required two-year probationary period but prior to the mandatory time for review—i.e., before the sixth year for an assistant professor or the fourth year for an associate professor. In considering an early review, faculty, departments, and deans should not assume an automatic addition of years for previous service elsewhere to the years of experience at UNCW, and any candidate forwarded for such a review should be demonstrably exceptional.

A. A faculty member hired as an assistant or associate professor must complete at least two years of probationary service before being considered for tenure. No other minimum time requirement for service at any level has been established. Applications for tenure before a decision is mandatory must demonstrate that special circumstances or exceptional productivity have provided sufficient evidence that the faculty member has met the qualifications for that action.

B. An untenured assistant or associate professor may not apply for promotion without also applying for tenure.

C. A faculty member may not be tenured at the rank of assistant professor.

D. A faculty member who has been denied tenure or who has withdrawn an application for tenure after the dean has forwarded a recommendation on that application to Academic Affairs is not eligible to reapply subsequently for tenure and is not reappointed at the end of the current contract. However, a faculty member who has withdrawn a tenure application at any time prior to the dean's forwarding a recommendation on that application is eligible to reapply subsequently for tenure, provided that the deadline for review has not passed. A faculty member who has been denied tenure based on grounds of institutional financial exigency may reapply for tenure if the Chancellor determines that the
financial exigency has ended and if either the faculty member's contract has not expired or the faculty member has been reappointed at a tenure-eligible rank.

D. Typically, candidates for tenure and promotion are reviewed in the fall, and candidates for reappointment are reviewed in the spring. However, a faculty member hired with a start date in January may be reviewed for reappointment in the fall or for tenure and promotion in the spring if that semester is the mandatory final semester for review. Discretionary reviews, whether for tenure (with or without promotion) after the required two-year probationary period but prior to the mandatory time for review or for promotion of a tenured faculty member, may be conducted either fall or spring semester.

E. An assistant professor with an initial 4-year contract must be reviewed for reappointment no later than early in the 6th semester of employment.

F. An assistant professor with a second 3-year contract must be reviewed for tenure and promotion no later than early in the 3rd semester of that contract (11th semester of employment).

G. For an assistant professor who previously held the rank of instructor at UNCW, the mandatory review period is the same as for other assistant professors, except that it is measured from the first semester of employment as instructor.

H. An associate professor with an initial 5-year contract must be reviewed for tenure no later than early in the 7th semester of employment.

II. Content

B. A. Instructions to the RTP candidate.

1. Compose the application to include the first six Roman-numbered sections specified in the prescribed format. Beginning with section IV, all required subcategories must be included as numbered.

2. Whenever it is appropriate to list items by date, use reverse chronological order (most recent first).

3. There are typically two parts to an RTP candidate's dossier: the recommendation application (to which is appended the chairperson's recommendation) and the supporting documentation.

   a. The recommendation application format should consist of (1) a narrative specifically prepared for the personnel action being recommended applied for and (2) lists of accomplishments. The recommendation application should be self-contained, since it is typically read in its entirety by RTP Committee members before supporting documentation is consulted. The recommendation application must be prepared in the prescribed format.

   b. Supporting documentation

      i. Supporting documentation must include:

         1. all of the candidate's SPOT summaries—the printouts summarizing results of all 16 evaluation questions—over at least the most recent two-and-one-half years, as well as copies of the Question 16 Section Summaries and frequency graphs over the same period. All SPOT results should be organized in reverse chronological order. (See Guidelines for the Administration, Use, and Interpretation of the "Student Perception of Teaching" (SPOT) Evaluation, especially Section B4.)

         2. all refereed publications published since the candidate was appointed at the present rank. A "selected" sub-collection of those publications is not sufficient, nor is a collection of photocopies of titles pages or tables of contents. Copies of publications will be returned to the candidate when the review process is completed.

      ii. A table of contents or explanation of the organization of the supplementary documentation is helpful.
iii. The supporting documentation normally can be presented in one, or perhaps two, three-ring binders. It is not necessary or desirable to submit boxes of voluminous files.

A. B. Instructions to the administrator responsible for initiating the making the initial recommendation (2)

1. [4:] No later than four weeks prior to submission of a recommendation forwarding an application, request from the Office of Institutional Research a "Report of SPOT Question 16 by semester" for each RTP candidate in time to include that report with the recommendation Section IV of the application.
2. [6:] Assemble, and consult, and take an advisory vote of the senior faculty of the school or department.
3. [7:] Prepare, sign and date the Chair's Evaluation (Section VII of the recommendation application).
4. [8:] Complete the Certification section (Section VIII of the recommendation application).
5. [3:] Compose the recommendation to include Verify that the application includes the eight Roman-numbered sections specified in the prescribed format. Beginning with section IV, all required subcategories must be included as numbered. Any optional subcategories may be omitted, but those included should be numbered sequentially.
6. [5:] Verify that all courses taught by the RTP candidate during the preceding two and one-half years are listed on that report, and sign the report to that effect.
7. Notify the senior faculty of how the chair is recommending and append a separate senior-faculty recommendation, if any [see the process for such recommendations in the RTP Process document].
8. [2:] Number the pages of the recommendation application.
9. [1:] Submit 10 copies, each stapled or bound in some manner.

Footnotes

(1) This policy does not apply to faculty tenured as assistant professors prior to April 2004.

(2) Normally, this is the department chairperson.

- In the case of the School of Nursing, it is the chair of the School of Nursing Committee on RTP.
- In the case of Randall Library, it is the chair of the Randall Library Promotion Committee.
- In cases where the department chair is being recommended, the administrator responsible for initiating the making the initial recommendation is the college or school dean.

[Much discussion took place about whether a faculty member who has been turned down for tenure should be permitted to reapply in a subsequent semester. An amendment that would specifically allow reapplication was defeated on a 19-16 vote. A subsequent motion that deleted all reference to reapplication in this document then carried by a similarly contested vote. The question remains unresolved.]

2. [Motion 04-08-29; revise SPOTs; postponed until April 27] The motion to revise the SPOT instrument (see the motion in the agenda) was postponed until a special meeting called for Tuesday, April 27 (reading day). Most discussion centered about whether a pilot study should be undertaken involving a subset of tenured faculty before the instrument is used for all faculty.

3. [Motion 04-08-30; endorse Strategic Plan; carried] The following motion by the Steering Committee carried:
That the Faculty Senate endorses "Soaring to Greatness: Transforming Ideas into Action: A Strategic Plan 2004-2009" and the open, participatory process of its creation, and the Senate welcomes the opportunity for continued participation in the refinement and application of this document.

New business

Adjournment

Minutes by Richard Veit, Senate Secretary
Roll call

Absent: DePaolo (Chancellor), Gwinn (Information Systems), Kuiper (Nursing). Committee membership is not yet finalized, and committee senators were not marked absent.

Approval of minutes

April minutes were approved.

Special order of the day

Senate officers for 2004-2005 were elected as follows:

- Vice president: Mark Spaulding, History
- Secretary: Richard Veit, English
- At large members of the Steering Committee: Tammy Hunt, (Management & Marketing); Rick Olsen (Communication Studies); Jimmy Reeves (Chemistry); Reid Toth (Sociology & Criminal Justice)

Individual reports

1. Provost Paul Hosier reported, including the following:
   - Enrollments: We enrolled 1897 freshmen this year, slightly above our target of 1850. 20% are out-of-state students, up from 13% last year. The freshman SAT average is 1126 (up 22 points this year and up 66 points in ten years, the highest point gain in the UNC system). 11.4% of the class are minorities, including 4.4% African-Americans. Hispanic enrollments rose sharply. Transfer students number 1224 (target was 1250). We have 340 new graduate students, equal to 8.6% of UNCW's students; our goal is to reach 10% graduate students. Female enrollment is 59.9%, down somewhat. We are largely a campus of full-time students, with relatively few part-timers compared to other UNC schools.
   - Budget: We gained 22 new faculty positions and "bought back" four positions, for 26 new positions. These have been allocated to the College and schools.
   - Salaries: We received salary-increase funds of 2½% plus $700,000 from campus-based tuition funds, for an average increase of nearly 5%. Increases will be finalized this week. September paychecks will retroactively reflect raises for July, August, and September.
   - Personnel: We have hired a new Director of Institutional Research, Lisa Castellino from the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education. Her predecessor, Bob Fry, is now at the UNC Office of the President, where his voice is expected to benefit us. Searches are under way for a new CAS dean (Larry Clark, chair), an Assistant Provost for International Studies, a Director of Campus Diversity, and a Registrar.
   - Long-Range Planning: Planning Director Ken Spackman reported that the draft planning document will now go to departments for input and for fleshing out details.
   - Swim team controversy: Interviews have been completed. The Provost is reviewing all information and will issue a report next week, including recommendations.
   - Student photos: As a result of Senate motion 2004-07-26, faculty can now cut and paste photos (from their class photos found on Campus Pipeline) to create a photographic seating chart or attendance list for each class.
RTP: Changes to RTP documents require Board of Governors approval, so we will wait until the Senate indicates that changes are complete before submitting them. The RTP process this year will continue to follow existing procedures.

Equity funding: UNCW continues to seek equity funding increases from the Board of Governors and the legislature. We receive fewer dollars per student than any of the other 15 UNC campuses (ECSU: $11,000 per student; UNCW: $5800 per student). Various funding models are being proposed that would result in substantial increases for UNCW. For example, if we were funded at 90% of the average per-student funding of the other comprehensive institutions in the system, we would receive a $10 million annual increase.

Faculty parking: Asked about the status of Senate motion 04-02-05 to end faculty/staff parking fees, the Provost replied that he thinks it unlikely that funds will be found to make it possible

Following the Provost's report, the agenda was set aside by unanimous consent so that the following motion could be introduced. It carried without dissent:

[Motion 2005-01-02; praise appointment of Provost Hosier; carried] That the Faculty Senate expresses its enthusiastic support for the decision of Chancellor DePaolo to remove the term "Acting" from the title of Provost Hosier, and it warmly welcomes his appointment as our chief academic officer.

2. President Daniel Noland reported the results of elections to autonomous committees: George Shell was elected to the RTP Committee for Division IV. Patti Turrisi, Ron Sizemore, and Raquel Alexander were elected to the Hearings Panel.

Committee reports

1. The following motion by the **Steering Committee** carried:

[Motion 2005-01-01: amend Bylaws to allow alternate members; carried] That the following new section D. be added to section I of the Faculty Senate Bylaws:

   **I. Membership**

   **D. Alternate members**

   1. A senator who is unable to be present at a meeting of the Senate shall designate another full-time faculty member from the absent senator’s department or standing committee to serve as an alternate member of the Senate for that meeting only. The alternate member shall have the same voting privileges as the absent senator.

   2. Alternate members shall identify themselves at roll call when the absent senator's name is called.

   3. A senator who expects to be absent from more than two Senate meetings in any semester or more than three meetings in an academic year is expected to resign from the Senate so that the department or standing committee may elect a replacement.

2. **NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative Joanne Rockness** reported as follows:
   - She discussed the duties of the Athletics Committee and her own duties as UNCW's Faculty Athletics Representative.
   - She discussed the achievements of our athletic program and of Athletics Director Margaret Bradley-Doppes.
   - She reported that she, retired Athletics Representative Jim Sabella, Senate President Noland, and Bill Bolduc met with the Chancellor to discuss the swim-team controversy. Representative Rockness said, "I
think UNCW is best served by waiting for Provost Hosier’s complete report. I have every confidence that he has done a thorough job of examining the issues and gathering input from all the relevant parties. I personally hope UNCW can soon put this issue behind us and move ahead with our current athletic director in place. We are a great university with great students and great student athletes. It is time to move forward."

- Discussion followed among senators about the swim-team controversy. The idea of a motion was raised, but it was decided to take no action before Provost Hosier issued his report and Chancellor DePaolo had the opportunity to speak to us next month.

New business: none

Adjournment

Minutes by Richard Veit, Senate Secretary
Roll call

Absent: Bennett (HAHS), Clark (Cameron School), Dworkin (Psychology), Howell (Economics & Finance), Hungerford (Psychology), Messer (Creative Writing), Rosen (Information Systems), Toth (Sociology & Criminal Justice), Weber (Communication Studies)

Approval of minutes

September minutes were approved.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor Rosemary DePaolo reported, including the following:
   - Faculty parking: The Senate recommended that parking be free to faculty and staff. Cost, however, would exceed $285,000 annually. She hopes we can afford this in the future, but we are not in a position to do so currently.
   - Committees: We have a very large number of committees reporting to the Senate, the Chancellor, and the Provost. She is seeking Senate input into streamlining committee structure.
   - Faculty welfare: A staff committee made excellent recommendations on non-salary-related welfare items. It would be very helpful if the Faculty Welfare Committee would make similar proposals and recommendations.
   - Equity funding for UNCW: We are the most poorly funded UNC campus (1.4 standard deviation below the average). Bob Warwick and Hannah Gage (Board of Governors members from Wilmington) have worked tirelessly lobbying the Board to correct the inequity. The Board will vote in November on a proposal that no campus be more than 1 standard deviation below average. If adopted by the Board and, subsequently, by the General Assembly, UNCW will have $7 million annually added to our base budget. This "would be a tremendous gain for this tightly strapped campus."

2. President Daniel Noland informed the Senate that the November meeting will take place in DeLoach 212.

3. Faculty Assembly delegate Richard Veit reported, including the following:
   - President Broad sees much reason to be pleased with the budget. Although our base budget was cut 1.47% (some cuts one-time, others permanent), our enrollment growth was fully funded, financial aid support was increased, money for Distinguished Professorship was increased (UNCW got three endowed professorships), and we got a 2.5% pool for faculty salaries—with the result that our funding actually increased by 7.9%. This compares with major cuts in other states; e.g., a 7.9% cut in South Carolina.

4. Director of University Planning Kenneth Spackman reported, including the following:
   - Strategic Planning
     - The Strategic Plan is intended to be adapted to new conditions. For example, we recently added a new goal on campus safety (in response to the recent deaths) and a new objective on increased financial aid to make our education affordable.
     - The document is also intended for use rather than ostentation. Already it has resulted in changes to the budget to support objectives. Faced with multiple worthy but competing requests for funding, the administration will give priority to those that best support our strategic plan.
• **Master planning**: Two consulting firms have been hired to plan growth for the next 15 years (land use, building needs and design, etc.), and their study will be guided by our strategic priorities. For example, our faculty-student ratio of 18.9 is second worst in UNC. Also we are dead last in UNC in the number of small classes. Our goal of "intimate learning experiences" will likely dictate a plan to lower the ratio and to increase the number of smaller classes.

• **Nessie and Fessie**: Two national surveys were administered to students (National Survey of Student Engagement) and to faculty (Faculty Survey of Student Engagement). Results are voluminous but telling, and presentations are being made to various units. An open session for faculty is being scheduled.

### Committee reports

1. The following motion by the **Steering Committee** carried, after a successful amendment to move Film Studies from Division III to Division I [*Motion 2005-02-03: amend Bylaws to revise voting divisions; carried*]:

   That section 14 of [Election procedures for autonomous faculty committees](http://example.com), an appendix to the Faculty Senate Bylaws, be revised to reflect current university departments and to provide equality of representation [deletions, additions]:

   **14. Voting divisions**

   Departments are assigned to one of four voting divisions as follows:

   - **Division I**: Art & Theatre, [Creative Writing](http://example.com), English, [Film Studies](http://example.com), Foreign Languages & Literatures, History, Music, Philosophy & Religion
   - **Division II**: Biological Sciences, Chemistry & Biochemistry, [Computer Science](http://example.com), Earth Sciences, [Environmental Studies](http://example.com), [Mathematical Sciences](http://example.com), Mathematics & Statistics, Physics & Physical Oceanography
   - **Division III**: Anthropology, Communication Studies, [Health/Physical Education & Recreation](http://example.com), Health & Applied Human Sciences, [Library](http://example.com), Political Science, Psychology, [Randall Library](http://example.com), Social Work, Sociology & Anthropology Criminal Justice
   - **Division IV**: Cameron Schools of Business (Accountancy & Business Law, Economics & Finance, [Information Systems](http://example.com) & Operations Management, Management & Marketing, Production & Decision Sciences), [Watson School of Education](http://example.com) (Curricular Studies, Specialty Studies), [School of Nursing](http://example.com)

2. **Committee of the whole**

   The Senate went into a committee of the whole to discuss the following [recommendation](http://example.com) by the 2002 ad hoc committee to review RTP policy:

   Departmental [RTP] guidelines must include a provision for external review that is consistent across the university. External review is required when a faulty member requests promotion to the rank of professor; external review is optional and is the choice of the faculty member in all other reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions. Five letters are required for recommendations to the rank of professor and three letters for all other decisions [see: [Appendix 4](http://example.com) for guidelines for external review and [Appendix 5](http://example.com) for sample letter].

   Professor Lu Huntley acted as secretary during discussion and provided the following notes:

   Main points that emerged from the discussion include the following:

   - Clarity is needed regarding what is being evaluated (research only or teaching and service as well).
Should external review be part of UNCW's RTP policy or should each department incorporate external review as part of its RTP policy?

- Expenses in time and money are involved in external review.
- Does this shift responsibility regarding promotion to outsiders?
- What qualifications must a reviewer have?
- External review can bring out positive points about a candidate that may not be recognized. External reviewers can assist in helping those professors with areas of expertise that may not be well understood as this provides a type of protection for those in fields not well known (i.e., literary theory, rhetoric).
- Affirmative Action laws need to be examined.
- Should external reviewers who are co-authors be permitted?
- A summary from the Physics Department indicates objection to the whole idea of uniform standard, question about the number of letters and making these optional, and disciplinary implications for the sciences was addressed.
- A statement was made that a flow chart be made of the discussion as Senate members are dealing with the issue of external review at a conceptual level, and there is dissonance due to the history and culture of this university and disciplinary differences.
- Basic questions were brought forth regarding the purpose of external review and the original intent of the recommendation. The rationale provided is as follows: external review is “to empower people.” This provides another avenue for information, but it is not meant to be negative or punitive. Twenty schools similar to UNCW were checked, and the number of letters vary at different institutions.
- Clarification is needed regarding at what level external review is necessary.
- A point was made that the concept of a generalist in a field differs from narrow, specific expertise as in the case of education generalist.
- Generally, the discussion today suggests that different departments and disciplines vary in their ways of thinking about external review. Internal dissonance among the whole faculty senate body suggests more discussion is needed on the topic of external review and the recommendation by the 2002 ad hoc committee to review RTP policy.

**New business: none**

**Adjournment**

Minutes by Richard Veit, Senate Secretary
Roll call

Absent: Blake (Earth Sciences), Clark (Cameron School), Lee (Creative Writing), Maume (Sociology & Criminal Justice), Messer (Creative Writing), Reid (Arts & Sciences)

Approval of minutes

October minutes were approved.

Executive session

Senate went into executive session to consider honorary degree nominations.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor Rosemary DePaolo reported, including the following:
   - On Friday, the Board of Governors will decide whether UNCW will get an additional $7 million equity funding for its base budget.
   - Task forces on Diversity, Educational Safety, and Violence have reported or will report shortly. Each has been allocated $100,000 to implement its recommendations.
   - The newly renovated Kenan House will provide a beautiful space for the university to do the entertaining it needs to do. Most changes were to infrastructure, although the house was also restored as far as possible to its original look. The Kenan family was very generous.
   - Athletics: By law, she cannot address individual personnel issues. She met with all coaches and Athletics staff. Interim Athletic Director Mike Capaccio came into a difficult situation, is working seven days a week, and has her absolute confidence and support.

2. President Daniel Noland reported as follows:
   - He has been asked to name faculty representatives to the Diversity Council and to the Safety Committee. He is seeking interested volunteers.

3. Faculty Assembly delegate Richard Veit reported as follows:
   - A UNC-wide committee studied safety on the campuses. Rates of student-on-student violence on campuses are exceptionally low; few places are as safe to be as college campuses. They reviewed the applications of students who later committed crimes on campus; most had no prior arrests and did not differ in background from other students; the others lied about past arrests. They recommended (1) a standardized questions on applications about criminal history, (2) cost-effective steps to verify that information, and (3) training admissions staff to identify applicants who may pose threats. They do not recommend universal criminal checks. Students who admit prior arrests should be interviewed to determine admissibility.
   - OP will ask the legislature for the following:
     - an increase from two to three in the number of courses that staff/faculty may take per year without charge;
     - an exception to the 12-month residency requirement so that dependents of new faculty may pay in-

state tuition rates immediately;  
  - an exception to the state personnel act so that the identity of outside RTP reviewers can be kept confidential.
  - Over 12,000 faculty responded to the **health-benefits** survey (a very high 35% response rate, showing much unhappiness). One step to improve our competitiveness: we will seek immediate vesting in the optional retirement plan (TIAA) rather than the current 5-year wait.

**Committee reports**

1. The following motion by the **Academic Standards Committee** was defeated [**Motion 2005-03-04: disallow W or WP after classes end; failed**]:

   That the "WITHDRAWAL POLICY FOR UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS" on page 78 of the 2004-2005 Undergraduate Catalog be revised by inserting the following as a new fourth paragraph:

   No withdrawals ("W" or "WF") shall be processed after the last day of classes for the semester.

   It was argued that since only deans can assign these grades and since deans have the authority to override such restrictions, this one would serve no useful purpose.

2. The following motion by the **University Curriculum Committee** carried [**Motion 2005-03-05: approve curricular changes; carried**]:

   a. That the Senate approve the creation of a **Journalism Minor** in the CAS
   b. That the Senate approve the creation of a **Postcolonial Studies Minor** in the CAS
   c. That the Senate approve **THR 227 (FST 227)** as a Basic Studies Course in Fine Arts
   d. That the Senate approve the creation of a **new prefix, LIB**, for Library Science courses
   e. That the Senate approve **LIB 103** as a new course

3. The following motion by the **Steering Committee** carried after amendment [**Motion 2005-03-06: set principles for outside evaluation in RTP; carried**]:

   Whereas:

   - Departments at UNCW have different expectations of their faculty, including the importance of the "impact on the profession" in the decision to promote to full professor and the method by which this impact can be assessed; and
   - When assessing the “impact on the profession” of individuals, letters solicited from external evaluators can be of value; therefore,

   Be it resolved:

   - That individual departments may formally decide to require outside evaluation letters for all candidates who seek the rank of associate and/or full professor; and
   - That in the event that the department decides not to solicit such letters in all such cases, the department's senior faculty may request outside evaluation letters in individual cases where they feel these letters would be of benefit in assessing the candidate; and
   - That any candidate for promotion may request that the department solicit such letters when the candidate believes the information would be beneficial in the assessment of their candidacy; and
   - That each department shall develop explicit and consistent guidelines for the solicitation of outside letters of evaluation that include the following:
     - the number of letters to be sought (which shall be no fewer than two nor more than five);
- the criteria by which evaluators are to be selected;
- the information to be provided to the evaluators;
- the role of this evaluation in the overall decision process;
- (for departments not requiring letters for all candidates for promotion) the process by which, in specific cases, the senior faculty may request letters in a timely manner consistent with evaluation deadlines; and
- That the Steering Committee shall bring forward to the Senate a subsequent motion presenting language revising existing RTP documents to incorporate the principles approved in this motion.

The Senate amended the original motion to delete language saying that outside letters may be sought only in cases of promotion to full professor. An amendment that would not have allowed the department's senior faculty to seek letters in individual cases for promotions to associate professor was defeated.

New business: none

Adjournment

Minutes by Richard Veit, Senate Secretary
Roll call

Absent: Chen (History), Honchell (Curricular Studies), Howell (Economics & Finance), Hurdle (Social Work), Roer (Graduate School), Simmons (Anthropology), Snowden (Budget Committee) Weber (Communication Studies)

Approval of minutes

February minutes were approved.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor Rosemary DePaolo reported, including the following:
   - Although the $7 million in equity funding that UNCW is seeking is not in the Governor's proposed budget, the actual state budget is determined by the General Assembly, and we remain hopeful. Our local delegation has introduced motions to give us equity funding and a new nursing building. The outcome will not be known for some months.
   - The NCAA ranked institutions on the academic progress of their student-athletes. We are proud that UNCW ranks first in UNC and second in the entire state (behind only Duke and tied with Davidson).
   - The move of IT to new facilities will mean an inevitable disruption in services. This could not be delayed until after the semester without having a domino effect on every other construction project. Email will be shut down for 2-4 days starting March 24 (over Easter break). Incoming mail will be rejected with an explanatory message to the sender.

2. Senate President Daniel Noland announced that coordination of the interdisciplinary Leadership Studies minor is being moved from the College of Arts and Sciences to the School of Education. Under the expedited procedure, this was approved on behalf of the faculty by the Senate president and the chair of the University Curriculum Committee.

Committee reports

1. The following motion by the Academic Standards Committee was defeated [Motion 2005-07-13; remove majors from diplomas; defeated]:

   Whereas the practice of indicating majors on diplomas was not a practice at UNCW before 1991 and is not a practice at most schools; and
   Whereas this practice has led to problems for former students coming back to UNCW to get a second degree; and
   Whereas the diploma is only a decorative symbol of graduation from UNCW; the actual record is the student’s transcript; therefore,
   Be it resolved, that indications of majors no longer be printed on undergraduate diplomas at UNCW.

   [After considerable discussion, the motion was defeated. Several senators argued that a student who subsequent to graduation fulfills requirements for a second major in the same degree should have the right...]

to get or purchase a reprinted diploma listing both majors.]

2. The following motion by the Steering Committee was defeated [Motion 2005-07-14; define collegiality in RTP evaluation; defeated]:

That Section IV of the RTP Criteria document be revised as follows [additions; text not underlined is current language]:

IV. Guidelines for tenure and academic rank

The overall goal of Guidelines is to ensure continued professional growth of the faculty. Guidelines should emphasize excellence in teaching and professional activity in order both to reward individual faculty and to further the university's goal of excellence.

A. Tenure

Because of their long-term consequences for the university and its faculty, tenure decisions are more important than promotion decisions. To be granted tenure at any academic level, a faculty member must have evidenced proficiency and a pattern of growth in areas of teaching; scholarship and research/artistic achievement; and service. Of these, teaching effectiveness is the primary criterion for the granting of tenure. When a faculty member who has served two years or longer at the rank of assistant professor is recommended for permanent tenure, he/she will also be recommended for promotion. Accordingly, when there is a recommendation for conferral of tenure but at the rank of assistant professor, the recommendation will explain the special or unusual circumstances for not also recommending promotion.

B. Academic rank

1. Assistant professor

For appointment to the rank of assistant professor a candidate shall show promise as a teacher and evidence of progress in the area of research or artistic achievement.

2. Associate professor

For appointment to the rank of associate professor a candidate shall show evidence of having developed into an effective teacher, of a continuing pattern of research or artistic achievement, of regular professional service, and of scholarship and professional development.

3. Professor

For appointment to the rank of professor a candidate shall have exhibited during her/his career distinguished accomplishment in teaching, a tangible record of research or artistic achievement, and a significant record of service. An individual with the rank of professor should have a reputation as an excellent teacher and be recognized as a scholar within her/his professional field.

C. A note on collegiality

Professional collegiality is among the factors that should be considered in assessing the teaching, research/artistic achievement, and service of RTP candidates. Collegiality is defined as: a willingness to work toward achieving the broad goals of the University, college/school, and department; the ability to interact with other faculty members—whether in agreement or dissent—in
accord with civility and professional courtesy; and contribution to the governance of the University, college/school, or department by responding to the need to serve on appointed committees. Collegiality must always be distinct from and unrelated to conformity of thought and expression, and it must never be confused with the absence of criticism or dissent or with congeniality. Chapter VI of The Code of the University of North Carolina guarantees that faculty members shall enjoy academic freedom and protects faculty in "their responsible exercise of the freedom to teach, to learn, and otherwise to seek and to speak the truth."

[Debate was lengthy and animated but not uncollegial. Much discussion centered on whether the university would benefit from having an implicit criterion made explicit. The motion was defeated.]

3. The following motion by the University Curriculum Committee carried [Motion 2005-07-15; approve German Studies major; carried]:

That the Senate approve the establishment of a major in German Studies for the B.A. degree, with the following additional catalog language [additions]:

The Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures offers classes in French, German, Italian, Japanese, Latin, Portuguese and Spanish language, as well as in literature, film studies, civilization, linguistics and classics. Majors in French, German Studies and Spanish prepare students for graduate studies, teaching, and other careers requiring a strong liberal arts background combined with knowledge of foreign languages and cultures. The major in German Studies is available in conjunction with the UNC German Studies Consortium (see page 99). A substantial number of courses for the major are offered through the Consortium as GER 495 Special Topics. Also available are minors in French, German, and Spanish, and, in conjunction with other departments, classical studies, film studies, European studies, and Latin American studies, which complement students’ majors, deepen their cultural and linguistic appreciation, and enhance employment opportunities.

Requirements for a Major in German Studies for the B.A. degree: 36 hours, including GER 201-202 or the equivalent and thirty hours at the 300-400 level of which at least 6 hours must be at the 400 level. Only 3 of the hours at the 400 level may be obtained by means of a GER 491 or 498.

Computer Competency Requirement: To satisfy the computer competency requirement for the B.A. degree in German Studies a student must successfully complete GER 306 or 311.

Oral Communication Competency Requirement: To satisfy the oral communication competency requirement for the B.A. degree in German Studies a student must successfully complete GER 305.

A grade of "C-" or better is required in each course counted toward the major and a “C” (2.00) average or better for all courses counted toward the major. Also required is a passing score on the departmental German oral proficiency exam. Recommended: HST 101 and 102.

Adjournment

Minutes by Richard Veit, Senate secretary
Roll call

**Absent:** Badaranathi (Information Systems), Gamble (Earth Sciences), Honchell (Curricular Studies), Howell (Economics & Finance), Maume (Sociology & Criminal Justice), Tomas (Biology), Wilcox (Art & Theater; Buildings & Grounds Committee)

Approval of minutes

December minutes were approved.

Individual reports

1. **Chancellor Rosemary DePaolo** reported, including the following:
   - President Broad singled out UNCW for compliments at the Board of Governors meeting for achievements, including Carole Tallant's winning the Carnegie Award, Daniel Baden's work on cystic fibrosis, and student fundraising to aid tsunami victims.
   - She sees state House bill HB1264 as benign in intent. It would study university course offerings and facilities in relation to needs of the state's work force. It may do good, but the fear is that it would mandate expensive programs at university expense.
   - The Board of Governors is unlikely to approve requests for campus-based tuition increases. The General Assembly may raise tuition, but we won't get the revenue.
   - The Board of Governors is presenting a long wish list to the legislature, including a nursing building for UNCW, equity funding (now called "minimally acceptable level of state appropriations, or MALSA), and a 6% salary increase (unlikely to be realized).
   - Haleigh Beyer, spirit chair for ACE, spoke about Homecoming (theme: "Teal the End of Time").
   - In response to a question, Chancellor DePaolo said she "would not oppose" a faculty dining room.

2. **President Daniel Noland** reported as follows:
   - Departments should hold elections for senators for 2005-2007 terms prior to scheduling fall courses, so that senators do not have Tuesday afternoon classes.
   - Curricular changes approved by our expedited procedure for minor changes are posted on the Curriculum Committee website.
   - Basic Studies proposals will come to us in February. Departments need to think seriously about the core academic mission of the university.

Committee reports

1. The following motions by **University Curriculum Committee** carried after amendment:
   a. That the Senate approved the following curricular changes [additions, deletions; amendment in blue] [Motion 2005-05-09; make various curricular changes; carried]:
   i. Revision of the B.S. Degree in Nursing (pages 170-172, 2004-05 Catalogue):

   **BACHELOR OF SCIENCE DEGREE**
Accredited by the National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission and the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education

Dr. V. Adams, Ms. Allred, Ms. Baynes, Dr. Bechtel, Dr. Bell-Kotwall, Dr. Bomar, Ms. Ellender, Dr. Flynn, Dr. Glenn, Ms. Hopkins, Ms. Kanoy, Dr. Kemppainen, Dr. Kim-Godwin, Dr. Kuiper, Ms. Latham, Dr. Owensby, Dr. Pollard, Ms. Savinon, Dr. Scheuring, Dr. Smith-Taylor, Dr. Turner, Ms. Turrise.

The School of Nursing offers programs leading to the Bachelor of Science degree with a major in professional nursing and Clinical Research.

Bachelor of Science with a Major in Professional Nursing

The baccalaureate program in the School of Nursing baccalaureate program is approved by the North Carolina Board of Nursing and accredited by the National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission (NLNAC), 61 Broadway-33rd Floor, New York City, NY 10006 and the Commission on Collegiate Education in Nursing (CCNE), One Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 530, Washington, DC 20036-1120. In order to be eligible to begin practice as a registered nurse, each graduate must obtain a satisfactory score on the National Council Licensure Examination for Registered Nurses (NCLEX-RN). The purpose of the this baccalaureate program in professional nursing is to prepare a generalist who possesses the knowledge, skills, and attitudes with which to practice family-centered professional nursing in a variety of current and emerging health care delivery systems. In addition, the program is designed to provide a foundation for graduate nursing education. Through interactions with clients—individual persons, families and communities—and other health care professionals, nursing graduates will contribute toward meeting the wide-ranging needs of the region, state, and the larger community.

Computer Competency Requirement: To satisfy the computer competency requirement for the B.S. in professional nursing, a student must successfully complete NSG 415.

Oral Communication Competency Requirement: Within the nursing curriculum, several required clinical courses are deemed as oral intensive in the nursing major. These courses meet the UNCW requirement for oral communication competency. NSG 330 and 370 are NSG 333 – Leadership and Management in Nursing is the required courses for the prelicensure generic student in the baccalaureate program. NSG 389 and 489 are required courses for registered nurses in the baccalaureate program.

Requirements for the B.S. Degree with a Major in Professional Nursing: Prelicensure Option 96 hours

Collateral courses: PSY 105, PSY 223; SOC 105 or ECN 125 or ECN 221, 345 or PSY 366; MAT 111 or MAT 151; BIO 204, BIO 240, BIO 241, BIO 246; CHM 101, CHM 215 and CHML 215 or BIO 204; PAR 101 or PAR 110 or PAR 115 or PAR 205 or PAR 211 or PAR 215; STT 210 or STT 215. (Note: Completion of these courses will satisfy university basic studies requirements in the social and behavioral sciences and the natural and mathematical sciences.)

Core courses: NSG 250 and NSGL 250, NSG 312, 325, 330 and NSGL 330, NSG 331, 362, 370 and NSGL 370, NSG 410, NSG 415, 430 and NSGL 430, NSG 460, 470 and NSGL 470, NSG 490; NSG 251, NSG 326, NSG 327, NSG 328, NSG 329, NSG 332, NSG 333, NSG 334, NSG 401, NSG 402, NSG 403, NSG 404.

A minimum grade of "C" (2.00) is required in each nursing course. A cumulative grade point average of 2.00 or better is required for graduation.
ii. Creation of a new prefix ATR for Athletic Training courses:

The following courses (currently prefixed with PED) would receive the new prefix:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATR 210</td>
<td>Introduction to Athletic Training</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATR 211</td>
<td>Care and Prevention of Athletic Injuries and Lab</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATR 300</td>
<td>Seminar with Allied Health Care Professionals</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATR 302</td>
<td>Therapeutic Modalities in Athletic Training and Lab</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATR 303</td>
<td>Therapeutic Rehabilitation in Athletic Training and Lab</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATR 304</td>
<td>Evaluation of Athletic Injuries I and Lab</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATR 305</td>
<td>Evaluation of Athletic Injuries II and Lab</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATR 306</td>
<td>Clinical I in Athletic Training (fulfill oral com.)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATR 307</td>
<td>Clinical II in Athletic Training</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATR 445</td>
<td>Organization in Administration in Athletic Training</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATR 448</td>
<td>Clinical III in Athletic Training</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATR 449</td>
<td>Clinical IV in Athletic Training</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATR 490</td>
<td>Clinical V in Athletic Training</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iii. Deletion of UNI 103: The Electronic Library, and creation of the new course, LIB 101:

**LIB 101. Introduction to Information Literacy (1)** Concepts & methodology for locating, selecting, and evaluating information, with an emphasis on electronic resources. Overview of the structure and organization of information.


v. Deletion of Basic Studies course CHM 103: Chemistry in Everyday Life.


vii. Inclusion of SWK 417 and SWK 418 in the list of courses that qualify as an elective for the major under "Requirements for a Major in Social Work for the BSW Degree" (catalog p. 149).

b. That the duties of the University Curriculum Committee in the Senate Bylaws be revised as follows [Motion 2005-05-10; revise UCC duties; carried]:

**Duties:** To review all proposals for the following: the establishment, dissolution, division, or consolidation of academic departments or other degree-granting entities; the establishment, or dissolution, or revision of academic degrees, including majors, minors, and certificate programs; the revision of academic degrees when these revisions directly affect any academic unit outside of the revising department's school or college; policies for maximum and minimum hours required for majors, minors, and certificates; total number of hours required for graduation; basic studies requirements; university-wide competency requirements; course prefixes; any curricular conflicts between schools and/or colleges; and other general curricular policies which have total university impact. The committee shall submit all such proposals, along with the committee’s recommendations, to the Senate for consideration.

**New business**

1. The following motion by the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice carried after amendment [Motion
2005-05-11; create faculty dining room carried:

Whereas it is widely acknowledged that faculty interaction and collegiality are desirable for faculty development, and
Whereas, the need for a faculty meeting place has been noted several times by the Faculty Senate, therefore,
Be it resolved, that a faculty dining room be established at UNCW.

2. The following motion by the Anthropology Program was referred to the University Curriculum Committee [Motion 2005-05-12; establish Anthropology department; referred to UCC]:

That the Anthropology Program be made the Department of Anthropology.

Adjournment

Minutes by Richard Veit, Senate secretary
Roll call

Absent: Dworkin (Psychology), Honchell (Curricular Studies), Howell (Economics & Finance), Maume (Sociology & Criminal Justice), Tse (HAHS), Weber (Communication Studies)

Approval of minutes

January minutes were approved.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor Rosemary DePaolo reported, including the following:
   - UNCW received high praise from the Board of Governors and President Broad for our hosting of the February Board of Governors meeting.
   - She asked Human Resources Director William Fleming to report on possible child care on campus. He said that many faculty and staff are seeking a child-care benefit. Ken Gurganus is chairing the Human Resources Advisory Committee, which is studying the feasibility of a child-care option, particularly the question of available resources and legal issues.
   - She also asked Provost Paul Hosier to report on enrollments. He said:
     - Admissions Director Roxie Shabazz is chairing the new Enrollment Affairs Committee.
     - He has heard rumors about next year's enrollments and wants faculty to have accurate information. The current freshman class size is 1900; our target for next year is 1950. We also expect 1250 transfers (up from 1234 last year) and 358 graduate admissions (up from 341 last year).
     - Applications will probably be down 3% from last year, but the quality is up: average SAT of applicants has increased from 1092 to 1103. Less qualified students apply less often as our reputation for high admission standards grows. We predict that the SAT of the incoming freshman class will be about 1130, up from 1126 this year.
     - Out-of-state applications are up. Applicants from the local 8-county area are down.
     - Minority applicants are down (a trend at most schools).
     - In response to a question about the quality of transfer students, he said we need to gather data about the success of transfer students.
     - He hopes to have news about the CAS dean search this week.
   - The Chancellor said that the Board of Governors is asking the legislature for a 7.5% salary increase for faculty, but few expect an increase of that size. Some are predicting that a 2% gain would be a more likely outcome.

2. Faculty Assembly delegate Richard Veit asked for comments on the Assembly's draft of "Minimum Standards of Governance on the 16 UNC Campuses." UNCW meets all of the standards in the draft except that our college/school curriculum committees are appointed by deans rather than elected by the faculty.

Committee reports

1. The following motion by the University Curriculum Committee carried:

That the Senate approve a change in status for the Anthropology Program and that it become the
Department of Anthropology [Motion 2005-05-12; establish Anthropology department; carried].

[Much comment centered pragmatically around shared secretarial resources between the Sociology and Anthropology departments and philosophically around the question of what factors make it academically and economically desirable for a program to split off and gain departmental status.]

2. At the request of the Basic Studies Curriculum Revision Committee, the Senate went into a committee of the whole to discuss a draft of a preamble to a revised Basic Studies curriculum. The committee stated that the draft is in rough form, and it is seeking feedback related more to content than to editing. Among the varied comments from many individuals were these:

- Ethics should be a separate bullet.
- We should decide objectives and create a curriculum around them; others favored the opposite approach.
- "Core curriculum" may be a bad choice, since departments use that term within their majors.
- We need to decide what is an educated person.
- The term "scientific" is not exclusive of "quantitative" and "qualitative," so they should not form a series of three items.
- Basic Studies should have two components: (1) Basic knowledge behind disciplines and (2) the ability to use that knowledge critically.
- An instrumental purpose is stated, but the preamble should emphasize ways of thinking, how to explore and think creatively, aesthetics.
- The phrase "speech and writing" is limited; "discourse skills" is more inclusive.
- What is the role of the library?
- Basic Studies should focus more on interrelationships among disciplines rather than the characteristics of separate disciplines.
- It is difficult to make changes to introduce something bold and new. When something bold is proposed, it meets a firestorm of criticism—the nature and limitation of a democratic process.

Chair Noland closed the discussion and asked that it continue electronically by Senators and others sending comments to the Senators mailing list (senators@lists.uncw.edu).

Adjournment

Minutes by Richard Veit, Senate secretary
Roll call

Absent: Chen (History), Clark (Cameron School), Honchell (Curricular Studies), Howell (Economics & Finance), Hurdle (Social Work), Kyzer (HAHS), Roer (Graduate School), Toth (Sociology & Criminal Justice), Turner (Nursing)

Approval of minutes

November minutes were approved.

Election of a president-elect

Mark Spaulding, History, was elected president for the 2005-2006 academic year.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor Rosemary DePaolo reported, including the following:
   - She thanked the Senate for awarding honorary degrees to Julia and Hugh Morton. She was impressed by the level of discussion during those deliberations.
   - She announced that the Senate president will henceforth be a member of the university's extended cabinet (applause).
   - The company hired to oversee the Physical Master Planning process is raising all the right issues and communicating well. She hopes the Senate will devote a meeting to a presentation on that process and to a discussion of the issues, which are critical to our future. Moreover, she urges the Senate to consider other large and important issues.

2. President Daniel Noland reported as follows:
   - There is great variation among departments in their efforts to support and mentor junior faculty. We need to reflect on the extent to which we are a community.

Committee reports

1. Bill Bolduc and Bill Atwill reported for the Athletics Council, including the following:
   - The Council meets several times each semester. Its duties include compliance, Title IX monitoring, a comprehensive review of each athletics program, and reviewing faculty reports on athletes' academic progress.
   - We are lucky in that athletics at UNCW has had the right emphases and a proactive Athletics Department.
   - The Council is considering the degree to which it complies with guidelines of the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics, and in particular what relationship the Council should have to the Faculty Senate —for example, whether it should become a standing committee of the Senate. The Senate urged the Council to bring forth a proposal for Senate consideration.

2. The following motion by the Steering Committee carried after amendment [deletions from the original motion]:
That the RTP Process document, as revised by the Senate last year, be further revised with the addition of the following new section allowing for the external review of RTP candidates (in accordance with motion 2005-03-06) to be inserted immediately following the "Timetable" section [Motion 2005-04-07: allow external review of RTP candidates; carried]:

RTP process

Timetable

External reviews of candidates for tenure and/or promotion

Departments have the option whether or not to require external reviews of candidates for tenure and/or promotion. Assessments of candidates, solicited by the department from reviewers who are external to UNCW, can be a valuable aid to the department's senior faculty and others as they make their recommendations. External reviews may be especially useful in cases where candidates have teaching and research interests that are atypical within the department. In its deliberations the senior faculty shall consider such reviews as one among many forms of documentation providing information on the candidacy. In cases where external reviews are not required, the absence of such reviews shall not be considered a detriment in any way to the candidacy.

Each department shall establish a formal policy on external reviews, approved by the department and the appropriate dean, stating (1) whether the department shall seek external reviews in all cases for tenure and promotion to associate professor and (2) whether it shall seek external reviews in all cases for promotion to professor. Departments that do not require external reviews in all such cases shall establish a procedure whereby (1) the department's senior faculty may, by majority vote, request external reviews in individual cases and (2) the candidate may request departmental solicitation of external reviews.

The department policy shall also establish explicit and consistent guidelines for the solicitation and use of external reviews that include the following:

- the number of reviews to be sought (which shall be no fewer than two nor more than five)
- the criteria by which reviewers are to be selected, including whether any are to be chosen from a list of potential reviewers provided by the candidate
- the information and guidelines to be provided to the reviewers
- the role of external reviews in the overall decision process
- for departments not requiring external reviews for all candidates for tenure and promotion, the process by which, in specific cases, either the senior faculty or the candidate may request external reviews in a timely manner consistent with evaluation deadlines

External reviews, where used, shall be solicited by the department. The anonymity of reviewers is essential in assuring candid reviews, and reviewers shall be asked to submit a cover letter identifying themselves, their affiliation, and any personal or professional connection to the candidate. Reviews are to be submitted as attachments to the cover letter and should contain no information...
identifying the reviewers. Senior faculty and others making decisions on the candidacy shall have access to both the reviewers' identities and evaluations, but only the content of the reviews shall be made available to the candidate.

Letters of support solicited by or provided by a candidate are not encouraged. Such letters may be included in the candidate's supplemental documents, but they shall not be considered equivalent to external reviews solicited by the department.

[The last paragraph was deleted to allow departments to determine the extent to which they consider letters solicited by candidates. Two other motions were defeated:

- to delete the phase "by majority vote" in "the department's senior faculty may, by majority vote, request external reviews in individual cases"
- to delete the phrase in parentheses in "the number of reviews to be sought (which shall be no fewer than two nor more than five)"

3. The following motion by the University Curriculum Committee carried after amendment [additions, deletions from the original motion]:

That the following curricular changes be approved [Motion 2005-04-08: approve curricular changes; carried]:

a. Create an interdisciplinary Forensic Science minor in the College of Arts and Sciences:

   Coordinator: Dr. A. Midori Albert

   The College of Arts and Sciences offers an interdisciplinary minor in Forensic Science. The minor affords students the opportunity to gain foundation-level exposure to the various sciences from which forensic applications are derived. Students will acquire broad-based knowledge and skills in a combination of areas such as biology, chemistry, anthropology, criminal justice, sociology, environmental science and law. The minor is designed to prepare students for future graduate education and or on the job training in specialized fields within forensic science; examples include but are not limited to search and recovery of human remains, human identification, crime scene investigation, evidence collection and or laboratory analyses.

   Requirements for a Minor in Forensic Science: A minor in Forensic Science requires 21 hours, distributed as one 3 hour core course, and 18 hours of electives including at least one course in each of two groups--Group 1 (A) Biology or (B) Chemistry, and Group 2 Social-Behavioral Sciences.

   Core: ANT 211

   Group 1: Option (A) Biology, or Option (B) Chemistry

   Option (A) Biology: BIO 240-241, BIO 335-BIOL 335, BIO 488
   Option (B) Chemistry: CHM 380, CHM 417

   Group 2: Social and Behavioral Sciences

   ANT 207-ANTL 207, ANT 326-ANTL 326, ANT 426, CRJ 220, CRJ 380, CRJ 495
   Criminalistics or Law of Evidence, EVS/BLA 362, SOC 355

   Some 400 level courses focusing on forensic science, such as directed independent study, seminars, or honors work, may substitute for courses in Group 2 if approved by
UNCW Faculty Senate: Minutes: 7 December 2004

the coordinator. Students must have at least a “C” (2.00) average in all courses counted for the minor. Many courses listed above have prerequisites and or co-requisites, which do not count for the minor but may satisfy basic study requirements or other major requirements.

b. Create a new course, UNI 105:

**UNI 105 Learning Community Integrative Seminar. (2)** A seminar course designed to help first-year students develop critical thinking skills in relation to the common themes presented by the discipline-based course(s) in a Learning Community. Students will participate in guided discussions, enrichment activities, and practice applying college-level study skills to the material presented by the Learning Community.

c. Delete the E-Business option in the B.S. in Business Administration, Cameron School of Business.
d. Revise the B.A. degree in Economics in the Cameron School of Business.
e. Create an Information Technology Minor in the College of Arts and Sciences:

**Requirements for a Minor in Information Technology**: A minor in information technology requires completion of 18 hours, including 12 hours of core courses and 6 hours of electives. At least 3 elective hours must be at the 300 level or above.

Core Courses: CSC 110; CSC 112 or CSC 121 or equivalent; LIB 103; and any 3-credit 200 or higher level CSC course.

Electives: Any 200 or higher level CSC course (not used to fulfill the core course requirement); ART/FST 220; ART/FST 320; CHM 425; COM 260; CRW 314; CRW 319; EDN 303; EDN 416; ENG 204; ENG 314; ENG 319; FST 201; FST 395; FST 497; GGY 224; GGY 422; GGY 424; MIS 311; MIS 315; MIS 316; MIS 317; MUS 110; PAR 110; PAR 218; SOC 303.

Students must earn at least a “C” (2.00) average in among courses counted for a minor in information technology. This minor is not available for students majoring in computer science.

f. Designate MUS 114, Choral Music Literature, as a course meeting the Basic Studies requirement in the Fine Arts.
g. Designate MIS 105, Basic Computer Applications for Business, as a course meeting the Basic Studies requirement in Mathematical Sciences as an elective.
h. Designate PLS 203, Religion and Politics in the United States, as a course meeting the Basic Studies requirement in the Social and Behavioral Sciences.
i. Designate CLR 305, Clinical Research Seminar, as a course meeting the Oral Competency requirement.
j. Designate CLR 450/L, Data Management, as a course meeting the Computer Competency requirement.

[Discussion took place about the meaning of "integrative" in b. above. A motion to delete that word from the title of UNI 105 was defeated.]

New business: none

Adjournment
Minutes by Richard Veit, Senate secretary
Roll call

Absent: Berkeley (Art & Theatre), Gwinn (ISOM), Howell (Economics & Finance), Hunt (Management & Marketing), Roer (Graduate School), Schmid (Philosophy & Religion), Simmons (Anthropology), Snowden (Budget Committee), Tse (HAHS)

Approval of minutes

March minutes were approved.

Special Order of the Day

The agenda was suspended for President-Elect Mark Spaulding to commend outgoing president Daniel Noland and outgoing secretary Richard Veit for their years of service to the Senate.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor Rosemary DePaolo reported, including the following:
   - Wilmington played host to 50 members of the General Assembly, and we made many friends.
   - We are gravely concerned about the devastating impact that proposed budget cuts would have on UNCW. What is being proposed would amount to a 6% cut in our funding and would also deny us flexibility in how the cuts are made. These cuts would, for example, mandate the loss of 12.2 unfilled faculty positions, which we now use to cover $1.25 million in operating expenses. They would also force us to cut 23 staff positions. We would lose additional millions in our appropriation and suffer many other reductions. Since we have already experienced $19 million in cuts in the past five years, we have no fat to pare and these new cuts would severely harm our teaching mission.
   - Faculty, students, and parents are urged to contact legislators (contact information found at http://www.ncleg.net/) and write letters to newspapers urging the General Assembly to raise revenues to forestall dire consequences to the university.

2. Senate President Daniel Noland reported that he and President-Elect Spaulding will be meeting with the Chancellor, Provost, and Vice-Chancellor for Business Affairs to discuss the roll of Academic Affairs vis-a-vis the other divisions in university budgeting.

3. Faculty Assembly delegate Richard Veit reported that the Assembly adopted the policy document "Standards of Shared Governance on the 16 UNC Campuses." UNCW complies with all the standards except in two curricular matters: our college and school curriculum committees are not accountable to the faculty, and faculty do not have oversight over substantive changes to majors. He urged the Senate to bring us into compliance next year.

Committee reports

1. The following motions by the Academic Standards Committee carried:
a. That the following revisions [deletions, additions] be made concerning the Purpose and Criteria for UNCW Honorary Degrees [Motion 2005-08-16; revise honorary degree document; carried]:

i. Editorial change in "Purpose":
   1. Academic excellence in the individual's field of endeavor.
   2. Appreciation of time, energy, and financial resources spent in behalf of the university and for its sake.
   3. Excellence in fields other than those which would normally be called academic, i.e., the contributions which have enhanced society and its quality of life.

   ii. Changes to "Procedure" (Note that 6 is new and current items 6-7 become items 7-8.)

Procedures for nominating and evaluating candidates for honorary degrees

1. At the beginning of each semester the residing chair of the ASC will make a call for nominations in the Campus Communiqué, Seahawk, and UNCW Magazine. A call for nominations will also be made by the president of the Faculty Senate at the first Faculty Senate meeting of each semester. Nominations may be made at any time to the Academic Standards Committee or the Faculty Senate President by any member of the University community or by any academic department. Owing to institutional needs, it would be of benefit to have, at any given time, a number of nominees approved for receipt of honorary degrees.

5. ASC will recommend for or against approval of the nomination with a recommendation as to the degree to be awarded. A simple majority of ASC voting members present is necessary for approval. Such action will be noted on an honorary degree tracking form. If approved, the nomination will be recommended to the Senate at its next regularly scheduled meeting. Any nomination which fails to receive Academic Standards Committee endorsement but which is supported by two or more members of the Academic Standards Committee shall be reported to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee. The Steering Committee may either accept the report as information or, by majority vote of the entire committee, forward the nomination to the Faculty Senate for consideration at its next meeting.

6. If a nomination is not supported by the Academic Standards Committee, the Chancellor may present support of the nomination to the Steering Committee and the Academic Standards Committee Chair. The Steering Committee may either accept the report as information or, by majority vote of the committee, forward the nomination to the Faculty Senate for consideration at its next meeting.

7. If the Faculty Senate approves the nomination, the Senate President will forward it, with accompanying documentation, to the Provost, who will then forward it to the Chancellor for recommendation to the Board of Trustees; if the Senate disapproves the nomination, it dies in the Senate. Approval or disapproval of the recommendation by the Senate shall be announced while the Senate is still in executive session and made known to the nominator and the Provost’s Office by the Senate President.

b. That the following revisions [deletions, additions] be made to the section "Requirements for a Double Major or a Double Degree" on page 75 of the 2004-2005 Undergraduate Catalog [Motion 2005-08-17; issue second diploma for second major; carried]:

A student who returns to the university after the initial graduation to complete the requirements for a second major may have the additional major added to the official record upon written notification from the department chairperson that all departmental requirements have been met satisfactorily. A new or replacement diploma will not be issued reflecting only the new major and will be subject to the replacement diploma fee.

c. Information item: The Academic Standards Committee has posted a new web site with information on
honorary degrees and the nomination process, as well as with forms for nominations. The site is people.uncw.edu/hermanr/asc/, and it is linked from the Senate home page.

2. The following motion by the University Curriculum Committee carried [Motion 2005-08-18; split Department of Art and Theatre; carried]:

   That the Department of Art and Theatre be divided into two academic units: the "Department of Art and Art History" and the “Theatre Program.”

New Business

1. Steve Dworkin of Psychology offered the following motion for September consideration [Motion 2005-08-19; establish Veit Award; new business]:

   That, in recognition of the contributions to governance made by senator Richard Veit during his 19 years in the UNCW Faculty Senate, the Senate establish the Richard Veit Award for Contributions to Shared Governance and Academic Freedom, and that it be awarded from time to time by the Senate to faculty members and others who have made distinguished contributions in these areas.

Adjournment

Minutes by Richard Veit, Senate secretary
Tuesday, 13 December 2005  
Meeting 2006-04

The meeting was called to order at 2:04.

Absent:

Departmental senators: Badaranathi, Berkeley, Ciner, Dworkin, Elikai, Feng, Myers,

Committee chairs: Frierson (IT), Graham (Budget), Hanerfeld (Bookstore), Levy (Advancement), Roscher (Financial Aid), Rosen (Admissions), Sweeney (Library), Veit (Handbook),

Approval of minutes:

November minutes were approved as posted.

Special Order of the Day: Mark Spaulding was unanimously approved for a second term as Senate President, for academic year 2006-07.

Individual reports:

1. **Chancellor Depaolo** forewent her report in light of the heavy agenda for this meeting; the Senate approved the following commendatory resolution:

The Faculty Senate of the University of North Carolina, Wilmington hereby recognizes and thanks Chancellor Rosemary DePaolo for her principled decision to donate all but 2% of her recent raise to UNCW scholarships. The decision to limit her raise to the percentage received by faculty is a welcome statement of solidarity and understanding. This generous donation to student scholarships will also have a meaningful impact on our campus and sends a strong positive message to current students, graduates, and supporters of UNCW.

2. **President Spaulding**

-- introduced Jimmie Reeves, who as senior UNCW delegate to the UNC Faculty Assembly gave a brief report on Assembly activities.

--reported on various curricular changes approved by the Senate President and chair of the UCC Committee as permitted in the Senate Bylaws:

Changes in pre-requisites for following courses:

FST 495 (Oral Competency)  
FST 496 (Oral Competency)  
FST 201 (Computer Competency)  
REC 266 (Computer Competency)
Addition of pre-requisites for:

BIO 240-241 (Basic Studies)

Change in description:

PED 101 (Basic Studies)

3. Old Business:

After five-minute summative presentations delivered by Buildings and Grounds Committee Chair Steve Emslie and Provost Hosier concerning the draft Campus Master Plan to be presented to the UNCW BoT in January, the Senate engaged in an extended, frank and multi-lateral discussion on the merits and demerits of the Master Plan and the committee motion, a discussion that frequently shed light on the subject and came parlously close to addressing the nature and purposes of an American public university in the 21st century. At the point of exhaustion, the Senate defeated 27-26 Motion 2006-03-08:

The Faculty Senate supports a designation of the ‘UNCW Forest Reserve’ comprising ~200 acres of wooded and wetland habitat now present in the back of campus, to be managed for its ecology, educational activities, recreation, and other low-impact uses that will maintain this property as a permanent conservation area.

After a shorter discussion, the Senate approved with one dissent Motion 2006-03-09:

The Faculty Senate supports a university parking policy that promotes a reduction of cars and parking on campus.

Committee reports:

The Senate passed without dissent the following motions from the University Curriculum Committee:

To approve the following new prefixes:

In the Cameron School of Business:

INB to designate all courses within the school with international content.

EBD to designate configuration of already existent courses as Entrepreneurship and Business Development.

Motion 2006-04-10

For African American Studies courses:

Change the Prefix from AFA to AAS

Motion 2006-04-11

For the Department of Foreign Languages and Literature:

RUS for a new series of courses for Russian language study.

Motion 2006-04-12

Approve an existing course as a Basic Studies course:

under E. Natural Sciences and Mathematical Sciences
1. Natural Science
   b. Physical Science

GLY 125 Natural Disasters (3) [non lab course]. Examination of the causes, effects, and options available to mitigate actual disasters, such as earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, landslides, subsidence, flooding, severe weather, and meteorite impacts. Case histories are used to demonstrate scientific principles and socioeconomic issues.

Motion 2006-04-13

Approve RUS 101 & RUS 102, as new Basic Studies courses.

under C. Humanities

4. Language

RUS 101-102 Introductory Russian (3-3). Introduction to Russian language and culture. Emphasis on achievement of an active command of the language through a communicative approach.

Motion 2006-04-14

Approve listing choice of MUS 105 or 106 in Basic Studies.

D. Fine Arts

MUS 105 or 106, 111, ...

Motion 2006-04-15

Approve preexisting course, CLR 301 (3) Basics of Clinical Research, as the computer competency course for the School of Nursing.

Motion 2006-04-16

Approve new course in College of Arts and Science as the oral competency course in Antropology:

ANT 440 Seminar in Southeastern Archaeology (3) Prerequisite: ANT 207 and any 300-level ANT course. Integrates southeastern archaeology, archaeology theory, and contemporary issues in archaeology. Emphasis on the southeast as a regional unit and the interplay of local environment and culture throughout the region.

Motion 2006-04-17

Approve the creation of a new Certificate Program in Creative Writing.

Certificate in Publishing

Requirements for the Certificate in Publishing: 10 hours. Majors only. Current practice, theory, and history of publishing industry taught in conjunction with the UNCW Publishing Laboratory. Requirements include CRW 321 Book and Publishing, CRW 322 Editing Fact and Fiction, CRW 323 Bookbuilding; with three additional elective hours from CRW 324 Special Topics in Publishing [may be repeated twice under different subtitles] or CRW 460 publishing Practicum.

Motion 2006-04-18

Old Business

none
Meeting adjourned at 4:02
Tuesday, 08 November 2005
Meeting 2006-03

Roll Call

Absent:
Departmental senators: Badaranathi (ISOM), Bushman (English), Clifford (English), Dworkin (Psychology), Feng (Math), Gwinn (ISOM), Hargrove (Curricular Stud), Kieber (Chem), Maume (Soc & Crim Just), Simmons (Anthropo).

Committee chairs: Frierson (IT), Graham (Budget), Hanerfeld (Bookstore), Levy (Advancement), Roscher (Financial Aid), Rosen (Admissions), Sweeney (Library), Veit (Handbook).

Approval of minutes

October minutes were approved as posted.

Individual reports

Chancellor's Report

- Chancellor Depaolo reported on UNC President-elect Erskine Bowles' visit to campus, at end of which he said "Wow!" He repeated several times that he knew we were achieving great things with limited resources. He also frequently reiterated that our current campus diversity is unacceptable as is the level of faculty/staff salary and benefits.

President Spaulding's Report

1. In December President of DOT Christa Tillman will be at Senate Meeting, at which meeting we will also have the election of Faculty Senate President for next academic year.
2. The ad hoc Basic Studies Review Committee is still hanging fire; Provost Hosier says that he and the Chancellor have met with the committee and he thinks the Senate will be getting something from them soon.
3. President Spaulding's very personal view is that the University High School issue was not directly addressed by President-elect Bowles, even after being questioned, but that the larger political pressures to follow through with this program are likely ineluctable, so since we will be assimilated, resistance is futile.

Committee reports:

1. ASC:
[Motion 2006-03-03: add Registrar to ASC], That the Registrar be added to the ASC as an ex-officio, non-voting member, passed with one dissent.

- [Motion 2006-03-04: change readmission policy], The Academic Standards Committee moves that the following changes [deletions, additions] be made to the Special Readmission Policy on page 35 of the Undergraduate Catalog 2005-2006:

Special Readmission Policy:

Although the traditional policy for readmission is the norm, the university recognizes that individuals can gain personal and intellectual maturity over a period of years. Hence any former UNCW degree-seeking student whose grade point average was below the current retention standard may apply for special readmission provided the student has been out of school [UNCW] for a minimum of five years and has not attended any other institution since leaving UNCW. Special readmission may be granted only at the time of application for readmission. Special readmission status, once granted, may not be changed. Degree requirements for the student granted special readmission will be those in effect at the time the student re-enrolls. The student’s original academic record will not be altered, and the student will receive academic credit only for past courses in which a grade point average of at least 2.00 was attained. The student’s grade point average will be calculated only for those courses taken subsequent to re-enrollment. Failure to maintain an overall 2.00 grade point average after readmission will result in dismissal from the university. A student may be granted special readmission only once, passed without dissent.

2. UCC:

- The Senate defeated a motion to postpone discussion of [Motion 2006-03-05], Approve two new courses to the catalogue under Basic Studies requirements:

  E. Natural Sciences and Mathematical Sciences
  1. Natural Sciences
     a. Life Science courses

  Bio 140 Human Physiology (3) Introduction to the function of the human body emphasizing basic physiological principles and their relation to current health trends and fads. Three lecture hours per week.

  Bio 140L Human Physiology Laboratory (1) Corequisite: Bio 140 Introduction to the scientific method of inquiry using human physiology as a focus. Three laboratory hours per week, which then passed without dissent.

3. Buildings and Grounds:

- [Motion 2006-03-06], The Faculty Senate supports an ecological management plan of existing natural habitats on the UNCW campus that would promote our mission as good environmental stewards and to ‘study and protect the rich heritage, the quality of life, and the environment of the coastal region’ in which our campus is located, passed without dissent

- [Motion 06-03-07], The Faculty Senate supports a Master Plan that
incorporates this ecological management plan as a defining priority when siting buildings and in developing UNCW as a pedestrian campus, passed without dissent.

- **Motions 2006-03-08** and **2006-03-09** were **carried over** until the November meeting as Old Business.

Adjournment at 3:59
Tuesday, 11 October 2005

Meeting 2006-02

Roll Call

Absent:
Departmental senators: Virginia Adams(NSG), Ann Berkeley(ART), John Clifford(ENG), Steve Dworkin(PSY), Pamela Evers(BUS), Ling He(ISOM), Barbara Honchell(Curricular Studies), Donna Hurdle(SWK), Diane Levy(ADV), Susan McCaffray(HST), Donna McGiboney(FLL), Nelson Reid(GRAD), Thomas Shafer(BIO), Scott Simmons(ANT), Doug Smith(MAT).

Committee chairs: Steve Emslie (Buildings & Grounds), Dargan Frierson(ISOM), Edward Graham(Budget), Arlene Hanerfeld (Bookstore), Richard Roscher(Admissions), Meghan Sweeney(LIB), Richard Veit(Faculty Handbook), David Weber(ART).

Approval of minutes

September minutes were approved as posted.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo: NCNow will feature UNCW scientists promising treatment for cystic fibrosis. We must work together on the 7 goals of Strategic Plan, especially as we approach our capital campaign. Unfortunately, campuses have very little control over one of these items, salary increases. Steve Pullum asked how we will measure faculty involvement in global citizenship. Provost Hosier answered that we will support that. For instance, the provost's office has added money to International Programs for faculty travel. The Planning Council has worked hard to achieve this goal.

2. Senate President Mark Spaulding reported that the web page is being updated. For instance, a draft of the Master Plan is linked there. The Building and Grounds Committee is in discussion with the Provost on Master Plan issues. They will be sending the plan to The Board of Trustees in January. Provost Hosier pointed out that since now the Plan is public and linked, everyone has an opportunity to review it. Trustees will see the preferred alternative in October, which in its general contours is pretty complete. Senator Olsen asked if there is evidence that faculty input has resulted in changes, or have we been primarily reacting? The Provost responded that there have been many public venues for commenting. He wondered if the Plan's web site should have a space for comments on webpage but reiterated that it's pretty fixed in its current state.

President Spaulding continued: We will soon have the aggregated RTP
policy and procedure changes posted, and they will go to trustees later this month. There is a change in the membership of the University RPT Committee- Sarah Messer is replaced by Joann Mount. The Senate Research Committee has taken over awarding Cahill Grants on an experimental basis. We should be seeing part of the ad hoc Basic Studies Committee's recommendations in November. We will initiate a Face Page: Senators may elect to use existing UNCW photos., have one made on 11/8, or not use one at all.

Committee reports:

1. Sharon Boyd of the Parking Committee reports that in 2001 we commissioned a traffic and parking study. Commuter students and faculty/staff were identified as the stakeholders most impacted by growth in traffic, in that order. By fall, '04 we had addressed that shortfall, but current construction has taken 383 spaces from students, some having been shifted to faculty/staff. New nearby properties will add 302 net spaces. So, our parking fee increase will be smaller (31% instead of 70%). Business Affairs still has many ideas in play, with new ones coming in all the time.

2. Bob Blundo of the UCC introduced Raymond Burt from Academic affairs, who chairs a planning committee charged for one year to explore an early college high school. Burt pointed out that it will not be a traditional high school, but that it will address address a problem; existing schools are not addressing our current social and economic needs. 40% of current 9th graders don't graduate, in part because they slip though the cracks in large schools. This problem of graduation rates echoes through community colleges and universities. Business leaders want a better-educated work force. Anticipated reforms include high schools of fewer than 400 students to allow teacher/student relationships to develop; relevant subject topics; schools focused on technology, health care or early college enrollment. We foresee students on campus for two years of high school classes taught by NHC teachers, then they would become UNCW students for 60 transferrable hours. This means we would have ~200 students sprinkled through Basic Studies classes and would therefore need close to 13 new faculty lines. As a result of the ensuing discussion of various advantages and disadvantages associated with any such high school, a burbling hubbub arose. The funding grant mandates that these plans need to implemented this fall, since students need to be identified by February, 2006.

Stemming from this discussion, the senate passed the following motion offered by the Steering Committee, with one dissent:

That UNCW undertake no obligations regarding the establishment of a University High School without the consent of the Faculty Senate.

[Motion 2006-02-02: Contemplate University High School]

President Spaulding adjourned the meeting at 3:58 pm.

Minutes by Dan Noland, Senate Secretary
Roll Call

Absent:
Departmental senators: Badarinathi (ISOM), Berry (PAR), Bushman (ENG), Ciner (BUS), Dworkin (PSY), Gwinn (ISOM) He (ISOM), Hurdle (Social Work), Mahar, Steve (ISOM), Messer (CRW), Monohan (FST)

Committee chairs: Frierson (Information Technology), Hanerfeld (Bookstore), Roscher (Financial Aid), Sweeney (Library), Veit (Handbook)

Approval of minutes

September minutes were approved as posted.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo asked Provost Hosier to report on faculty pay raises. A total of close to 3% is available to each UNCW college, apportioned by the number of positions on Budget Document 119. Each individual faculty member must get at least $850; the remaining money will be pooled and distributed by merit. Departmental chairs may choose to give any unfilled positions in their department $850 or add that money to filled positions. Provost Hosier assured the Senate that administrators are keenly aware of the ongoing need to augment faculty salaries. Chancellor DePaolo added that a committee of the UNC Board of Governors is looking at campus-based tuition in toto, including its relation to salaries. Moreover, the Office of the President’s peer institution plan will give UNCW bases of comparison for salaries.

Sharon Boyd, Associate Vice-chancellor for Business Affairs, reported that, since UNCW is now at its parking capacity, we need to expand parking resources. Her office is trying to encourage alternate methods of coming to campus, including shuttle buses, bicycles and feet. UNCW will try to keep surface lots out of the campus core, moving them to the periphery. Since we are promoting a pedestrian campus core with peripheral parking, the site near Trask Coliseum was chosen for the parking deck; UNCW can also realize special events revenue at that location. Building this deck will cost approximately $12 million for 600 spaces; funding this cost has lead to an increase in faculty parking fees of between $110 and $120, phased in over two years. In the face of bracingly high costs, Business Affairs is actively looking for other parking options. On a related topic, a surface parking lot will be built near the Cultural Arts Building. The subject of parking
occasioned polite but vexed exchanges about the location of lots, which existing lots might be devoted to "higher uses," whether or not and how much faculty should pay for added parking or for parking at all. Associate VC Boyd agreed to meet with the Faculty Welfare Committee to discuss these issues and will address the Faculty Senate before any final decisions, as long as that is feasible.

2. Senate President Mark Spaulding reported that any Honorary Degree nominations should be sent to the Academic Standards Committee. The ad hoc Basic Studies Review Committee approaches the end of its work and may send some piece of its recommendations to the Senate for the October meeting. Andy Jackson (Psychology) will chair an ad hoc committee on standards and processes for promoting Research Faculty. The University High School Committee will have its report to the University Curriculum Committee in time for it to submit a report at the October Senate meeting. In a surprise to no one, UNC faculty members will not be seated on the system's Presidential Search Committee. The NC General assembly will allow an investigation into alternatives to the State Health Care Plan, but UNC faculty will not be separated from other State employees.

Committee reports

1. Buildings and Grounds chair Steve Emslie (Biology) reported that the campus Master Planners have not chosen the planning option preferred by the Buildings and Grounds committee, one incorporating reduced on-campus parking to allow for more habitat conservation. B&G member Cara Cilano (English) added that the B&G Committee is really interested in a plan that would reduce parking on campus and increasing alternative transportation, since according to projections we will be adding between 3500 and 4500 new spaces over the next ten years. Emslie reported that many species of interest are even now living in the back of campus and that the new student housing being built does not follow the Green Dorm concept. B&G member Gregory Chandler (Biology) added that the environmental study done at the behest of the Master Plan consultants was not very informed or thorough. More animated discussion followed, resulting in Emslie offering a motion from the Buildings and Grounds Committee. The Senate suspended its rules (vote 31-12) to consider the following motion, which had not appeared on the agenda for today's meeting [Motion 2006-01-01: Master Plan Revision]:

Given that the UNCW Faculty Senate recognizes our role as a university in being a leader in the local community and a model for good environmental stewardship in a rapidly expanding urban region,

Given the acknowledgement that UNCW has promoted itself as an "arboretum" campus,

And given that our Mission Statement includes the premise that UNCW seeks to "study and protect the environment of the coastal region in which it is located":

The Faculty Senate is opposed to any Master Plan design for growth at UNCW that does not include a significant reduction of cars allowed on campus and a sound plan to prevent further loss of the many natural habitats remaining on our campus. To these ends, we fully
support the recommendations by the Building & Grounds Committee to phase out undergraduate parking on campus over several years, site all new buildings on existing parking lots, and design new housing units following a more "green" concept.

More animated discussion ensued, after which the Senate voted to return the motion to the Buildings and Grounds Committee with the understanding that the Provost and other knowledgeable parties would confer with B&G before the October Senate meeting.

Old Business

President Spaulding reported that the Senate Steering Committee will decide on the specific procedures for deciding on Veit Award recipients [include link to motion in April minutes here] and that Chancellor DePaolo and Provost Hosier have added a one-time stipend of $1000 to the boundless esteem any such recipient would reap.

Adjournment

President Spaulding adjourned the meeting at 4:02 pm.

Minutes by Dan Noland, Senate Secretary

Maintained by L. Palmer (palmerl@uncw.edu)

Copyright Notice  |  About this Site
Tuesday, 18 April 2006
Meeting 2006-08

Meeting called to order at 2:03

Roll Call:

Absent:
Departmental senators: Badaranathi, Bennett, Ciner, Dworkin, Elikai, Evers, Gwinn, Hungerford, Hurdle, Sideman, Simmons, Stiles,

Committee chairs: Blundo, Frierson, Roscher, Rosen, Veit, Weber,

March minutes were approved as posted.

Individual reports

1. **Chancellor DePaolo** reported that:
   a. the Watson School of Education had successfully passed all six NCATE standards without any recommendations, making it the only UNC school to do so.
   b. New UNC President Erskine Bowles stressed in his inauguration that the system will place an emphasis on K-12 education, especially in science and math, and that UNC will partner with the State's community colleges to create an education economy.
   c. The Early College Initiative has revived, UNCW and the NC Governor's office have agreed to an off-campus site, and Raymond Burt will welcome any and all faculty assistance and contributions.

2. **Senate President Mark Spaulding** reported that:
   a. He will forward to the Provost a faculty name for service on the Diversity Climate Survey Committee.

Committee reports

1. **Bookstore Committee**:
   a. [Motion 06-08-27], That UNCW increase its annual contribution to bookstore scholarships from $2,750/year to $10,000/year, this latter figure representing approximately 5% of UNCW's annual revenue from bookstore activities, **passed without dissent**.
   b. [Motion 06-08-28], That the Senate approve a reassignment of Bookstore Scholarships to academic units as shown in attachment; amended to allocate the number of scholarships **per capita** by academic major in 2006-2007, with a report to the Senate from Institutional Resources on the matter in September, 2006, **passed**.

2. Ed Graham, chair of the **Budget Committee**, reported that UNCW students endorsed the idea that 3% of their tuition increase should go to help fund faculty raises.
3. Eddie Caropreso, chair of the Evaluation Committee, reported on progress being made to fulfill the three goals articulated in the January, 2006 minutes.

4. Diane Levy, chair of the Advancement Committee, reported that total pledges to the Faculty-Staff campaign are up, but that participation is still only ~25%, an embarrassingly low level in light of the upcoming capital Campaign.

5. Steering Committee:
   a. [Motion 06-08-29], That UNCW establish the Richard Veit Award for Contributions to Shared Governance and Academic Freedom with the following provisions:

   criterion: This is an occasional award for extraordinary service in shared governance and academic freedom.

   eligibility: any member of UNCW community, excluding current officers of UNCW Faculty Senate; no one may receive the award more than once.

   process: confidential, written nominations may be submitted at any time to the Steering Committee of the UNCW Faculty Senate; a single nomination endorsed by 2/3 of Steering Committee will be presented to the UNCW Faculty Senate for consideration in executive session; a majority vote by secret ballot in the Senate confers the award.

   award: recipients will receive a one-time award of $1,000 from the university; their names will be recorded, passed without dissent.

6. The Department of Earth Sciences, Geography and Geology offered [Motion 06-08-30], That the Senate postpone discussion on changing Basic Studies until the campus generates sufficient assessment data on individual programs and on Basic Studies, based on the campus-wide assessment initiative, to determine the need for basic studies reform and its impact on existing programs; it failed.

Old Business

none

President Spaulding recessed the meeting until 2:00 p.m, May 2.

Minutes by Dan Noland, Senate Secretary
Tuesday, 21 March 2006
Meeting 2006-07

Roll Call

Absent:
Departmental senators:
Committee chairs:

February minutes were approved.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo's reports
   - Congratulations to the UNCW Basketball Program.
   - Bowles presented non-budget legislative agenda on 3/20/06.
   - Budget for Short session getting finalized.
   - UNCW included in teacher prep.
   - Our proposal for fast-tracking teachers is already in the Budget.
   - Higher level of Graduate tuition waivers.
   - Capital Budget-UNCW's Nursing School Building number one.
   - Equity Funding-Bowles doesn't understand why.
   - UNCW is still, after MALSA 7 million, the most underfunded school in the system.
   - Open Forums(March 23 and 28th). Chancellor will discuss various measures of progress.
   - Senator Burr wanted Federal Funding requests prioritized at system level. CORMP is #3.
   - Cindy Larson, from GA is new director of UNCW Marketing and Communication. She will help us move forward at an ever faster rate.
   - NSSE & FSSE forums at the last two days provided much valuable information.
   - Money from NCAA Bball tournament goes to... what part of UNCW?

2. Paul Hosier's moment on Basic Studies
   - Commends ad hoc committee
   - 06-07-26 addresses questions of University's identity, which should be our focus as we discuss Basic Studies. What is unique here? What attitudes, knowledge, skills does faculty want students to have? We have had historic landmarks:
     - Learning from full-time faculty, included in Basic Studies through ? now often not the case.
     - students engaged in scholarship, so they graduate with that set of skills (active learning experience).
   - Assessment will flow from the "ideals", and so far our assessment looks at majors.
3. **President Spaulding** reported that:
   - **William Fleming**, Director of Human Resources- on Healthcare
   - Open enrollment now in late May-June 30!, but UNCW will help faculty complete elections by end of final exams.
   - No late decisions allowed!
   - List of physicians on website.
   - Mike Walker- New Dean of Students
   - ad.hoc Committee for Promotion of Research Faculty still working, but without current procedures and one Faculty mentor languishing; Provost and Steering Committee decided he could be reappointed at Associate level.
   - Assembly Delegates: Pullum pulled out, so Noland, Reeves and Hunt.
   - Elections for 3 autonomous committees/ please attend to nomination ballot, especially chairs.

**Committee reports**

1. **Budget Committee** report moved to April
2. **Athletic Council** Bill Bolduc and Tammy Hunt (Chair of the Athletic Council)
   - UNCW 2nd to William and Mary on CAA
   - 6 yr graduation rate at 80%, which puts us 1st in UNC System, 86% if you count athletes who have transferred and graduate elsewhere. Their overall GPA 3.296 critical of Academic success
3. **Bookstore Committee** Arlene Hanerfeld reports that they met 5 times; learned lots; buy-back before exams, cost of rental options for textbooks, distance ed. students timely book getting. Large revenues from Bookstore to Auxiliary Services. UNCW gets 9.1% 5-6 million and we provide and 10.5% 5-6 million to maintain space.

   Senior management decided to give 1 million to athletic scholarships in 2002, 1 million to student union in 2003 and 250,000/yr for debt on new student union building. Full details linked via webpage.

4. **Academic Standards** Committee recommends that the following statement be added to the 2005-2006 Undergraduate Catalogue as the last paragraph in the departmental honors section, page 104.):

   If a student must withdraw from the honors project (499), the faculty supervisor must notify the honors director as soon as possible and indicate the reason for the withdrawal. In consultation with the honors director, the supervisor may recommend that the student receive partial credit (0-3 hours total) for any work completed in the form of Directed Individual Study (491).

   [Motion 06-07-24]
   Passed

5. **Steering Committee** offers the following motions:
   a. That the Senate create a standing committee on Basic Studies called the Basic Studies Committee, with the following duties and membership:

   **Duties:** To review existing and proposed content of Basic Studies curriculum and catalog copy. To coordinate efforts to refine Basic Studies offerings to promote the academic mission of the university. To work with academic units to ensure that Basic Studies courses are offered on a reasonable and regular basis.
**Membership:** Nine faculty members, including at least four from the College of Arts and Sciences and at least one from each of the professional schools, and two other from the faculty at large. Term of membership shall be three years with staggered term so that one-third of the committee terms expire in a given year. A member may serve a second consecutive term. At the initial Fall meeting the Committee shall elect a vice-chair who will normally assume the role of chair in the following year. The chief academic officer, the Dean of the University College, and a representative from the library faculty shall be ex-officio non-voting members.  

[Motion 06-07-25]  
Passed  

b. That the Senate endorse the following portion of the Basic Studies Revision Task Force Proposal from Spring 2006:  

Students who complete the Core Curriculum will:  

1. acquire the academic skills needed to locate, evaluate, and use information;  
2. understand the basic values of academic life at the university level;  
3. be able to think and express themselves critically in speech and writing in relation to the broader questions of knowledge and value raised in the arts, sciences, and humanities;  
4. be able to communicate and express themselves clearly in speech and writing in a foreign language;  
5. know how to examine problems from quantitative, qualitative, and scientific perspectives;  
6. understand and respect diversity among people of different racial, ethnic, religious, and cultural backgrounds;  
7. understand the disciplinary and ethical responsibilities of active citizenship in an increasingly global society.  

[Motion 06-07-26]  
Passed by vote 28 in favor, 18 opposed  

Old Business  

Adjournment  

President Spaulding adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.  

*Minutes by Dan Noland, Senate Secretary*
Tuesday, 21 February 2006
Meeting 2006-06

Meeting called to order at 2:06

Absent:
Departmental Senators: Badaranathi, BerkeleyCutting, DePaolo, Dworkin, Gwinn, He, Honchell, Maume, Pullum, Reilly, Shafer, Simmons
Committee Chairs: Frierson, Hanerfeld, Levy, Roscher, Rosen, Veit

The January minutes were approved.

Individual Reports:

1. President Spaulding reported that:
   • Dargan Frierson has been appointed as a Senate representative to the Search Committee for ITSD Vice-chancellor.
   • It is not true as rumored that students will not be required to go to their departmental advisors to register under the new Banner system, since departments will be sent "alternative PINS" for each of their majors.
   • The Department of Public Service and Continuing Studies is not offering Summer School classes for credit; it is advertising them only.
   • The Bookstore Committee and Athletic Council will make reports to the Senate in March.

2. Faculty Assembly Delegate Reeves reported about new UNC President Erskine Bowles:
   • that he will solicit faculty input, genuinely and actively,
   • that he is well aware that faculty compensation is a critical matter and that NC Health Care Benefits are inadequate,
   • that he is unilaterally disarming in any state-wide resources or power competition between UNC, the Community College and K-12 systems,
   • and that faculty will have more influence in the Office of the President.

Nominations for Faculty Assembly Delegates:
Tammy Hunt, Jimmy Reeves, Steve Pullum and Dan Noland were named as nominees for the three delegate positions opening next year.

Committee Reports:

1. The following motions from the University Curriculum Committee passed without dissent:
A. That, effective July 1, 2006, the Watson School of Education be reorganized to consist of four separate departments:

Department of Early Childhood and Special Education
Department of Elementary, Middle Level and Literacy Education
Department of Instructional Technology, Foundations and Secondary Education
Department of Educational Leadership

[Motion 2006-06-20]

B. That, effective July 1, 2007, two new departments in the Cameron School of Business be created out of the existing Department of Management and Marketing:

Department of Management
Department of Marketing

[Motion 2006-06-21]

C. That the following courses be approved for addition to Basic Studies under:

C. Humanities
   1. Literature

PRT 210. Literature of the Portuguese-Speaking World in Translation: Topics (3). Representative works from the literature of Portuguese-speaking countries in Africa, Europe, and South America. Readings and class discussions in English. May be repeated under a different subtitle.

[Motion 2006-06-22]

F. Social and Behavioral Sciences

COM 220. Interpersonal Communications (3). An introduction to the theory and practice of communication in face-to-face situations. Focus upon improving everyday interpersonal communication skills through understanding verbal, nonverbal, and relational processes.

COM 104. Concepts in Communication Studies (3). Introduction to communication concepts central to interpersonal relationships, organizations, mass media and other contexts of communication. Focus on concepts and skills that have a practical impact on the student's understanding and practice of communication. Designed specifically for students not intending on becoming communication study majors. This course does count for basic studies but does not count toward completion of the COM major.

COM 160. Media Literacy (3). Exploration of the structures, systems, effects, conventions and genres of contemporary mass media. Emphasis is on critical and educated consumption of mass media. This course does count for basic studies but does not count toward completion of the COM major.

[Motion 2006-06-23]

2. The ad hoc Basic Studies Review Committee took a series of information-gathering question from the floor of the Senate to
facilitate deliberations in future meetings:

Q. Will the capstone course be more like UNI 101 or what?
A. They could be in addition to the capstones for majors, and who will teach them is part of the next step in the process.
Q. Will there be enough resources?
A. The Chancellor told us not to concern ourselves with that issue.
Q. Who will decide which course counts for what part of Basic Studies?
A. If the report is approved by the Senate, a new Basic Studies oversight committee will be charged to make those decisions.
Q. Are there criteria for all sub-categories?
A. If they don't already exist, the follow-up committee will make them.
Q. What data did the committee consider, and what problems were you trying to fix? Were employers consulted?
A. Besides looking at aspirant and benchmark institutions, various members of the committee freely consulted any other university in the country. Since we are not trying to address social problems, we did not consult prospective employers; we focused on what it takes to be a UNCW version of an educated person.
Q. Could the three writing courses be from one's major?
A. Yes.
Q. Has required English Composition been reduced from two course to one?
A. Yes, but the change will allow for a reduction in class size per section and therefore superior instruction, and the new Eng 110 will be much more writing intensive.
Q. Not all classes that involve writing grade writing, so will, for example, Physics Labs have to start grading writing?
A. Writing intensive classes should assign 50% of the grade on written work, even though there may be no formal writing instruction in such a class.
Q. What about Professional School students, who already have capstone courses—will those courses have enrollment caps for majors only?
A. The Chancellor will have to find ways to enact this new program, if approved by the Senate.

There were some other items, but these are the meatiest, in the tardy Secretary's estimation.

President Spaulding adjourned the meeting at 3:40.

Minutes by Dan Noland, Senate Secretary
Tuesday, 17 January 2006
Meeting 2006-05

Roll Call

Absent:

Departmental senators: Badaranathi, Black, Blundo, Ciner, Hurdle, Kieber, Mahar, Noland, Scott.

Committee chairs: Frierson (IT), Hanerfeld (Bookstore), Levy (Advancement), Roscher (Financial Aid), Rosen (Admissions), Veit (Handbook)

Approval of minutes

December minutes were approved as posted.

Individual reports

1. Chair of the UNCW Board of Trustees, Krista Tillman

Ms. Tillman introduced herself to the Faculty Senate and provided a brief summary of her background. She stated that she has come to understand how important UNCW is to the entire state, and that it is an honor and a challenge to represent this university. Her priorities are as follows:

1. Funding—her primary goal is more from the state, more from the community (endowments are way too low). She also stated that this money needs to go to increasing faculty salaries.
2. Support and assist the Chancellor and the Chancellor’s primary staff. She feels her responsibility is to provide oversight and guidance, particularly with an eye toward managed growth and its issues.

2. Chancellor Depaolo

Expressed her personal thanks to Ms. Tillman, who is “known as the one who asks the most probing questions.”

Insight into Erskin Bowles’ governance to date. The Chancellor states that his ideal is to “…shape everything around how to get more North Carolinians a higher education.” There is already more participation from chancellors in determining priorities, which are currently as follows:

1. Enrollment growth funding should be part of the system automatically, rather than an annual discussion.
2. Faculty salaries.
3. Increase number of nurses and teachers that we graduate.
The Board of Trustees has approved a tuition increase. A maximum of $322 on tuition and fees, combined, has been established. The Chancellor has two aims for this additional funding:

- To use the full capacity of the tuition increase in conjunction with recent money increase.
- To use this money as a means of raising faculty salaries (currently our only means).

At this point, the Chancellor turned the presentation on tuition increase to Kay Ward, who stated that the committee recommended a $293 tuition increase, for a total of 3.1 million increase in revenue. The difference between the maximum tuition and fees increase of $322 and the requested $293 increase is the $29 increase in student fees.

In discussion, Denise DiPuccio stated concern over benefits, especially health insurance costs. The Chancellor responded that this is a State issue that is currently under scrutiny.

3. President Spaulding:

Began by praising Ed Graham for his work on the Tuition Committee and the Senate Budget Committee. He stated that this is an example where faculty governance can, and did, make a difference. This is an opportunity to “pat the process on the back.”

Our number of Faculty Assembly delegates has been raised from three to four. We will solicit nominations for these positions in February.

Basic Studies: proposal sent via email. Discussion for the purpose of clarification to be held at February meeting, deliberation to begin in March.

Introduction to Faculty Senate of Steve Demski of the Division for Public Service and Continuing Education. Demski states that their purpose is to advocate for community engagement, and to help locate funding.

Introduction of Adrian Sherman, Office of International Programs, who states that their goal is to internationalize education and globalize the community. His main initiative is the development of a new series of exchange relationships for faculty, with a goal of 25 new study abroad programs. Will be bringing to the next Dean’s meeting a new tier of funding for international research, with funding for up to 3 years. He wants to establish a Title VI internationalization grant committee for Arts & Sciences. A student passport drive will be held next month, with a lottery held for a ticket to study abroad. There is also an ongoing recruitment drive for international students in Mexico, Brazil, India, Turkey, and Asia in general.

Committee Reports

1. The Evaluation Committee has worked/is working on the following:

   1. Update Senate web page (forward suggestions to caropresoe@uncw.edu)
   2. Technology Support & Enhancement—SPOT
modification forms via email
3. Revised SPOT review and assessment—design data analysis and interpretation, additional data collection procedures, and reporting and communication strategies

In discussion, a problem was pointed out by Reid Toth. Apparently there is a 7-pt scale for regular classes, a 5-pt scale for online courses, yet the statistics are being lumped together in a way that skews the results.

2. The following Academic Standards Committee motion passed:

That the following be substituted as paragraph 4 of the RETENTION, DISMISSAL AND READMISSION section on page 78 of the Undergraduate Catalogue 2005-2006:

Students who have been declared academically ineligible for the first time may seek administrative review of mitigating circumstances for authorization to continue with their studies on a conditional basis. Students seeking a review must submit the required appeal form and a written statement outlining their circumstances to the appropriate dean. This process must be completed prior to the beginning of the semester in which such students wish to enroll. [Motion 2006-05-19]

Discussion: This motion will work in conjunction with a new form created by CAS in order to formalize the appeal process.

Old Business:

none

Announcements:

Provost Hosier: 99.14% of the grades for Fall 2005 were posted on time.

Meeting adjourned at 3:20.

Minutes by Lavonne Adams(substituting for Dan Noland, Senate Secretary)
Tuesday, 16 January 2007
2:00 p.m., EB 162
Meeting 2007-05
Meeting called to order at 2:04

Roll Call:
Absent:
Departmental Senators: Evers (ACG), Gill (EDU), Habibi (PAR), Huntsman (GGY/GGL), King (SOC), Morling (CRW), Murrell (PAR), Salwen (MUS), Sawrey (PSY), Schuhmann (ECN), Stiles (MGT), Walters (NSG)

Committee Chairs: Brenner (Student Affairs), Frierson (Information Technology), Gerard (Advancement), Lowery (Bookstore)

Clark (Dean), Roer (Dean)

December minutes were approved as posted.

Individual Reports:
1. Chancellor DePaolo

Chancellor DePaolo informed the Senate that the budget task force, chaired by Bob Tyndall, has come up with a number of recommendations that will soon be available on the web. She noted that they did excellent work: their suggestions will make the budget more transparent and strategic.

The Chancellor reminded the Senate that President Bowles has set up faculty groups and external groups to work throughout the next year and a half. Their charge will be to figure out what North Carolina needs from its universities in the next 20 years. They will be looking at faculty salaries, grants, research issues, faculty productivity, retention, graduation rates (four- and six-year), and distance education, among other things. The Chancellor said that President Bowles knows UNCW has high space utilization; he recognizes that space issues are tied to under-funding.

She then discussed the presentation by the College Foundation of North Carolina. As their presentation revealed, Federal Aid does not look at whether or not a student is working while going to college. CFNC, however, wants students to work and encourages them to do so.

She acknowledged the $1 Million in scholarships recently made possible by the generosity of philanthropists.

Lastly, she discussed aspects of our agreement with community colleges: currently, if a student graduates with an Associate’s Degree and a B average, UNCW will admit him/her. This is, she noted, a state agreement. (Discussion ensued.)

2. President’s Report

President Spaulding told the Senate that he has sent a note to the new basic studies committee. They will provide a brief oral presentation at every Senate meeting and a written report at the end of the semester.

He reminded the faculty of issues that will be on the agenda in future meetings including a possible blending of schools and departments into a school of health and the relationship between academic directors/deans and their departments.

He noted that the process of taking RTP pages and putting them together in two forms (one with changes recorded, one in standard format) is ongoing. The document will go to the trustees in April.

Committee Reports:
1. Search Committee
Becky Porterfield reported on the status of the search for a new Assistant Provost in the Office of International Programs: the committee has begun its work, and Cathy Barlow is chair. There are currently 87 applicants; the position announcement is on the website. Timeline: They will try to have someone in place by May 2007.

Old Business: none
New Business: none

Meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

Minutes by Meghan Sweeney, Senate Secretary
Tuesday, 12 September 2006  
Meeting 2007-01

Meeting called to order at 2:05

Roll Call:

Absent:
Departmental senators: He (ISOM), Satterlie (BIO)

Committee chairs: Hanerfeld (Bookstore), Levy (Advancement), Veit (Handbook)

Elections: Proceeded to ballot

Individual reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo

There were a few clarifications from the fall faculty meeting:

*Assessing Diversity: The number of minority students is not going up significantly. However, students who check “other” on their application or who leave the box blank is going up significantly (up 80% this past year).

*Average salary: Last year the average salary was $65,000. This year it is $71,000. The Chancellor stressed that these figures must keep going up.

2. Provost Paul Hosier

Isaac Bear Early College (IBEC) High School Report

Last year, UNCW began thinking more seriously about this issue. Space was an overriding concern. In May, the Board of Education agreed to approve an off-campus site, which allowed plans to move ahead.

Highlights of the IBEC plans:

*School is a New Hanover County school, not a part of UNCW.

*Costs (including instruction, fees, and utilities) are covered by NHC school tuition.

*Site adjacent to campus was chosen. State will give $500,000 to purchase modular buildings at this site.

Questions for Provost Hosier and Associate Provost Burt from
members of the Senate:

Q: How will we staff the program?
A: New Hanover County schools have decided to hire high school teachers for this year and next to serve as faculty. After students have had two years of schooling, they will come to campus to obtain 60 hours of college credit. The plan is to integrate students into the classroom. It is estimated that that approximately 5 additional faculty lines will be needed to serve these students.

Q: How many students will there be?
A: 400 students, 100 per class. 200 will be taking classes on campus at any given time.

Q: (regarding point 22 of the IBEC Memorandum): What happens when there is a conflict between UNCW policy and high school policy? (For example: field trips or films. Would permission slips be required?)
A: This is an issue that will have to be worked out by a faculty committee.

Q: After two years, would students receive a diploma?
A: This is another issue for the faculty committee to discuss. Students will not be allowed to take UNCW classes if they are not prepared. They will also follow our academic calendar.

Q: Do you have information about the student profile?
A: It is not simply an elite group, but it is not a group of low performers. 60% come from families who didn’t attend university; 30% received free or reduced lunches. 64 are Caucasian; 33 are minority.

Q: Will students be taking upper-division classes?
A: Students will be taking lower-division basic studies classes.

Q: Will there be an assessment to determine readiness?
A: This hasn’t been worked out fully, but we will be the ones to decide. (Spaulding refers the Senate to point #15 of the IBEC Memorandum).

Q: Will there be a protocol for disruptive students?
A: Students will be held to the code of conduct. Faculty members will not need to become “bailiffs.”

Q: What are the track records of other programs?
A: There are many programs throughout North Carolina and elsewhere, but these programs have not been in place for a long time.

Q: Who will be in charge of this tremendous responsibility?
A: Part of the grant includes hiring a liaison. Moreover, some of the faculty members at the school have already had good track records at UNCW, which will be a help.

Q: Will students have a choice of basic studies?
A: The faculty committee will look at this.

Plans should move ahead soon and students will be in the modular units in the spring.
*Last spring, there was concern about forest land development including the ropes course that was installed. (Specifically: how did it get there?) Now, there is an agreement that if any cutting is to be done, those who are responsible must communicate with officials.

*Each year salary data is put on the web. Faculty will be alerted to the location of the data.

3. President Mark Spaulding reported the results of elections.

Vice President: Steve Pullam
Secretary: Meghan Sweeney
Steering Committee: Sue Cody, Gene Tagliarini, Eddie Caropresso, Andy Jackson

President Spaulding remarked that the Senate would resume discussion of basic studies in October.

He noted that there have been two resignations from the RTP committee. According to the bylaws, the elections officer should conduct a special election. This creates a problem, since the RTP committee needs to meet soon. Spaulding suggested that, since the bylaws cannot be suspended, the Senate amend the bylaws, which can be done with “previous notice.”

Ken Gurganus raised concerns about this procedure. He suggested that we should determine the proper protocol. At issue: What constitutes “previous notice”?

Committee reports

1. Academic Standards: Russ Herman, Chair

   - The Academic Standards Committee offer the following motion: That the senate approve the following additions (underscored) and deletions (struck through) to the UNCW Repeat Policy: [Motion 07-01-01]

   repeating of courses – current policy – page 80-81, undergraduate catalogue 2006-2007

   students who receive a grade of "C" (2.00) or better in a course may not repeat the course but may audit without credit. students who repeat a course in which they have earned credit or for which transfer credit has been awarded, will have the status changed to audit during the term the course is repeated.

   students who receive a grade below a “C” (2.00) in a course taken at UNCW may repeat the course at UNCW. For the first five different times a student repeats courses repeated the previous grade and hours of credit for the repeated course will not be used in calculating the student's grade point average and hours toward graduation. All grades shall remain on the student's transcript.

   In interpreting the policy it is to be understood that:

   1. the term "first five different courses" means
a. that the policy is automatically operative for a student the first time that the student repeats a course and continues through the fifth time a student repeats a course, and

b. that the five repeats may involve five different courses or fewer courses repeated more than once;

2. a student may go beyond 5 course repeats, but such repeats will not enjoy the privilege of the policy;

3. all students will be able to enjoy the benefits of this policy irrespective of prior course repeat activity;

4. this policy does not govern the repeating of graduate courses (see the Graduate Catalogue for the appropriate policy).

Students enrolled in a special topics course for a grade replacement must enroll in the same topic for which they originally received an unsatisfactory grade.

Note: A failing grade received owing to admitted or adjudicated academic dishonesty shall not be replaced if the course is repeated. Both the penalty grade and the new grade shall appear on the student's transcript and count in the student's grade point average. A student may not appeal the policy stated in this paragraph to any faculty or administrative level.

Discussion:
Concern: Should we limit our policy to freshman? What about transfer students?
Concern: What about students taking the same course 3-4 times?
The faculty discussed the “Note” and raised questions about current policies.
Spaulding reminded Senators to direct questions about policy to Russ Herman.
Motion carried.

Old Business: none

New Business:

Ken Gurganus offered the following motion [07-01-02] to amend the Senate by-laws, “Election procedures for autonomous faculty committees,” point 13, as follows:

If a member of an autonomous faculty committee resigns after the beginning of the final semester of service, that vacancy is not filled. Otherwise the Elections Officer conducts a special election starting with step 3. Steering Committee will appoint the next highest vote-getter from the appropriate division in the most recent election. Persons so elected shall serve the unexpired term and shall not be, on this account, disqualified from candidacy in the subsequent regular election.

Call for division of the house. Because this was a change in the bylaws, it required a two-thirds vote. 58 were in favor of the motion and the motion carried.
President Spaulding adjourned the meeting at 3:30

Minutes by Meghan Sweeney, Senate Secretary

Maintained by L. Palmer (palmer@uncw.edu)

Copyright Notice | About this Site
Tuesday, 17 October 2006
Meeting 2007-02

Meeting called to order at 2:01

Roll Call:

Absent:
Departmental senators: Richard Dillaman (BIO), Ling He (ISOM), Sam Murrell (PAR), Curt Stiles (MGT)

Committee chairs: Philip Gerard (Advancement), Donna Hurdle (Public Service), Roger Lowry (Bookstore), Dick Veit (Handbook)

September minutes were approved as posted.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo

• Chancellor DePaolo introduced Debra Saunders-White, Vice Chancellor, Information Technology Systems

• The Chancellor discussed President Erskine Bowles’s historic decision to cap student fees and tuition at 6.5 percent, which will make planning easier for students and parents. She noted that the reason UNCW has had to raise fees is because of low state appropriation. Now, tuition will be tied to state appropriation, and the onus is on the general assembly. She praised President Bowles for gathering an impressive amount of data to bring to this discussion.

• Currently, the second iteration of the expansion budget is being created; it will go to the Board of Governors for November’s meeting. The Chancellor expressed hope that the process will become ever more transparent. One critical piece that is not included is the continued piece of equity funding, which the President has said he is committed to.

• The Chancellor reminded the Senate of the October 26th reception with Board of Trustees at Kenan House. This is an informal gathering without a specific agenda.

2. Faculty Assembly Delegate Jimmy Reeves

• Delegate Reeves noted that the Faculty Assembly is now an important institution. He emphasized that President Bowles has a clear agenda and strategy. Two of Bowles’s most important goals are to raise faculty salaries and to address student tuition/ student aid. He has made it clear that if the legislature comes up with money, tuition will
drop. Moreover, 10% of General Administration has been cut and President Bowles is asking that other cuts be made.

• For more information, please see the full minutes of the Faculty Assembly meeting:
  http://uncfacultyassembly.northcarolina.edu/html/minutes/sep06.htm

• Chancellor DePaolo reminded faculty that President Bowles has a number of points he is going to measure, including retention and graduation rates and alumni giving; we will be held accountable in the fall. The fact that we already have performance measures was impressive to him. President of the Senate Spaulding

President Spaulding reported that the Board of Governors approved RPT changes submitted approximately a year ago. There will be merely a few small items to clean up.

Q: Will the old guidelines will be enforced until the fall of 2007?

A (Provost Hosier): Yes.

Committee reports

1. Curriculum Committee:

   a. The following motion [Motion 07-02-03] was passed without discussion.

   **3 + 2 PROGRAM IN PHYSICS AND ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING**

   The 3 + 2 Program is a cooperative agreement between the UNCW Physics Program and the North Carolina State University Electrical Engineering Program. The Program gives students the opportunity to earn a Bachelor of Science in Physics from UNCW and a Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering from NCSU. Students must complete all coursework listed below to satisfy the 3+2 Program requirements. The UNCW phase of study can be completed in three years. Students meeting NCSU's transfer admission requirements (see below) are automatically accepted into the Electrical Engineering Program at NCSU. This program can be completed in two years. UNCW will accept credits from NCSU to complete degree requirements at UNCW and NCSU will accept credits from UNCW to complete degree requirements at NCSU. Thus, the student receives a degree from UNCW and a degree from NCSU.

   To complete the 3 + 2 Program, a student must complete the following coursework:

   - All UNCW basic studies requirements
   - PHY General core requirements: CHM 101, CHM 102, MAT 161, MAT 162, MAT 261, PHY 201, PHY 202, PHY 321, PHY 335
   - PHY B.S. core requirements: MAT 361, PHY 311, PHY 322, PHY 411, PHY 412, PHY 444, PHY 455
PHY Oral Competency requirement: PHY 495
- PHY Computer Competency requirement: PHY 400
- Additional courses prescribed by the Electrical Engineering Program at NCSU. Of these, the following are taught on-site at UNCW as distance education classes: ECE 109, ECE 200, ECE 209, ECE 212, and E 115.

A student must finish the UNCW phase of study with an overall GPA of at least 2.90 and have at least a 2.50 GPA in the last two calculus courses (MAT 162 and MAT 261) to meet NCSU’s transfer admission requirements. Students in this program will be advised jointly by the Chair of Physics and Physical Oceanography and the Director of the Engineering Program at UNCW to assure completion of the correct requirements for both programs.

b. Motion to approve the document[link needed] "Intent to Plan for a B.S. Degree in Community Health" [Motion 07-02-04] was passed with the following discussion and amendment:

Q: (Noland) By approving this document are we saying that we endorse the intent to plan or the document itself?

A: (Gurganus) Intent to plan is a formal procedure. The faculty senate is part of the larger process; there is ample room in the next phase for concerns to be raised about the document.

Noland offered an amendment to the motion: to remove the word “document,” the quotation marks, and the capital letters in [Motion 07-02-04], thereby suggesting that the Senate approve the intent to plan rather than the document. The motion carried.

[Motion 07-02-04] now reads as follows:

Motion to approve the intent to plan for a B.S. degree in community health

Thus revised, the motion carried.

c. Motion to revise GGY 210 [Motion 07-02-05] as follows was passed without discussion.

Current Course Title/Description:

**GGY 210. Economic Geography (3)** Human economic activities, their location and relationships to physical and economic conditions of the environment.

Proposed:

**GGY 210 Geography of the Global Economy (3)** Introduction to the world economy, with emphasis on regional and local variations in the pattern of economic globalization. From subsistence agriculture to the global flows of capital and information, this course examines the geographical dimension of current economic activities.

Old Business
none

New Business
1. Departmental Motions

The Fine Arts departments of the College of Arts and Sciences offered the following motion [Motion 07-02-06]: that [Motion 07-02-07] be amended as follows: by increasing the Fine Arts minimum requirement from 3 hours to 6 hours and by including the restriction “from two disciplines.” After the following discussion, the motion failed.

Dan Johnson reiterated some of the points found in the document below.

http://www.uncw.edu/facsen/documents/Arts.doc

He argued that this motion is actually a compromise, and he finds it consistent with UNCW’s mission. He further noted that all chairs in Fine Arts (from 7 different disciplines) provided unanimous support. Given the diversity of disciplines and the importance of the arts, they believe that this motion is justified.

Other proponents of the motion argued that fine arts was not adequately considered in the basic studies proposal, emphasizing that they found reduction of the hours deeply troubling for the university as a whole.

Ken Gurganus, a member of the basic studies task force, responded as follows: It is true that to make room for other requirements (the total report is not given in the motion) all the areas were reduced to the minimum. Fine Arts wasn’t singled out. This is the same argument we heard from science chairs, and if we want to have equity, we must bring them back into the conversation. There is a bigger issue: one of flexibility. He argued that the senate is not the place to do this.

Other senators noted that the Natural Sciences and Social Sciences were also reduced. Now there is a “new ecosystem” (Andy Jackson) and altering it here has many other repercussions.

Other concerns were raised: we can only require so many credits at this level and still allow student to pursue other courses. If there’s an increase in Fine Arts basic studies, might this lead to decrease elsewhere (philosophy, religion)?

Proponents of [07-02-06] observed that, as the motion stands, social sciences require two classes in order to have a range of classes. So, they suggested, should Fine Arts. The idea is not to protect turf; rather, it is to protect the role of fine arts.

There was a call for a division of the house.
Those in favor of the amendment: 24.
Those opposed: 33.

The motion failed.

2. Motion [07-02-07], that the Senate endorse the following portion of the template contained in Basic Studies Revision Task Force Proposal of Spring 2006 was passed after much discussion.

(3h) Mathematics and Statistics

(3h) Quantitative and Logical Reasoning

(2h) Physical Education
(3h) Foreign Language (through 201 in language from high school or through 102 if new language)

(3h) Fine Arts

(3h) History

(3h) Philosophy

(6h) Social Sciences – from two disciplines

(7h) Natural Sciences – 1 from each category; one must be a laboratory course

biological sciences

physical sciences

Initial question: How can we vote on the portion of the template when we have no philosophical underpinning for physical education?

The members of the senate discussed possible philosophical underpinnings at some length. Dr. Dennison asked to go on record stating that students cannot express themselves if they do not have their health. Health is integrated in each and every one of the seven areas [in the template], and health literacy is critical. Another senator noted that the more educated people are, the better their health.

Finally, Steve Pullum stressed that we should move forward as long as the committee is charged with coming up with philosophical underpinnings.

Senators also raised questions about foreign language requirements. It was reiterated that the new foreign language requirements ensure that students can’t just take 102 to complete their requirement. The new requirement would not emphasize hours; it would emphasize proficiency.

There was a call for a division of the house.
40 in favor
13 opposed
The motion carried.

Individual Reports Continued

President Spaulding:

The Steering Committee has had numerous discussions about the new basic studies committee. The new committee will be asked to use subgroups, as everyone underestimated the amount of work the committee would entail. If the committee of nine establishes sub-committees, we can better include junior faculty and lecturers. A new committee should be named by November; the chair will get one course reduction. The committee will have some space and staff support and a letter of appreciation will be signed. The Steering Committee believes that, at this stage, feasibility will become an issue. The new committee will have to produce catalogue copy and work on criteria for courses. The Steering Committee will seek input from all faculty. Ideally we would have two discussions, April and early May.

He reminded the faculty that this is a standing committee of the senate: it will be a committee of nine, with at least one member from each of the
professional schools, four from the college. The membership is selected by the Steering Committee.

He raised the question: “What is it that you think Basic Studies should be examining?” He will solicit information from faculty, and by the November senate meeting there should manageable tasks to give to a committee.

Q: What is within the purview of this basic studies committee? What will they not be allowed to do? How will suggestions be made—possibly in the form of motions from the faculty senate?

President Spaulding: This is one possibility; this is one of many issues that should be raised in the next two weeks.

Meeting adjourned at 4:05
Tuesday, 14 November 2006
Meeting 2007-03

Meeting called to order at 2:02

Roll Call:

Absent:
Departmental senators: Berkeley (THR), Elikai (ACG), Frierson (MAT), Kieber (CHM), Lowry (PLS), McGiboney (FLL), Messer (CRW), Reincke (ISOM), Palmer (LIB), Rice (SOC),

Committee chairs: Brenner (Student Affairs), Gerard (Advancement)
DePaolo (Chancellor), Clark (Dean)

Individual reports

1. Chancellor was not present at today’s meeting. There were no questions for the Provost.

2. President of the Senate Spaulding noted that President Bowles is commissioning a panel to report on the relation of the university system to the economic needs of the state over the next 10-20 years. The main work in that review will be done by a panel of ten faculty members. As senate president, he has been asked to send up to three names, and he is seeking responses from senators. He remarked that the panel will be the delegate’s primary consideration for one semester and that his/her teaching time will be bought out. He emphasized that, as there are sixteen campuses and ten positions, it is critical to put forward strong candidates from UNCW.

Q: What kind of expertise will be necessary for this?

A: Spaulding: The candidates need to be people who understand the university system and are committed to the state. It is not just a matter of pure intellectual development.

A: Provost: Faculty should have a keen understanding of the system and have the capacity to assess the needs of key constituencies throughout the state.

President Spaulding continued his report by informing the Senate that Erskine Bowles is asking for $80 million across 16 campuses to bring salaries to the 80th percentile. Additionally, he will ask for 4% merit increases in the next two years. Expanding financial aid is another priority. Once the 80th percentile goal has been achieved, Bowles will concentrate on benefits. The downside of this good news is that equity adjustment, which is a major issue at UNCW, is being subordinated.
President Spaulding told the Senate that the Steering Committee of the Senate is going to organize an ad hoc committee of junior faculty to explore and make recommendations about issues relating to junior faculty on the campus. The impetus was the COACHE survey, which was given to all 16 campuses.

Kim Sawrey has, President Spaulding related, agreed to be chair of the new Basic Studies task force. By December, the committee should have received a letter from the Steering Committee and should have responded to it.

President Spaulding concluded his report by observing that the bylaws require that a senate president be elected in December.

Committee reports

1. UCC
President Spaulding reminded the faculty that if items that come to UCC are deemed routine, those items can be processed without a vote. Items listed in the agenda were routine; these items are reported.

   a. [Motion 07-03-08] carried after brief discussion. Motion: That the following additional language be included in the “Waiver of Requirements” section of Basic Studies (catalogue p. 104):

   Physical Education: Students who meet either of the following conditions will be waived from the PED 101 requirement: 1) Current military personnel or veterans who have served two or more years active duty; and, 2) students who are 55 years of age or greater.

   b. [Motion 07-03-09] carried. Motion: That computer competency course GGY 320 be re-designated as GGY 220 with the following course description:

      GGY 220 Cartography. (3) Prerequisites: GGY 130 or GGY 140. Techniques of cartographic design, drafting, data presentation and map interpretation.

   c. [Motion 07-03-10] carried. Motion: That the following changes be approved to Basic Studies course COM 160 course description:

      COM 160. Media Literacy (3) Exploration of the structures, systems, effects, conventions and genres of contemporary mass media. Emphasis is on critical and educated consumption of mass media. COM majors may use this as Basic Studies or as elective credits within the major but not both.

      And the following related changes to the COM degree requirements:

      **Degree Requirements**

      **Requirements for a Major in Communication Studies for the B.A. degree:** 42 hours. CSC 105, COM 105, 110, 200, 340, 341 and 490 plus 21 additional hours of communication studies coursework. At least 12 of these 21 hours must be at the 300 or 400 level. With respect to these 21 hours, note the following restrictions on the maximum number of credit hours from these courses: COM 104 (0
hours), COM 160 (0 hours), COM 216 (4 hours), COM 295 (6 hours),
COM 491 (0 hours), COM 495 (6 hours), COM 498 (3 hours).

A minimum “C” (2.00) average across the seven core courses and 21
additional hours of communication studies coursework is required.
Differently titled courses with the numbers 295 or 495 may be
repeated for additional credit.

A maximum number of credit hours may be counted toward
graduation from these courses as follows: COM 216 (8 hours), COM
491 (9 hours), COM 498 (12 hours).

COM 160 may be used to fulfill Basic Studies or be counted toward
the COM major but not both.

d. [Motion 07-03-11] carried. Motion: That Basic Studies course
HST 275 be revised as follows:

**HST 275. Introduction to the History of Western Science I: Antiquity to the Scientific Revolution (3)** An introduction to the history of the major developments of western science and technology, including an examination of both the origins of scientific discoveries and technological innovations and their impact on society. The History of Science from Antiquity (ancient Babylon and Greece) to the 17th century. Topics include the rise of natural philosophy in Greece, Medieval universities, Copernicus and the 16th century revolution in astronomy, Renaissance medicine and anatomy, and Isaac Newton’s mathematical study of gravitation.

And that the following additional Basic Studies course be approved:

**HST 276. History of Science II: Modern Science (3)** The growth and development of modern science. Topics include Darwin’s theory of evolution, Einstein’s special and general relativity, quantum mechanics, wartime science, the discovery of DNA, and the impact of science and technology on modern society.

e. [Motion 07-03-12] carried. Motion: That the following new course be approved for oral and computer competencies:

**ART 265. Introduction to Typography (3)** Prerequisite: ART 260 or permission from instructor. Introduction to the conceptual, formal and technical issues of Typography. Lectures emphasize the history of typography, the anatomy of letter forms, classifications of type, visual syntax, legibility and technology. Exercises and projects emphasize production of visual communication for print using type as the dominant element. Six studio hours per week.

f. [Motion 07-03-13] carried. Motion: That the program name of HAHS Therapeutic Recreation be changed to HAHS Recreation Therapy.

(Note that this does not require changing the course prefix.)

g. [Motion 07-03-14] carried. Motion: That a new Minor in Digital Arts be established:

**Requirements for a Minor in Digital Arts:**
A minor in digital arts requires completion of 24 hours, including 18 hours of core courses and 6 hours of electives. At least 3 elective hours must be at the 300 level or above, and at least 3 elective hours must be chosen from outside a student’s major department.

**Core Courses:** ART 101, ART 260, CSC 112 or 121 (or other approved course), CSC 204, CSC (ART/FST) 220, and COM 280. ART 101 is a prerequisite for ART 260. ART 260 should also be taken before CSC 204 and before CSC (ART/FST) 220.

**Electives:**

Students must earn at least a “C” (2.00) average in courses counted for a Digital Arts Minor.

**Motion 07-03-15** carried. Motion: That a new Minor in Biology be established:

**Requirements for a Minor in Biology:** 21 Hours. BIO 204; BIO 205 or 206; 2 courses selected from BIO 335, 345, or 366 (with or without laboratory); and 6 additional hours in biology at the 300-400 level, one of which must be a laboratory course.

A “C” (2.00) or better average is required on courses counted towards the minor in Biology.

2. Steering Committee. Please refer to the link to view the items discussed.

**Motion 07-03-16** carried after a brief discussion ensued on the following points:

C6
Q: Should the language be elaborated? What form should written communication take?
A: Carol Ellis: Dean and chair must always elaborate in so-called recommendation. In the notification to candidate they are not required to explain.

5. Reminder: The term instructor has been struck; there is separate language that applies to lecturers.

**Motion 07-03-17** carried after the following discussion and amendments:

President Spaulding noted that this motion is not mere line editing: it suggests that procedure be changed.

Q: What is the intent of this change?
A: Ken Gurganus: The intent was to further describe how RTP committee would seek information and not an extension of the ways
they could seek information.
A: Spaulding: Rather than regulate the entire list (who may speak to whom), the idea was that the committee could get information as long as it was carefully documented and put in the file. He reminded the Senate that the current language is even broader.

A period of intense debate followed. Some members of the Senate thought that the language should restrict the committee to on-campus sources; otherwise, it might transgress department’s rights. Others felt that it was imprudent to limit information gathering to people who failed to provide adequate information in the first place.

Dan Noland presented the following **amendment**: That “from appropriate sources” be added immediately after “additional information” in [Motion 07-03-17].

Discussion ensued. A major point of contention: should this read “from appropriate sources” or “from appropriate individuals”? The pro-sources faction asked, “What if the information has to do with a document or a webpage rather than a person?” The pro-individual faction suggested that sources might be too imprecise.

**Amendment to the amendment** is proposed: That “sources” be changed to “individuals” in [Motion 07-03-17].
Yes: 25
No: 26
5 abstentions
Motion to amend the amendment failed.

Amendment under discussion remains “from appropriate sources.”

A motion was made to return [Motion 07-03-17] to Steering Committee.
President Spaulding suggested that we test votes to see where we are first.
Discussion ensued.

Motion: That [Motion 07-03-17] be sent back to the Steering Committee.
Motion failed.

Amendment: That [Motion 07-03-17] be amended by adding “from appropriate sources” immediately after “additional information.”
Motion carried.
Abstentions: 4

Amendment: That the following language be added to [Motion 07-03-17], after “Such requests”: “, with justification,”
Motion carried.
Abstentions: 8

The motion now reads as follows:
**Procedures for Evaluation and Documentation**
4. The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall convene the Faculty Committee on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion for the purpose of organization and shall present the submitted recommendations for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. The Faculty Committee on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion
may seek additional information from appropriate sources for the purpose of clarification. All such requests for information shall come through the chairperson of the Faculty Committee on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion. Such requests, with justification, and any responses shall be written, and the chairperson of the Faculty Committee on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion will ensure that any such correspondence is inserted into the candidate’s dossier before it is forwarded to the Provost and VCAA.

10. Appropriate individuals involved in the recommending process and the Faculty Committee on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion may exchange information for the purpose of resolving differences.

Vote on [Motion 07-03-17] as twice amended:
Motion carried.
Abstentions: 6

[Motion 07-03-18] carried.

3. Evolution Learning Community
[Motion 07-03-19] carried after brief discussion. Motion: That the Senate adopt the following resolution:
Resolved, the UNCW faculty declares its support for a three-year academic celebration of the bicentennial of the birth of one of history’s greatest scientists, Charles Darwin, and the sesquicentennial of the publication of his monumental, paradigm-changing book, The Origin of Species.

Tom Schmid reminded the Senate of the success of UNCW’s previous learning community and handed out a pamphlet with a concept statement for the current proposed learning community. It would, he note, engage people from sciences, human sciences, humanities. There was a motion to call to question.
Motion carried. Approved by the necessary 2/3.
Abstention: 1

[ Motion 07-03-19] carried.
Abstention: 1.

4:03: Meeting adjourned.

Minutes by Meghan Sweeney, Senate Secretary

Maintained by L. Palmer (palmerl@uncw.edu)
Tuesday, 20 February 2007

Meeting called to order at 2:02

Roll Call:

Absent:
Departmental Senators: Combs (HAHS), Cook (SOC), Durako (BIO), Graham (ECN), Huber (EDU), Hungerford (PSY), Salwen (MUS), Schuhmann (ECN), Shafer (BIO), Stiles (MGT)

Committee Chairs: Brenner (Student Affairs), Frierson (ITC), Gerard (Advancement)

Chancellor DePaolo

January minutes were approved as posted.

Individual reports

**Provost Hosier**

Provost Hosier apologized for not bringing the Academic Affairs reorganization plan forward sooner. He noted that Academic Affairs faces many challenges: the Chancellor and the President of the system are asking for greater accountability and assessment, there are new academic programs, there is increased residence hall activity; there are also many other issues that need to be addressed in a timely manner. The question now is: What do we need to do to include faculty members in the process? The Provost has added a number of the individuals suggested to him by the Senate President to various committees. Twenty-three of them have faculty rank; sixteen are faculty members with no administrative tasks. Bob Tyndall is the chair of the search committee for the Vice Provost; Deb Saunders-White is the chair of the search committee for Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Programs; David Cordle is the chair of the search committee for Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Support and Development. An advertisement for Vice Provost has been out for over a week; the other positions have been out for a couple of days. These positions will stay open until someone who is suitable is found. If there are issues and concerns, Steering will provide a committee to receive comments about this plan; the Provost promised to respond to these suggestions in writing. He urged faculty to study the proposed plan, which is available here: [http://www.uncw.edu/aa/documents/AAReorganization.pdf](http://www.uncw.edu/aa/documents/AAReorganization.pdf)

**President’s report**

First item: faculty participation in the reorganization of the
Division of Academic Affairs. What constitutes “satisfactory representation” is up to the faculty, President Spaulding said, but there must a mechanism for the Provost to receive carefully considered input from them. President Spaulding proposed that, as per his discussion with Provost Hosier, the Senate call for an ad hoc committee, at least some of whose members have experience in this area. This committee would assemble faculty concerns to present to the Provost; faculty should, he asserted, volunteer for this committee.

Senator Black made the following motion. **Motion:** that the Senate express satisfaction with the level of faculty representation on search committees as reported by the Provost on 20 February 2007.

Discussion: One senator remarked that the “numbers do look good,” but there is the issue of making sure that faculty on this committee are indeed representing faculty and not just administration. Another senator asked if this ad hoc committee would be only faculty with administrative experience; President Spaulding insisted that it should be a mix of those with and those without administrative experience.

**Motion carried.**

One senator asked that the following question be recorded: What about the ongoing search for the head of the Office of International Programs, which was presented to senators without this discussion? President Spaulding remarked that the spillover of this conversation could be helpful with similar issues in the future.

Q: Will this new ad hoc committee prohibit direct communication with the Provost?

A: No. The idea is that they would filter out misinformation and refine thoughts before sending them to the Provost.

**Motion:** That the Senate express satisfaction with the arrangement that Steering will create an ad hoc committee to present concerns to the Provost, who has promised to respond.

**Motion carried.**

Next item of discussion: Applied Learning in CAS. President Spaulding said that it is not yet clear what the role of the Senate should be in this initiative. Because the Steering Committee has communicated with Dean Cordle about Applied Learning Initiatives, however, he believed it was important to include in the agenda.

Discussion ensued. Several senators wondered: how are other departments talking about this initiative? Will there be a forum for us to discuss what we are thinking about? Dean Cordle told the Senate that almost all departments have forwarded him a plan and that these plans, in many cases, don’t require curriculum change. Whatever we are going to do, he insisted, we should give ourselves a comfortable time frame, such as the
Some senators expressed concern about Applied Learning and wondered how much say faculty will really have in this process. One senator suggested that this initiative was “a fait accompli,” which has, he insisted, broader ramifications for faculty governance. Other senators expressed their opinion that, with additional funding, applied learning could be very good for departments. Another senator responded that the question is about process and precedent rather than whether or not applied learning is a good thing.

The Provost told the Senate that applied learning is a notion that is sweeping the country and is not something that has been invented by administrators. Administration is trying, he said, to make sure we are a leading campus; we are behind in determining how to assess students and this is one way to measure how students are learning. One senator remarked that assessment, though, is different from applied learning and should be kept separate.

President Spaulding stated that there should be some way for deans to launch initiatives, but the relationship between deans and the traditional arrangements by which faculty control curriculum is something that needs to be considered. The by-laws do not directly address matters like this. The Dean reiterated that curriculum is in the hands of the faculty and noted that Applied Learning would have to happen at the department level; it can’t be a College issue.

The chair of UCC raised the following questions: When an initiative like this is brought forward, the question is: Are we satisfied with this proceeding through departments? Should the full senate be asked to weigh in? At what stage?

Spaulding asked senators: “Would it be satisfactory to have the Steering Committee think through this?”

Q: Do you have material necessary?

A: We don’t, but we could solicit it. Steering will talk to UCC and the Basic Studies Committee. We will put it on the agenda.

The next item on the agenda: Report from Faculty Assembly Meeting 26 January 2007

President Spaulding said that the budget was major discussion at the meeting. The assembly asked the Board of Governors: How do we know the Assessment Task Force won’t become merely a vehicle for thinking about vocational training? The Board of Governors said that it will not allow the initiative to be based on this.

The next item: report from the Director of Campus Activities and Involvement. John Kapell reminded the Senate that he wants to be able to have as many opportunities as possible to collaborate with faculty.
**Steering Committee**  
*Motion 07-06-23* carried.  
Steering Committee offers the following motion [Motion 07-06-23] (passed by Faculty Assembly on 1/26; Assembly asks that campus Senates also endorse):

Whereas, the proposed budget priorities of The University of North Carolina for the 2007-09 biennium have been carefully articulated and prioritized by the General Administration under the leadership of President Bowles after consultation with the constituent campuses, and approved by the Board of Governors, and

* funding of need-based financial aid to make sure every eligible North Carolina undergraduate student who applies for a state need-based grant actually receives one;

* funding for academic salary increases to allow the University to recruit and retain the very best faculty;

* funding for a research competitiveness fund and for graduate student recruitment and retention to allow the state to compete nationally and globally;

* funding to produce more and better K-12 teachers and to respond to critical health-care needs;

* funding for student success through improved graduation and retention rates;

* funding for needed academic facilities and the repair, maintenance, and upgrading of existing campus infrastructure; and

* legislative changes to generate cost savings and cost avoidance as recommended by the President’s Committee on Efficiency and Effectiveness that will be used to advance teaching, research, and public service,

Therefore, be it resolved that the UNCW Faculty Senate offers its most enthusiastic endorsement for the proposed 2007-09 Budget Priorities as submitted by the Board of Governors.

*Motion 07-06-24* carried. Motion: That "excess receipts from tuition" be reserved for direct support of core academic activities of teaching and research and that these “excess tuition” funds be put in the hands of the University Librarian and the deans of the college and the professional schools for use in directly promoting teaching and research.

Additional information: We have this excess, a little over two million dollars, because of the larger number of out of state students. It must be spent by June 30 and the largest amount of requests is for renovation.

*Motion 07-06-25* did not come to a vote.

Additional information: We have this excess, a little over two million dollars, because of the larger number of out of state students. It must be spent by June 30 and the largest amount of requests is for renovation.
Steering Committee to offer following motion on their behalf:

Whereas faculty governance is a vital component of the nature of the university; and

Whereas the faculty as a whole benefit from having faculty members serve in various administrative roles as they bring the perceptions, values and appreciation of the academy and the intellectual mission into the core operations of the university; and

Whereas a faculty member’s service in an administrative role is generally of short duration in that person’s academic career; and

Whereas a faculty member in an administrative role has a vested interest in the life of the academy, the department and the college or school; and

Whereas a faculty administrator generally maintains some teaching duties and other responsibilities in the home department;

Therefore be it resolved that the UNCW Faculty Senate recognizes and supports the concept of basic rights earned by all faculty members receiving tenure, and that these rights are not abrogated when a faculty member serves the university community in an administrative role. These basic rights include academic freedom and the right to participate in curriculum development and Promotion, Reappointment, & Tenure discussions and decisions in their academic department unless the nature of the particular administrative assignment precludes such involvement.

Steve Meinhold reminded senators that this was brought forward by faculty serving in administrative roles. They feel that it is important to be recognized as faculty and not just as administrators.

Ken Gurganus offered an amendment to the motion that would clarify ambiguous or inaccurate language. Meinhold accepted this as a friendly amendment.

One senator raised the following concern: what about faculty members who have been involved with administration and subsequently have not been involved in the day-to-day running of the department? They aren’t a part of peer evaluation and they don’t follow the careers of faculty members in the way that those who are full time do.

Discussion ensued.

Because of the complexity of the issue, President Spaulding proposed that deans and directors take the information provided in the amendment and reconsider how the motion is presented. It is also important to be clear about current policy; this will be an issue to address.

Motion (made by Steve Meinhold): That we take this motion
and the amendment back to steering committee, deans, and
directors for additional discussion.

**Motion carried.**

Meeting adjourned: 4:10

*Minutes by Meghan Sweeney, Senate Secretary*
Minutes

Tuesday, 12 December 2006
Meeting 2007-04

Meeting called to order at

Roll Call:

Absent:
Departmental senators:
Committee chairs:

November minutes were approved as posted.

Individual reports

1.  
2.  

Committee reports

1.  
2.  
3.  

Old Business

none

Minutes by Meghan Sweeney, Senate Secretary
Tuesday, 20 March 2007
2:00 p.m., EB 162
Meeting 2007-07
Meeting called to order at 2:06

Roll Call:
Absent:
Departmental Senators: Black (PHY), Caropreso (EDN), Cutting (EVS), Durako (BIO), Feng (MAT), Gill (EDN),
Graham (ECN), Huber (EDN), Mahar (ISOM), McGiboney (FLL), McKinney (COM), Monahan (FST), Porter (MGT),
Reid-Griffin (EDU), Reilly (ENG), Reincke (ISOM), Salwen (MUS), Schuhmann (ECN)

Committee chairs: Brenner (Student Affairs), Gerard (Advancement), Frierson (ITC)

Chancellor DePaolo, Provost Hosier

February minutes were approved as posted.

Individual Reports
1. Chancellor’s Report: The Chancellor and the Provost both had a previous commitment.

2. President’s Report
1. President Spaulding reminded the Senate that the ad hoc committee on AA reorganization is receiving input.

2. Next, he discussed applied learning, noting that the existing structures within the College are not adequate for the
task—a significant curricular initiative from the dean—that is in front of us. We have not had a case like this
before, but the system has to be able to accommodate it. We are outgrowing current structures and have to find our
way forward, thinking not just of this action, but of long-term solutions. There must be a way for the faculty to review
applied learning and see if we should adopt it as a college wide value. The existing structure is the UCC, although it is
not a perfect match for this task.

Other option: Turn it over to the CAS committee. Concerns with this option: it is not an elected body. This has not
been an issue in the past because curricular initiatives have come from the faculty. Another option: have an ad hoc
committee with CAS members from UCC.

Q: Do we wish to have a representative body from the faculty discuss this issue?

Motion: That UCC report to the Senate regarding a definition of applied learning and report with recommendations on
whether CAS should adopt applied learning as a college wide value.

Problem: A member of UCC suggested that UCC might not be adequate for this task—UCC already has a mandate.
Perhaps another committee could report on this in a more complex fashion. Another concern: faculty from other
schools will be making decisions about an initiative from the College.

Amendment to the motion: change UCC to “CAS members of the current UCC.”
One item of discussion: should this decision be put in the hands of just four people?
Amendment to the motion carried.

Amendment to the motion: substitute requirement for value in the motion.
Amendment to the motion carried.

The motion now reads: That CAS members of the current UCC report to the Senate regarding a definition of applied
learning and report with recommendations on whether CAS should adopt applied learning as a college wide
requirement.
Motion, as twice amended, carried.

Thus, in the short run, President Spaulding remarked, we have a way for deans to suggest initiatives and the faculty has a way to review it. What about a long-term solution?

A motion was brought forward by a member of the senate: That the CAS Curriculum Committee be an elected committee of the CAS faculty.

Amendment to the motion: to change the motion to read: “That the curriculum committees of all colleges and schools be elected by their faculty.”

Amendment to the motion carried.

Discussion: Can the Senate direct how committees are elected? Perhaps this should be prefaced with “the Senate recommends.” Another senator remarked that we meet in the Senate under the aegis of the university. There is no mechanism for shared governance within the college. The Schools, deans noted, already have mechanisms in place for handling similar situations, if not specifically initiatives from the dean.

Carol Pilgrim clarified the structure of the CAS Curriculum Committee: First, there is a call to chairs for nominations; nominations are balanced in terms of areas and new and returning members. All course actions are sent forward by departments and are considered by the 10-person CAS. CAS has not, at this stage, looked at applied learning.

Motion: That we add the words the “Senate recommends” and proceed from there. The motion now reads: “The Senate recommends that the curriculum committees of all colleges and schools be elected by their faculty.”

Motion, as amended, carried.

3. Ken Gurganus reported that there would be more information next meeting regarding the rights/duties of Associate Deans and Academic Directors.

4. Elections to Autonomous Committee: Gene Tagliarini is serving as elections officer.
   All faculty should make sure to look at the verification ballot.

5. Kemille Moore is available if there are questions on the common reading experience.

6. Plans by Division of Student Affairs for a Convocation were reported. See agenda for information on this.

Committee Reports
1. Basic Studies Committee has been meeting. See agenda for information.
2. Academic Standards Committee offered the following motions.

[MOTION 07-07-27] carried. Motion: That the following changes be made: DECLARATION OF MAJOR – page 75 of the 2006-2007 Undergraduate Catalogue

Undergraduate students admitted as freshmen may must declare and be accepted into a major field of study after completing a minimum of 24 semester hours at UNCW. They must declare a major before or during the semester that they complete 45 semester hours of credit. Students will not be allowed to preregister or register for the following semester until a major or a pre-major has been declared. Additional advising may be required prior to registration for continuing students who have completed 30 hours or more and have not declared a major or a pre-major.

ADMISSION TO DEGREE PROGRAMS – page 114 of the 2006-2007 Undergraduate Catalogue

Admission to the College of Arts and Sciences
University College students wishing to declare a major within the College of Arts and Sciences will request to have their records transferred to the appropriate department no earlier than the end of the second semester of the freshman year after earning 24 credits at UNCW but before or during the semester that they complete 45 semester hours of credit. See departmental requirements for any prerequisites to declaring a major.

Admission to the Professional Schools
University College students wishing to declare a major within a professional school will request to have their records transferred to the appropriate school no earlier than the end of the second semester of the freshman year after earning 24 credits at UNCW but before or during the semester that they complete 45 semester hours of credit. These students will then be assigned to that school for pre-professional advising.

[Motion 07-07-28] carried after the following discussion and an amendment. Motion: That the following changes be made:
Explanatory Note: The Academic Standards Committee offers a motion concerning re-enrollment of former UNCW students. It establishes an academic review of formerly ineligible students, which currently does not happen. Also, the Registrar’s Office will be handling Re-Enrollments starting Summer 2007. This motion affects the working in two sections of the catalogue.

ADMISSIONS-FORMER STUDENT (Re-enrolling) – page 35, Undergraduate Catalogue 2006-2007
Former UNCW students who left in good academic standing must apply for re-enrollment before May 1 for fall semester and December 1 for spring semester. Former UNCW students who had been declared academically ineligible to return to the university must complete the Re-enrollment Review Process prior to these deadlines as described below.

Re-enrollment Review
Former UNCW students who had been declared academically ineligible to return to the university must make their case in writing in their Re-enrollment Application. The Re-enrollment Review forms must be obtained from the Registrar’s Office and submitted by March 1 for fall semester and October 1 for spring semester. The Registrar will forward all documentation for review to the Re-enrollment Review Committee, selected by the deans. The results of the review will be passed on to the Registrar’s Office with a determination of the acceptance, or rejection, of the applicants depending upon their potential for academic success. Students who are allowed to re-enroll may be required to meet with their dean to discuss their academic plans.

Addition as per amendment below: Decisions of the Re-enrollment Review Committee are final.

RETENTION, DISMISSAL AND READMISSION, pg 82-83, Undergraduate Catalogue 2006-2007
Students who do not meet the minimum grade point requirement for retention at the conclusion of the spring semester will be declared academically ineligible. The student will be allowed to make up deficiencies during this university's summer sessions immediately following the spring semester in which the ineligibility was declared. If such deficiencies are not removed after the completion of the summer sessions, the student will not be permitted to enroll for two consecutive regular semesters (fall and spring). Be suspended from the university and must sit out the following fall and spring semesters. A suspended student may apply for re-enrollment for the following fall semester. Readmission is contingent upon the availability of space, the results of the Re-enrollment Review. Suspended Academically ineligible students may enroll in any summer session. Re-enrollment forms are available in the Admissions Registrar’s Office. To ensure enrollment consideration, students should submit the forms to the Admissions Office by May 1 for the fall semester or December 1 for the spring semester. If a student is allowed to re-enroll, he/she must see an academic advisor before registering for classes. See also ADMISSIONS-FORMER STUDENT (Re-enrolling).

Discussion: The likelihood of students appealing is exceptionally high. At least some recommendation should be made in terms of this. Response to this point: there will be a good deal of paperwork that students will have to undertake. Clarification: “dean” refers to the office of the dean.
Amendment: That “Decisions of the Re-enrollment Review Committee are final.” be added as the last sentence under “Re-enrollment Review.”

Amendment to the motion carried.

3. University Curriculum Committee has come to Senate to ask: Do UCC duties include reviewing department name changes? Question boils down to whether or not this constitutes “general curricular policies and changes which have total university impact.” Historically, it has been a matter of the department and permission of the dean.

Discussion: It is more than just a title: the name change may have a larger impact on the university. This is a governance change and so far the Steering Committee hasn’t been instructed enough; they will solicit more information. Reminder from OIR that name changes can have serious beyond this campus and this may be something to consider.

Old Business:
[Motion 07-06-26] did not come to a vote. Motion: The Department of Geography and Geology offers the following: That the Dean of Students’ Office require the Wellness Center to provide written verification of the time and date of student visits to the Wellness Center, upon request by the individual students.

Discussion: Because of the potential legal complexity of this issue, might the Wellness Center and others have better ideas about how to do this?

Motion: that [Motion 07-06-26] be referred to the appropriate committee as determined by the Steering Committee. Motion carried.

New Business: none

Meeting adjourned 3:49.

Minutes by Meghan Sweeney, Senate Secretary
Tuesday, 17 April 2007
2:00 p.m., EB 162
Meeting 2007-08
The Senate observed a moment of silence and came to order at 2:02

Roll Call:
Absent:
Departmental Senators: Black (PHY), Cody (LIB), Combs (HAHS), Evers (ACG), Gill (ITSD), Herman (MAT), Huber (EDN), Hungerford (PSY), Schuhmann (ECN), Seidman (HIST)

Committee Chairs: Brenner (Student Affairs), Frierson (ITC), Gerard (Advancement)
Ex-officio: Kemille Moore

Chancellor DePaolo, Provost Hosier

March minutes were approved as posted.

Individual Reports
1. Chancellor’s Report: The Chancellor and the Provost both had a previous commitment. Max Allen spoke on behalf of the Chancellor, acknowledging the tragic events at Virginia Tech. He reiterated that we are a safe campus, although we are working toward ever greater safety, and he introduced Chief of Police David Donaldson, who spoke about violence in schools more broadly and response protocol here at UNCW. He also noted that the emergency phone number on campus has been transferred to 911 (which will go straight to Wilmington police) and that UNCW police monitor an e-mail account: police@uncw.edu There are many new safety procedures in place; they are also working on additional systems.

2. President’s Report
1. RTP Appeal Revision: this issue will be addressed in September.

2. Autonomous Committees Elections update: ballots have been posted.

3. Senate officers for 2007-2008: reminder that in December of next year, we’ll have to elect a new president; start thinking ahead.

4. Perceived lack of academic challenge in freshman courses.

Senators raised a variety of questions (some that will need to be addressed at a future date) and made numerous observations on this topic:
• Although this issue is a matter of perception in part, it is also supported by other self-reported activity that students have commented on.

• Q: Is there a correlation between class size and the perception of a lack of challenge? A: Lisa Castallino, Director of Institutional Research, responded that there seems to be some correlation with class size, but the statistics do not support it.

• Q: What does grade distribution look like?
Castallino remarked that distribution is scaling on the higher grades rather than the lower grades. Students have suggested, she noted, that it is hard to get in to UNCW, but that it is easy to stay. However, once students reach their major, they do find UNCW challenging. Dean Cordle: There is no indication that rank (instructor, professor, etc.) had any bearing on this matter either.

• Q: What is the difference between challenging in terms of content v. amount of work?
• Q: How might the Basic Studies reforms take this information into consideration?

• Q: Our students work (non-scholastic work) significantly more than peer institutions—how might this play into their perceptions?

• Q: To what degree is there more emphasis on facts rather than ideas in basic studies classes?

• Students need to be writing more in their classes.

• Each department needs to address grade inflation—this needs to come from the top down.

• Q: Which departments are perceived as “easy?” Can we get data on department specific basis? A: Castalino: Yes. We can also get data on in-state and out of state students.

• Perhaps faculty are watering down courses in order to get stronger SPOTs because they feel the pressure to have good SPOTs.

• Reminder: giving Fs is not more rigorous. Grade distribution may not tell us much about underlying rigor.

• Q: Could it be that the difference between our top students and bottom students is significant? Could this be a factor?

After this lengthy discussion, Spaulding suggested that we hand the matter over to the Academic Standards Committee with the thought that they will use the necessary research to make an assessment.

Committee Reports
1. Steering Committee [Motion 07-08-29] carried. Motion: That the Senate approve the following additions to the Format of the Application for RTP

[Explanatory note: the additions proposed below are logically necessary as a result of previously approved changes in the RTP “Process” and “Instructions” documents.]

VIII. Certification

The evaluating officer shall:

A. Certify the names of senior faculty who were assembled and consulted for this recommendation.

B. State the department's current definition of "senior faculty" as determined by the chair and members of the department in consultation with the dean (a copy of which must be on file in the dean's office).

C. State the numerical vote of the assembled senior faculty (the number for/against/abstaining; the officer shall not identify how individual faculty cast their votes).

D. If a majority of the senior faculty has prepared a separate, elaborated dissenting recommendation, insert that recommendation prior to forwarding the dossier to the dean. That recommendation must be signed by a majority of the senior faculty and should follow the same guidelines for content as that of the chair.

2. Ad-Hoc committee on [Motion 07-06-25]. After discussion, [Motion 07-06-25] carried. (Kathleen Berkeley, Denise DiPuccio, Ken Gurganus (chair), Stephen Meinhold, Carol Pilgrim)

(Only the last three paragraphs are modifications of the original motion.)

Motion 07-06-25 revised

Whereas faculty governance is a vital component of the nature of the university; and

Whereas the faculty as a whole benefit from having faculty members serve in various administrative roles as they bring the perceptions, values and appreciation of the academy and the intellectual mission into the core operations of the university; and
Whereas a faculty member’s service in an administrative role is generally of short duration in that person’s academic career; and

Whereas a faculty member in an administrative role has a vested interest in the life of the academy, the department and the college or school; and

Whereas a faculty administrator generally maintains some teaching duties and other responsibilities in the home department;

Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of the University of North Carolina Wilmington recognizes and supports the rights and responsibilities of faculty members that derive from The Code of the University of North Carolina. Among these are the substantive rights to participate in curriculum development and, depending upon departmental tenure and rank, to participate in departmental Promotion, Reappointment, and Tenure discussions and recommendations.

Furthermore, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recognizes that all these rights and responsibilities are retained by a faculty member serving the university community in an administrative role unless the letter of appointment (required by UNC Policy 300.1.1 Section III.A.5) specifies otherwise. The Faculty Senate also recommends that the letter of appointment reference any departmental policy that affects the substantive or procedural rights of a departmental faculty member serving in an administrative role.

Finally, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends the following policy found in Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure of AAUP Section 1.a: “Any subsequent extensions or modifications of an appointment, and any special understandings, or any notices incumbent upon either party to provide, will be stated or confirmed in writing and a copy will be given to the faculty member.”

Discussion: This is an attempt to seek clarity in how changes are made—there should be no ambiguity about what role the administrator has. Ken Gurganus, chair of the committee, suggested that this motion serves to protect departments, but it requires that they have a policy. That is, departments can make policies, but they need to be part of the contract. Departments, as another senator noted, cannot make policy that go against the UNC Policy.

3. UCC

[Motion 07-08-30] carried. Motion: That the Senate approve the re-designation of the Theatre Program to the Department of Theatre.

[UCC Applied Learning Sub-Committee. [Motion 07-08-31] carried. Motion: That the Senate endorse the Applied Learning CAS requirement for all graduates of the CAS initiative put forward by The College of Arts and Sciences Dean in the terms outlined in a and b below:

a) that voluntary departmental responses to the initiative from all CAS departments are advanced to the CAS Curriculum Committee for review/approval, and that before any requirement be instituted, the CAS Curriculum Committee must review and approve ALL the plans in relation to b below:

b) that the requirement to which departments are responding is the definition of Applied Learning put forward by the Dean’s Applied Learning Committee on 2/28/06 (appended to our report), supplemented by the following, “a draft addition to the CAS descriptive statement in the Undergraduate Catalogue (p.117)” provided at the University Curriculum Committee’s request, to the UCC by Dean Cordle on 4/11/2007:

The College of Arts and Sciences is committed to providing hands-on, integrative, applied learning experiences such as internships, research projects, field experiences, and service learning projects. All undergraduate majors offered by the College require specific applied learning experiences. These requirements are listed below by program.

[Motion 07-08-32] carried. Motion:
That the Senate recommend that all initiatives likely to affect curriculum be undertaken only after they are approved
by responsible curriculum committees as having the potential to lead to substantial improvement in the quality of the student academic experience.

4. Budget Committee: Ed Graham
Centerpieces of the budget planning process: higher salaries, need-based financial aid, smaller classroom sizes. Our faculty members should support the capital campaign, as this sends an important signal to prospective donors.

5. Research Committee: report given in agenda.

Old Business
[Motion 07-06-26] After the following discussion, the motion failed.
Motion: That the Dean of Students’ Office require the Wellness Center to provide written verification of the time and date of student visits to the Wellness Center, upon request by the individual students.

Don Habibi researched this matter; no one from whom he sought information believed that it would raise legal issues. However, they also did not believe it would offer any useful change. In fact, there might be a problem with the student body thinking that these notes would excuse them. This might cause an abuse of the system.

Wellness Center report: If medical providers believe students are contagious (or if they believe that there is another legitimate reason to stay out of class), students will be given notes proactively; students can choose to show this note to a professor.

Senators acknowledged that this procedure was unknown to most faculty and that awareness of it might obviate the need for the proposed motion.

Meeting adjourned at 4:07.

Minutes by Meghan Sweeney, Senate Secretary
Tuesday, 11 December 2007
2:00 p.m., EB 162
Meeting 2008-04

Meeting called to order at 2:04pm.

Roll call

Absent:

Departmental senators: Berkeley (Theatre), Black (Physics), Bushman (English), Cody (Randall), Cox (Creative Writing), Cutting (Environmental Studies), D'Abundo (Health and Applied Human Sciences), Dillaman (Biology), Elikai (Accountancy & Business Law), Hall (Social Work), Huber (Elementary, Middle, and Literacy Education), Hungerford (Psychology), Johnson (Film Studies), Lammers (Mathematics), McCartney (Biology), Noland (English), Pollard (History), Reinicke (Information Systems), Rice (Sociology), Rodriguez (Management), Schmid (Philosophy), Schuhmann (Economics), Simmons (Anthropology), Skrabal (Chemistry), Stevens (Foreign Languages), Wilcox (Art), Wray (Information Systems).

Committee chairs: Brenner (Student Affairs), Caropreso (Evaluation), Chandler (Buildings and Grounds), Combs (University Curriculum), Gerard (University Advancement), Hurdle (Public Service and Continuing Studies), Johnson (Research), Patterson (Information Technology), Walker (Admissions).

Approval of the November 2007 minutes

- November 2007 minutes were approved.

Special order of the day: Election of the Senate President.

- President Spaulding opened the floor for nominations.
  - Nomination for Bruce McKinney.
    - Nomination seconded.
    - McKinney accepted the nomination.
  - Nomination for Steve Pullum.
    - Pullum declined the nomination.
  - Motion from the floor: [Motion 08-04-20] That the nominations be closed and the secretary call the election, given that there are no other candidates.
    - [Motion 08-04-20] seconded.
      - No discussion.
    - [Motion 08-04-20] carried.
- President Spaulding ceded the floor to President-Elect McKinney.
  - I have been associated with UNCW from about 1990 onwards.
  - I received tenure here, then left for opportunities at other institutions, then decided to come back to UNCW.
  - Leaving UNCW and then coming back has been a good experience.
  - I am happy to serve as president and am aware that the position might turn into a 12-month position.
  - I have been a mediator in professional contexts, which may help in my new position as Faculty Senate President.
  - This will be the first administrative position that I have held here at UNCW.
  - My thanks to all who voted for me even without knowing him.
  - Questions:
    - Welcome back. It is odd to go and then come back – what were the things you missed about UNCW that brought you back?
    - Personal reasons brought me back to a life on the East Coast; I have lived most of my life on
the East Coast.
  • I like this area.
  • I missed my colleagues in Communication Studies. I like how the UNCW has grown and become more of a research institution. UNCW has come a long way since 1990 – I like the direction UNCW is going.
  • It is unusual to have a Faculty Senate President without tenure?
    • I am halfway through my third year and will be going up in fall 2008.
    • I know what I need for tenure and while nothing is ever certain, I feel that I have done all that I can do for the tenure process at this point, research-wise.
    • The position of Faculty Senate President officially begins on July 1, 2008.
  • If the Faculty Senate President position becomes a 12-month appointment, does this mean that there will be a 12-month salary as well?
    • Yes – the position will probably earn a stipend for one summer session a year.
  • President Spaulding: I am currently surveying other UNC System schools about their Faculty Senate presidents. I already have some responses. We will be using this data to help us to determine how to enhance the Faculty Senate position here at UNCW.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo

  • I know this is a busy time for us all.
    • I encourage you to go through the library if you need a boost to your spirits.
    • This morning, 3 to 4am, I am told, was the busiest time in their history at this time.
    • I was told to expect a proposal for going to a 24/7 schedule permanently.
    • So visit the library and the students and root them on – tell them to study hard.
    • Thank you for getting us through another semester – this has been a good one. Thank you for all your work.
  • The Chancellor ceded the floor to the Provost.
    • General Administration has shared with UNCW growth enrollment projections. I, in turn, have shared this information with department chairs and now Faculty Senate. The number of students coming to NC college campuses that are high school graduates will increase by 80,000 between now and 2017 (based on DPI statistics).
      • Some campuses have indicated that they will take on any students that come their way, some have indicated that they will follow moderate growth patterns, while others have indicated that they will not allow for any growth.
      • So over the coming months, we will be looking at how UNCW will grow. There is a committee working on this -- the Planning Council. The current members are: Mark Spaulding (as Faculty Senate President), Amy Kirschke (Art History), John Fischetti (WSE), Rob Burrus (ECN).
        • The committee is pleased at our continued growth and in the quality of our students.
        • The committee wants to continue to diversify students, including international students.
        • Space is a continual concern for the committee – they are considering plans that would increase the emphasis on extension students and online programs.
      • A response from the Planning Council regarding the enrollment figures is due to General Administration by February 15th.
    • Slow measured growth is what we are looking at.
    • Onslow County Extension Program.
      • This involves Camp Lejeune, Coastal Carolina with programs in nursing, criminal justice, and social work. Right now we are considering whether we want to have a branch campus there. As you hear about this, take a look at it and see if this is something we want to consider. Please bring any input or feedback on this issue to the committee.
    • School of Health Reorganization Presentation.
      • There is a task force at work on the future of health programs here on campus.
      • Last March, a group of faculty from Social Work, HAHS, and Nursing was established to see if
there was interest in bringing the health departments together in order to form synergy and make a bigger footprint in this area of study on campus.

- The committee is looking at these issues.
  - It's charged with basic design and operational elements.
  - I asked them to meet throughout the summer and fall.
  - They took a look at shaping what a health college would look like.
  - Stakeholders meetings have been going on, too.

- Today, the committee's findings will be shared with you. I have not yet received a final report.
- At this time, I invite the folks to come forward. Let’s have a dialogue here and a discussion – their information is available on the web if you want to consult it afterwards.

President Spaulding: The related documents are located on the Faculty Senate homepage, labeled"Task Force on Health Programs at UNCW" under the section "2007-2008 Issues."

- We will bring this to UCC early next semester and allow them to make their recommendations. The Chancellor and the Provost will make their final decision but we do want your input today.

President Spaulding: This is the exact course it should take -- going to UCC -- the existing structure is there.

- Kris Walters, School of Nursing.
  - Link to PPT.
  - Question from the floor: Can the PPT be linked off the Faculty Senate homepage since so many of us are missing today?
    - President Spaulding: PPT is already on the Faculty Senate homepage.
  - I will keep my presentation brief.
  - The Task Force should complete its work for the fall 2009 opening.
    - A draft report is due by December 2007.
    - The final report is due by February 2008.
    - The college would start in 2009.
  - Students have to learn to work with other disciplines -- this has real world applications.
  - We could become a center for healthcare.
  - Interdisciplinary level would attract funders.
  - It would help us to remain current and competitive.
  - Duplication of courses across departments would be reduced which would free faculty up to teach towards new certificates and programs.
  - We would be responding to public demand and the nursing shortage -- the legislative demand for more nurses.

- Candy Ashton, HAHS.
  - There is an excitement that faculty are feeling for this right now.
  - The Task Force has bonded.
  - The WHO model of health really spoke to what we are trying to accomplish with this School of Health.
  - Two of our peers are moving to this type of School of Health model.
  - This would be transdisciplinary in nature -- today’s problems are beyond one discipline’s bounds. This is not a new idea -- many grantmaking foundations are now requiring transdisciplinary models.
  - It would help our students approach problems in a non-disciplinary way.
  - As far as curriculum, we’re not suggesting another basic studies within the School of Health college.
  - The official name would be: College of Health and Human Services.
    - There would be a dean, an associate dean of research, and an associate dean of academics.
    - We also suggest developing some standing councils and committees, which would be transdisciplinary in nature.
    - There would be a national/international search for a new dean. We hope to start the dean search by July 2008, with the dean on campus by spring 2009.

- We welcome questions.
- Did you look at any criteria for what you are called? Schools versus college?
  - There are no criteria as far as I can tell.
- Perhaps we need to establish criteria for the future?
  - Not sure.
  - They have taken a stab at establishing this, the committee, as you will see from looking at the documents on the Faculty Senate website.
- President Spaulding: There are no GA definitions for school, college, etc.?
  - No. The term "school" is generally applied to a professional school.
  - According to the Association of American Colleges and Universities definitions, what we propose is not an uncommon scheme.
- During the presentation, it seems that all three units have not agreed on a structure that all three departments can live with?
  - The Task Force did achieve consensus. But all the faculty in these departments will not necessarily achieve this -- you're not going to get this.
- It seems, though, that the timeline persists despite this lack of consensus.
  - Well, you're not going to get consensus across the board.
- Have you identified the economic impact of this establishment of the school?
  - That wasn't the committee's charge.
  - Issues of turf are always difficult -- there has been a high degree of consensus from those involved and the faculty consulted. I'm more interested in your point about the economic impact -- can you say more?
- Just along the lines of budget -- and that it seems you are very far in the process not to be considering these factors?
- How does this new structure correlate with the philosophy of the different units?
  - The definition of health -- all of our units share this foundation. We respect the differences of each unit.
- You mention mental health in the definition -- why is Psychology not included?
  - They have programs that fit in CAS and professional contexts -- so it didn't fit comfortably.
- So how is the mental health aspect dealt with?
  - Social Work and Nursing.
  - Also, this was not part of our charge.
  - How can we be inclusive? We did talk about this -- it's not like we haven't talked about that. Part of this will come through in the Center for Healthy Living, which is very interdisciplinary in nature.
- Can you explain how this new structure would make a difference in achieving the goals?
  - UNCW received a large grant for an obesity initiative about a year ago. I spent a year trying to get faculty across all units within UNCW to talk about their expertise and interest in obesity. It was a very difficult task. The driving force behind this reorganization is to bring together those units that have common interests so that we can bring more NIH grants and funding in -- NIH grants are difficult to get.
- President Spaulding: This issue will be back to us soon. Faculty should engage with the documents on the Faculty Senate homepage.
- What's the proposed name of this new college?
  - College for Health and Human Services.

2. President of the Senate Spaulding

- SPAM.
  - From November 29th email:
    - Starting on January 7, 2008 at 9:00 AM, Information Technology Systems Division will be changing the way the university handles SPAM. Instead of "tagging" your SPAM with "?*?" in the subject line, we will reject your SPAM messages with a notification to the sender. The sender will receive a notice that their message was considered unsolicited junk mail. We will also be more
aggressive on identifying spam. If you want to allow SPAM (or specific e-mail addresses) through
the filter, simply go to https://spam.uncw.edu and change your settings to whatever you choose
(after 9:00 AM on January 7). In addition to modifying the SPAM settings, any messages in your
Junk Mail folder and Deleted Items folders on the server will be deleted after 7 days. If you have
any questions or need assistance, contact the Technology Assistance Center (TAC) at 962-HELP or
tac@uncw.edu.

- Bobby Miller, TAC.
  - One of my colleagues has expressed concern that 7 days is not long enough, particularly if you are
    out of the office at a conference with no email access?
    - The 7 days clock does not start until you log on to check your email. So the emails in your
      Junk Mail and Deleted Items folders will not be deleted until 7 days after you log on.
  - Can we get the size of our mailboxes expanded?
    - That’s going to be looked at soon.
  - When you say "centralizing archive mechanism" -- you mean the messages would be archived on
    the server?
    - There would be two tiers of storage. High performance and then, once messages reach a
certain age, they would be moved to a lower tier of storage and would not count towards your
mailbox size quota.
  - Faculty emails are considered state documents?
    - Yes -- this is called information lifecycle management and part of this is about retention.
      Once that lifecycle is over, it is deleted.
  - And how long is the lifecycle?
    - It varies -- usually about 7 years. It is based on the content of the document.
  - It would be nice if faculty could be educated about issues of privacy, etc.?
    - Yes -- we are looking into that.
  - What about wiretapping and the use of our emails for anything other that state business?
    - President Spaulding: If you put your concerns in note form, I will see that it gets to the right
      person to address them.
  - I am still getting messages with the ?*? in my inbox?
    - In the spring, we are going to start rejecting those messages -- the message will not be
delivered to your inbox and the sender will be notified that it was not delivered.
  - President Spaulding: Who do you call when there is a problem with this new policy?
    - Go to https://spam.uncw.edu/ and use the link at the bottom of the page. You can add the
      email addresses of those people who should be getting though and are not to your safe email
      list.
  - I am not getting my emails from a sister school in Japan?
    - Go to https://spam.uncw.edu/ and add them to your list.

- ROTC.
  - The problem is that the request was so vague that we had difficulty responding to it. So we are going
to write back to the ROTC contact and ask him to make a more formal request to us, using our existing
forms.
- Faculty Assembly 16 November.
  - This is in regards to the Assembly’s response to the UNC Tomorrow progress.
  - Nelson Reid (Social Work) was a member of the Scholars Council and co-author of the draft report,
    which is posted on the Faculty Senate website.
  - The Assembly wants to encourage GA to stipulate that the Chancellors and Provosts of the systems
    schools insure that a certain number of faculty is involved with their UNC Tomorrow response teams:
    50% from non-administrative faculty, with appointments coming from the faculty senates.
  - No response from GA yet?
    - No – not to the best of my knowledge.
  - Do we have any plans for our response team?
    - We are waiting for guidance from GA.
  - Nelson Reid.
    - Quick summary.
Last Thursday, the draft report was accepted with very few changes.
- There will be a final report to the Board of Governors.
- President Bowles will determine how to proceed with the responses from the campuses.
- I urge you to read the report. Here are some of the issues:
  - Global readiness and competitiveness are overarching themes in this process.
  - The idea that UNC should increase access to higher education for all North Carolinians.
  - There is the expected increase in enrollment, based on DPI figures.
  - It is believed that UNC should be more actively involved in the public school crisis -- the sorry state of the NC public education system was an overall theme and that the universities have an obligation to fix this.
- UNC should be more engaged in the global competitiveness issue.
- UNC should be more involved in issues of health care and health services in NC.
- UNC should assume a leadership role in the environment.
- UNC should become more involved and engaged regionally within NC. The public like and want faculty to be engaged with their businesses, communities, charities, and non-profits. It is thought that the RPT process should put a greater emphasis on research involving regional engagement.
- We should be looking at what changes should be made to the UNC System to respond to the needs of the state -- we need to prepare for faculty retirement and attract and retain high-quality staff.
  - The response period for this project will be integral -- please do look at the report.
- President Spaulding: There are points in the report where southeast NC is specifically addressed. So if you want to skim to those parts, do.
- Reid: Right -- and on the UNC Tomorrow page, there are reports that are regionally specific.
- President Spaulding: On the horizon for us -- I think there will be incentives to alter RPT criteria to conform with these findings.
- The Assembly has been absorbing body blows of initiatives from Bowles.
- Now it is the time for the Assembly to ask Bowles to address issues of concern to the Assembly.
  - The first issue will be an attempt to articulate what shared governance means. This is the first thing that the Assembly is asking GA and Bowles to address
- Questions.
  - I attended the forum with Bowles on campus. Most of what I heard is give us some more money. How will the Task Force handle all these requests from all these campuses? Is there a big pot of money somewhere?
    - Reid: You will have to look at the report to see. I think one of the ways that Bowles did this was to generate publicly the need for support of the UNC system -- part of the purpose is to generate a renewed understanding from the public.
  - President Spaulding: Bowles doesn’t find the current annual funding structure to be rational -- he would like to find a way to get long-term funding. Whether he can get the Legislature to let us off the short leash, I don’t know.

Committee reports

1. University Curriculum Committee submits the following motion:

- [Motion 08-04-19] That the Senate approve the following recommendations:
  - Approve request to Implement a B.S. in Community Health (HAHS).  (More information from HAHS in Word)
  - Approve PHY 300: Analog Circuits for computer competency.  (More information from PHY in Word)
  - Approve requirement change for Computer Science – Option 2.  (More information from Computer Science in PDF)
    - These are bundled together. Is there consent to vote on these as one? I do have some informational changes: it should read ACG 203 in the Computer Science documentation and GGY 320 should be GGY 220.
Senator from Geography and Geology objects to the Computer Science portion of [Motion 08-04-19].
- Can we vote together on the first two elements? Any objections to this?
- No objections to considering the first two elements of [Motion 08-04-19].
  - [Motion 08-04-19] carried.
- [Motion 08-04-21] To approve requirement change for Computer Science – Option 2, as separated out from [Motion 08-04-19].
  - [Motion 08-04-21] seconded.
    - Motion from the floor: [Motion 08-04-22] From John Hunstman (GGY) Can we amend the motion? The problem right now is with the 17 hours towards the GIS certificate program. Students could be taking the hours, using our lab equipment, and blocking our majors and we get no credit for this.
  - [Motion 08-04-22] seconded.
  - Discussion:
    - President Spaulding: Have you talked with CSC about this?
      - Hunstman: Not directly.
    - President Spaulding: Is anyone uncomfortable with this? Say something, if so. I don’t think the Senate should arbitrate this disagreement between two departments. I think we should vote down the amendment and then pass it back.
    - Motion to call to question: [Motion 08-04-23].
      - [Motion 08-04-23] seconded.
    - [Motion 08-04-23] carried.
  - [Motion 08-04-22] voted down.
  - Discussion of [Motion 08-04-21] continues.
  - Motion from the floor: [Motion 08-04-24] To amend [Motion 08-04-21] by striking out the GIS concentration entirely.
    - [Motion 08-04-24] seconded.
    - Discussion:
      - CSC would be okay with this in the interests of moving forward on this; we would be happy to add it back in later if it can be worked out with GGY.
      - Carol Pilgrim: There were some changes to this after it went through UCC but I am not sure if this is where the changes were made or not.
      - That was something else, to make the changes read better.
      - Are we voting on the catalogue copy?
        - CSC: The catalogue copy would not be affected be this.
        - I am concerned that we are backtracking on this after it has gone through CAS and UCC.
      - President Spaulding: Did your chair sign off on this?
        - Hunstman: As of 1pm today when I spoke with him, my chair indicated that he did not.
      - We presume the catalogue copy would be updated accordingly.
      - President Spaulding: We are voting to delete the GIS certificate from [Motion 08-04-21].
    - [Motion 08-04-24] carried.
  - Any more discussion about [Motion 08-04-21] as amended?
    - [Motion 08-04-21] carried.

Old business

1. Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice submits the following revised motion, as amended by Steering Committee with additions (underscored) and deletions (struck through):

  - [Motion 08-02-06] In an effort to expand faculty participation in the Commencement Ceremonies at Trask Coliseum as a celebration of student and faculty achievement, to make it a more meaningful event for all
Whereas, we believe the current Commencement without the conferral of either an honorary degree or speaker limits the celebration as an intellectual milestone, and,

Whereas, we believe that Commencement ceremonies are opportunities to honor students’ achievement as well as faculty involvement in that achievement, and,

Whereas, we believe that Commencement is a celebration of our collective intellectual accomplishment,

We resolve the following:

1. the Trask Commencement Ceremony should restore the conferral of honorary degrees when appropriate, and invite a suitable speaker the degree recipient to give a brief graduation speech
2. that reading students names individually be celebrated at the Departmental ceremonies where they will be greeted by the professors who guided their educational pursuits
3. that reading students names be discontinued at the Trask Commencement Ceremony

With faculty senate endorsement of this resolution, we intend to take this conversation to the appropriate bodies for continued consideration, especially Student Government Association.

- [Motion 08-02-06] was edited slightly in concert with the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice.
- This is going to be -- if it goes forward -- the basis for conversation with other constituencies on campus, particularly SGA.
- We’re not really here to give close textual readings.
- Basically, can we agree that Commencement needs to be enhanced from the faculty perspective?
- I am hoping we won’t sit here and speculate about what other constituencies want. Let’s think about what we want from the faculty perspective.
- Discussion:
  - Even before the edits, I didn’t like the first bullet -- we give honorary degrees already.
    - President Spaulding: When was the last time we gave one?
      - We just approved some at the last meeting.
      - President Spaulding: Just because we have approved them, doesn’t mean they will be given out.
    - What I hear Russ saying is that “restore” is not needed because we never stopped.
      - We are not hear to quibble about terminology.
      - President Spaulding: I am sympathetic to that -- I hate to have an inaccuracy. But...
  - Motion to amend: The Trask Commencement Ceremony should confer honorary degrees when appropriate, and invite a suitable speaker the degree recipient to give a brief graduation speech.
  - Point of order: Do we have a quorum?
    - Secretary called the roll and it was determined that there was not a quorum present.
    - President Spaulding: I, as President, will encourage the Steering Committee to put this as our first agenda item for the next meeting -- I apologize that Faculty Senate has not been able to address this sooner.

New business

- No new business.

Announcements

- No announcements.
Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:10pm.
Tuesday, 13 November 2007
2:00 p.m., EB 162
Meeting 2008-03

Meeting called to order at 2:03pm.

Roll call

Absent:

Departmental senators: Adams (Nursing), Avery (Chemistry), Barth (Public and International Affairs), Blundo (Social Work), Burt (Foreign Languages), Clark (Cameron), Cook (Sociology), Cordle (CAS), Graham (Economics), Lammers (Mathematics), Sawrey (Psychology), Seidman (History), White (Music), Wray (Information Systems).

Committee chairs: Brenner (Student Affairs), Chandler (Buildings and Grounds), Hurdle (Public Service and Continuing Studies), Johnson (Research), Walker (Admissions).

Approval of the October 2007 minutes

- October 2007 minutes were approved.

Executive Session

- In accordance with the provisions in the Faculty Handbook, we will go into Executive Session for the purposes of considering candidates for honorary degrees.
  - Two nominations were considered.
  - Both candidates each received the requisite 2/3 favorable vote.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo

- UNC Tomorrow meeting.
  - Tomorrow at 12:30pm in the Golden Hawk Room.
  - Thanks to Mark for getting the word out.
  - We are the last meeting of this group.
- Update on basketball player who was summary suspended.
  - Introduced Pat Leonard, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs.
    - UNCW Police got a tip that one of our students had a loaded gun on campus.
    - Student in question (who cannot be named) was given a summary suspension.
      - This results in an immediate removal from campus without question.
      - Student can request to be allowed back on campus.
- Millennial campus update.
  - Introduced Bob Roer.
    - Link to PPT.
    - CREST (Campus for Research, Entrepreneurship, Service and Teaching).
    - All activities must be consistent with mission and strategic goals of UNCW.
    - All proposals will be vetted by Buildings and Grounds committee, Board of Trustees, and Board of Governors.
    - Three current projects, based on faculty input:
      - Forensic lab.
      - Marine biotechnology facility – in Myrtle Grove campus.
      - Health and fitness center.
Centers:
- Center for Marine Science site – south CREST site.
- East CREST site.
- West CREST site.

Governance:
- Vice Chancellor for Business Affairs.
- Dean of Graduate School and Research.
- Assistant Vice Chancellor for Public Service.

Questions:
- Will UNCW still own the facilities on which they will be located?
  - Yes – there are two models.
    - Private funding
    - Or land lease long-term leases, after which time the buildings revert to UNCW.
- Is there an acceptable level of risk?
  - We might take out loans to build buildings without tenants in the space; that’s a risk
- Could there be biological risks?
  - No more than we already have on campus.
- Can we pull the plug on research that is deemed too risky?
  - Yes – NC State has all these safeguards in place.
- Would the same ethics that apply to federal-funded research apply for private-funded research?
  - Absolutely – they would have to go through the same approvals on campus (IRB, etc.).
- Will the PowerPoint presentation be available?
  - Absolutely.
- Can we post it on Academic Affairs?
  - Yes
- Is CREST the new name?
  - Yes – it's the generic name for this type of project.
  - But millennial campus is still in use

Talked about George Stokes.
- Executive Administrator of the State Health Plan.
- The Chancellor invited him to come today to address Faculty Senate.
  - But he is at a board meeting on campus.
- The Chancellor suggests hosting an open forum or a joint session of Faculty Senate and Staff Council.
  - Should she issue an invitation to him?
- From the floor:
  - They may be having an open forum with him today from 5 to 7pm in the Golden Hawk Room -- but that may have changed.
- He has talked of having a minimal employee contribution to offset the current dependant contribution; he has also talked about domestic partner benefits.
- From the floor:
  - Having him speak before Faculty Senate would be a better idea. Open fora do not usually benefit attendees – they are more about the presenters.
- Or it could involve Faculty Assembly and the system-wide Staff Council.
- Let the Chancellor know how this evening goes please.

2. President of the Senate Spaulding

- ROTC.
  - This was referred to UCC.
  - UCC tossed it back to us.
  - Perhaps CAS ought to look at it as last time we had ROTC on campus, it was housed in CAS.
- Senate President election in December.
Questions:
- When will we know who is/are nominated?
  - At the December meeting.
  - Interested people will arrange for their nominations.
  - Nominees are typically asked to say a few words.
- You are not running again?
  - That is correct – I am in year 3 of 4 and think a change would be good.
- You might want to tell people what is involved.
  - Steering Committee is working hard to generate more support for the Faculty Senate.
  - Currently, we are searching for permanent space and staff support for Faculty Senate.
  - We are discussing the possibility of the Faculty Senate President becoming a 12-month position.

Bill Bolduc, Faculty Athletic Representative.
- Link to PPT.
- Introduced Kelly Landry Mehrten, new Director of Athletics.
- Wants to remind everyone what faculty involvement with athletics is.
- Athletics Council.
  - Assists and guides the Athletic Department in maintaining academic integrity at UNCW.
  - Reviews grades of all athletes.
  - Reviews class attendance of all athletes.
  - Meets 2-3 times a semester.
  - Advises on policies.
  - Reviews missed class requests.
  - Each sport is reviewed every 2-3 years.
- Faculty Athletic Representative is Bill Bolduc.
  - He assists with NCAA compliance issues.
- A culture of academic emphasis persists in Athletics at UNCW.
  - The graduation rate is among the highest in the state and CAA.
  - UNCW has had three winners of the CAA Scholar Athlete of the Year.
  - The graduation success rates tend to be higher for athletes than for the population at large.
  - All 19 of our teams exceeded the baseline number of classes taken toward their majors.
- Faculty roles.
  - Help athletes monitor grades by submitting midterm grade reports.
  - Contact Sandy Morrison (Head Academic Advisor) with questions and issues (do not contact coaches directly).
  - Contact Dr. Hunt or Dr. Bolduc with questions or concerns.

President Spaulding:
- Faculty should be very appreciative of the work level that Bolduc and Hunt put in to this -- it saves the faculty as a whole work and worry about this.

3. Steering Committee submits the following motion, regarding proposed changes to Faculty Assembly Membership:

- [Motion 08-03-09] That the method for determining the number of delegates to Faculty Assembly from each campus be based on a percentage of total faculty, rather than a number. For more information, please read this document: Memo to campuses with Charter (PDF)

President Spaulding:
- It does not result in the redistribution of power. It is just a way to account more effectively for growth.
- Question:
  - I don’t understand the sentence as written.
    - Did the senator read the attached information? The attachment clarifies the situation.
    - No.
    - You should have done.
  - We will most likely be addressing this on our campus soon.
Committee reports

1. Academic Standards submits the following motion:

   - [Motion 08-03-10] The Academic Standards Committee submits the REQUIREMENTS FOR ANOTHER BACCALAUREATE DEGREE on page 92 of the 2007-2008 Undergraduate Catalogue be modified with the following additions (underscored) and deletions (struck through):

     A student with a baccalaureate degree from UNCW may receive another baccalaureate degree if it is a different second baccalaureate degree in and a different major. The student must meet all the requirements for the second degree and major, including 31 hours in residency, at least 15 semester hours in the major at the 300-400 level, and course work that meets the spirit of UNCW’s current basic studies requirements.

     - Does the Chair of the committee want to address this?
       - Russ Herman:
         - This only affects students who have completed a UNCW degree and have then come back.
         - It resulted from a complaint from a student in this situation, who was trying to get federal funding.
         - We realized there were some discrepancies.
     - Discussion
       - Chancellor: What does phrase “course work that meets the spirit” mean?
         - This is language that reflects what other campuses are doing and reflects other sections in the course catalogue.
         - It basically means that the requirements might have been changed since they got their first degree.
       - Chancellor: I am worried that it is too general – that it might get us in trouble.

   - [Motion 08-03-10] carried.

2. University Curriculum Committee submits the following motion:

   - [Motion 08-03-11] That the Senate approve the following recommendations:
     - Delete BIO 204: Principles of Biology: Cells (currently meets basic studies)
     - Delete BIO 205 Principles of Biology: Plants (currently meets basic studies)
     - Delete BIO 206 Principles of Biology: Animals (currently meets basic studies)
     - Approve BIO 201 Principles of Biology: Cells for Basic Studies - Life Science
     - Approve BIO 202 Principles of Biology: Biodiversity for Basic Studies - Life Science
     - Approve BIO 495 Applied Learning Seminar-- New Course, Computer Competency, Oral Competency, will be required for a major/minor option in department
     - Approve FST 210: Moviemakers and Scholars Series for Basic Studies – Fine Arts
     - Approve FST 110: Concepts in Film for Basic Studies – Fine Arts
     - Delete FST/THR 225: History and Appreciation of Film: Silent (currently meets basic studies)
     - Delete FST/THR 226: History and Appreciation of Film: Sound (currently meets basic studies)
     - Delete FST/THR 227: History and Appreciation of Film: Modern (currently meets basic studies)
     - Delete CRW 202: Explorations in the Creative Process and Change Prefix to FNA 102: Explorations in the Creative Process
     - Approve FNA 102: Explorations in the Creative Process for Basic Studies – Fine Arts
     - Approve CRW 203: Forms of Creative Writing – for Basic Studies – Literature
     - Approve EVSL 195 – Environmental Studies laboratory for Basic Studies- Life Science
     - Approve ARH 476: Art History Capstone Seminar (new course, required for a major, meets computer and oral competency)
     - Approve change in coursework required for Studio Art (49 hours to 55 hours)
     - Approve change in coursework required for Art History (42 hours to 48 hours and change in 300-400
level)
- Approve requirements in Film studies from 42 hours to 45 hours
  - President Spaulding:
    - Two points:
      - Regarding the BIO 495 line, there is a typo.
        - It should be BIOL 495.
      - Regarding the FST lines, we are only deleting the FST portions.
      - If there are no objections, we will vote on these as one motion. Are there any objections?
    - Discussion:
      - I’m concerned that BIO has 5 basic studies courses towards the major. It just seems to have 5 course in BIO, then those are 5 classes that students are not taking elsewhere.
        - Martin Posey, Chair of Biology:
          - No, we are replacing a three-course sequence with a two-course sequence.
      - Do you want 201 and 202 to be basic studies?
        - Martin Posey, Chair of Biology:
          - They are.
  - [Motion 08-03-11] carried.

3. Michael Freeze (Math) submits the following motion, motivated by recent interactions between students and speakers:

  - [Motion 08-03-12] "That the Faculty Senate investigate the adoption of a professional code of faculty conduct which specifically enumerates faculty commitments to its respective disciplines and to its students. In particular, that the Faculty Senate consider the obligation of faculty as educators to support and respect diversity among individuals in all educational settings, and to protect students from abusive or demeaning speech based on race, sex (such as gender, marital status, and pregnancy), age, color, national origin (including ethnicity), creed, religion, disability, sexual orientation, political affiliation, and veteran status."
    - Will Freeze speak to this please?
    - From the floor:
      - Can you make the motion larger?
    - Michael Freeze:
      - The Campus Diversity Climate Survey noted that students are often the victim of disparaging comments.
      - There is an ongoing difficulty on campus with respect to respecting differences.
      - Shared some emails from students to the Dean of Students Office regarding evangelicals who visit campus regularly.
        - The Dean of Students' Office replied that "yesterday’s event was not approved" and that those individuals involved may not apply for a Freedom of Speech pass for another year.
      - Tom Barth, Chair of the Diversity Council, informed Freeze prior to this meeting that the Diversity Council is working on a Campus Respect Compact.
        - The Diversity Council approved the establishment of a task force to address this compact at their November 5th meeting.
      - Freeze will respectfully withdraw the [Motion 08-03-12] now, given that the Campus Respect Compact Task Force is addressing this issue.
    - President Spaulding:
      - You need to ask for a unanimous assent that [Motion 08-03-12] be withdrawn or move to vote.
      - Any objections to withdrawing [Motion 08-03-12]?
        - Point of order:
          - It is not debatable.
      - Hearing none, [Motion 08-03-12] is withdrawn.

4. Department of Biology and Marine Biology submits the following motion:

  - [Motion 08-03-13] That the Faculty Senate endorse the following resolution prepared by the Department of
Biology and Marine Biology:

“Whereas the principles of academic freedom include the right to speak freely about the results of our scholarly work without fear of punishment, we condemn the termination of the UNCW Tidal Creeks Program contract by New Hanover County Commissioners in a manner and timing that could be construed as retribution for the exercise of those rights by our colleagues.”

- Martin Posey, Chair of Biology:
  - Is it appropriate to defer to a faculty member – Larry Cahoon?
    - Yes.
  - Larry Cahoon:
    - [Motion 08-03-13] refers to New Hanover County retaliating against two UNCW scientists for their public discussion of their results.
    - Goes back to the spring.
      - The trigger point was Cahoon’s discussion of his results about a sewage spill on a radio show some months ago.
      - The Assistant County Manager and County Manager threatened to cancel the contract with UNCW.
      - They cancelled without telling us why.
      - Politicians retaliated against UNCW for communicating their findings.

- President Spaulding:
  - Will you take questions?
    - Yes

- Martin Posey, Chair of Biology:
  - UNCW Administration has been very supportive of the scientists involved.
  - BIO has already passed this motion.

- Questions:
  - I think it is entirely appropriate that we support this. However, I have a problem with you accusing the County Commissioners of violating your academic freedom – they are under no obligation to respect your academic freedom. We can support you on the spirit of it – but this is following the wrong logical path.
  - Couldn’t we delete the 9 words after “Commissioners”? We have had confirmation in writing from one of those Commissioners that this is why it happened.
  - Motion from the floor: [Motion 08-03-14] To amend the motion by deleting the words: “in a manner and timing that could be construed.”
    - [Motion 08-03-14] seconded.
      - Discussion
        - Tim’s point is not addressed by [Motion 08-03-14].
        - What happens after this [Motion 08-03-14] is carried?
          - Hold on until after the vote.

  - [Motion 08-03-14] carried.
  - What happens next after this [Motion 08-03-13] is carried?
    - We talk regularly on the radio about these issues. The other side has accused us of not having the support of UNCW.
    - They will receive copies of this?
      - I do not send these out – no.
  - Is it possible to turn this [Motion 08-03-13] down and have it referred back to remove the allusions to “academic freedom”?
    - I think it does relate to academic freedom– this could have ramifications for future research at UNCW.
    - Perhaps it is better to allude to the principles of a free society – free speech?
    - If we have a contract with the County Commissioners, are they not obliged to respect our academic freedom? I don’t want us to drop the academic freedom.
Maybe we can combine the two?
- Is that a motion? We cannot do anything without a motion.
- I think it would require legal input to see whether County Commissioners are bound by academic freedom. I want to support you but actually accuse them of the crime that they are actually guilty of (and that the public will understand).
- Motion from the floor: "Whereas the principles of academic freedom include the right to speak freely about the results of our scholarly work without fear of punishment and the contract includes a right-to-publish clause, we condemn the termination of the UNCW Tidal Creeks Program contract by New Hanover County Commissioners in a manner and timing that could be construed as retribution for the exercise of those rights by our colleagues."
  - No second for motion.
  - Motion dies.
- Chancellor: Tim is making a compelling point – the County Commissioners did not sign the right-to-publish clause with a view to academic freedom.
- Motion from the floor: "Whereas the principles of academic freedom and indeed of free speech in general include the right to speak freely about the results of our scholarly work without fear of punishment and the contract includes a right-to-publish clause, we condemn the termination of the UNCW Tidal Creeks Program contract by New Hanover County Commissioners in a manner and timing that could be construed as retribution for the exercise of those rights by our colleagues."
  - No second for motion.
  - Motion dies.
- Tim is missing what the language in [Motion 08-03-13] actually asserts. It is not a narrow academic freedom. “Retribution for the exercise of those rights” includes free speech.
- Using the term academic freedom alienates us from the community.
  - Chancellor: I am in agreement.
- Motion to amend: [Motion 08-03-15] Strike "academic freedom" from [Motion 08-03-13] and replace with "free speech."
  - [Motion 08-03-15] seconded.
  - Discussion:
    - [Motion 08-03-15] addresses everything that people are concerned about.
    - It is not just a free speech issue – it is about the connection between provision of knowledge and the political world. This does distort the big point here.
    - This should be reworded to stress that the County Commissioners attempt at intimidation affects the objectivity of the researchers' research – that should be included.
    - If we’re talking about rewording, one of the things that is missing is a discussion about public health itself.
    - It seems to me that “scholarly work without fear of punishment” addresses your concern about the connection to the political world.
    - This is political intimidation – and we are against that.
    - I think when they read [Motion 08-03-15], that point won’t be lost.
    - The public will understand the public health issue and not the issues of free speech and academic freedom – if we are to tell the public why they should care, then that is what we should communicate.
    - I would argue against adding something about the public health – it mitigates against other environmental issues.
    - Could we add Tim’s first phrase, “We condemn the attempts to silence our colleagues”?
  - [Motion 08-03-15] carried.
- Motion from the floor: [Motion 08-03-16] To remove “speak freely about the” with “disseminate.”
  - [Motion 08-03-16] seconded.
  - Discussion:
    - Isn’t disseminate too scholarly?
  - [Motion 08-03-16] voted down.
• Point of order:
  • How much of the original wording do I have to keep if I make a motion?
    • You can make an amendment.
    • You can rewrite the entire thing.
• Shorter is sweeter – along the lines of Tim's thinking. Motion from the floor: [Motion 08-03-17]
  Delete the first clause and start with: “We condemn the termination of the UNCW Tidal Creeks
  Program contracts by New Hanover County Commissioners as retribution for the exercise of free
  speech by our colleagues.”
  • [Motion 08-03-17] seconded.
  • Discussion:
    • I think this is a great improvement but we should add a clause about intimidation
      of university research.
    • Motion to call to question: [Motion 08-03-18].
      • [Motion 08-03-18] seconded.
      • [Motion 08-03-18] carried.
  • [Motion 08-03-17] carried.
• Provost: if we pass [Motion 08-03-13] as amended, please inform the Chancellor and Provost about
  it with suggestions as to where it should go.
  • [Motion 08-03-13] carried.

Old business

1. Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice submits the following revised motion:

  • [Motion 08-02-06] In an effort to expand faculty participation in the Commencement Ceremonies at Trask
    Coliseum as a celebration of student and faculty achievement, to make it a more meaningful event for all
    participants, and,

    Whereas, we believe the current Commencement without the conferral of an honorary degree and speaker limits
    the celebration as an intellectual milestone, and,

    Whereas, we believe that Commencement ceremonies are opportunities to honor students’ achievement as well
    as faculty involvement in that achievement, and,

    Whereas, we believe that Commencement is a celebration of our collective intellectual accomplishment,

    We resolve the following:

    1. the Trask Commencement Ceremony should restore the conferral of honorary degrees and invite the
       degree recipient to give a brief graduation speech
    2. that reading students names individually be celebrated at the Departmental ceremonies where they will be
       greeted by the professors who guided their educational pursuits
    3. that reading students names be discontinued at the Trask Commencement Ceremony

    With faculty senate endorsement of this resolution, we intend to take this conversation to the appropriate bodies
    for continued consideration, especially Student Government Association.

    • This will be discussed at the December meeting.

New business

• No new business.

Announcements
No announcements.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4pm.
Meeting 2008-02

Meeting called to order at 2:05pm.

Roll call

Absent:

Departmental senators: Bushman (English), Clark (Cameron), Cox (Creative Writing), Cutting (Environmental Studies), Evers (Accountancy), Graham (Economics), Huber (Elementary), Lammers (Mathematics), Rice (Sociology), Rodriguez (Management), Salwen (Music), Schuhmann (Economics), Siegel (Creative Writing).

Committee chairs: Brenner (Student Affairs), Caropreso (Evaluation), Chandler (Buildings and Grounds), Gerard (University Advancement), Hurdle (Public Service and Continuing Studies), Johnson (Research), Walker (Admissions).

Approval of the September 2007 minutes

- September 2007 minutes were approved, following change to date of completion for the Nursing Building.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo

   - Hosted two open forums last week:
     - Showed a video; please visit the UNC Tomorrow site to see it (http://www.nctomorrow.org/). The video basically communicates what the state needs from its university system as a whole.
       - Erskine Bowles is touring the state with the Scholars Council.
         - They will visit UNCW on November 14th, 12:30 to 2:30pm (Room TBA).
         - This visit is for the purpose of hearing from faculty so please try to make it if you are free.
         - Bowles sees this UNC Tomorrow as demand-driven rather than supply-driven.
         - Question: Who is the audience for the video? This session is designed for faculty.
         - As soon as they have a room, they will send out and official announcement.
       - Please check the UNC Tomorrow website; there is a lot of good information there.
   - Two parking forums this week:
     - One during this meeting.
     - Friday, 2-3:30, at Randall Library Auditorium.
   - Faculty have confronted some situations recently involving first amendment rights and academic freedom; please know that they have the support of the Administration and Bowles.
   - Chancellor ceded the floor to Mary Gornto, Vice Chancellor for University Advancement, who gave an update on the Capital Comprehensive Campaign.
     - Congratulations to the Faculty Senate University Advancement Committee.
       - Just over $18,000 has been given to the faculty endowed merit scholarship to date
       - Current market value is over $27,000.
       - An award cannot be given until the gift is over $25,000.
       - Expect the first award in 2009.
       - Thanks for your work in this area.
     - 30.9% participation rate in the Capital Comprehensive Campaign in FY 2006.
       - More and more, external donors want to know how many faculty and staff contribute to and support this campaign.
Introduced Janell Johnson, Director of Annual Giving; she works with the Faculty Senate University Advancement Committee.

- Capital Campaign runs from 2005 to 2012, which marks UNCW's 65th anniversary.
  - 7.7 million in gifts for FY 2006; this represents a 39% increase from the prior year.
- Distributed and explained this report to senators. ([Link to Report in Excel](#))
  - Student Excellence Fund includes:
    - Scholarships (merit, athlete, and underrepresented populations).
    - Graduate student fellowships.
    - Technology for faculty funded research.
  - Faculty Excellence Fund includes:
    - Faculty support.
    - Distinguished professorships (already established two: Jazz for Music and Jewish History for History).
    - Post doc fellowships.
    - Promising young faculty.
  - Academic Excellence Fund includes:
    - Discretionary funds for departments.
    - Naming opportunities for facilities.
  - Regional and Global Engagement Fund includes:
    - Undergraduate scholarships.
    - Youth development activities.
    - Study abroad.
    - International students.
- Annual fund we live by, Capital Campaign is what we will grow by.
- Let your imagination run wild with ways to help with this campaign.

2. President of the Senate Spaulding

- ROTC? UCC to review.
  - UNCW was approached about restarting an ROTC program; Provost holds no strong opinion about this.
  - Referred to UCC.
  - Original request came through Campbell University via Colonel Wiseman
  - ROTC was once on campus but was stopped after a military budget cut.
- Health Affairs Task Force.
  - Reviewing the reorganization of some departments in CAS and School of Nursing.
  - Task force is still reviewing this.
- Engineering Task Force.
  - It has been requested that UNCW start an Engineering program.
  - A task force has been established and includes the chairs of the relevant departments (Computer Science, Math, Chemistry, Physics), Ken Diehl (manages the 2+2 program), and Craig Galbraith.
- Student Honor Code.
  - Chair of the Economics Department, Robert Burrus, suggested that UNCW consider adopting a real academic honor code for students.
  - Dick Veit was contacted.
  - Student Honor Code Committee will be established and will include 4 faculty, a Dean of Students Office representative, and students.
- President ceded the floor to Kathleen Berkeley.
  - Sloan survey is still active; please fill it out if you have not already done so.
  - We need to hit the required participation rate. Berkeley will find out what the current rate is next week; we were at 32% last time she checked (40% is minimum). But the survey states that the larger the participation rate, the more accurate the findings.
  - Would like to extend an apology to lecturers.
    - Sloan requires that participants be tenured or tenure-track faculty only.

3. Raymond Burt and Tammy Hunt, Faculty Assembly Delegates, regarding proposed changes to the University Code section 603/604. Background information available through these four links: (Appendix B: Introduction to University Code and Policies and Recent Historical Context | Memorandum to Faculty Assembly Delegates | Faculty Assembly’s Proposed Text Revisions to Nielsen “603/604” | FACULTY ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION: On Proposed Changes in University Code)

- [Motion 08-02-03] That the faculty senate endorse the following resolution prepared by the faculty assembly:
  - On Proposed Changes in Code of the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina

  Whereas, the Faculty Senate of UNCW has received a report from the Faculty Assembly Delegation and background materials relating to efforts of the Faculty Assembly of The University of North Carolina to address significant problems in the proposals by the “Code 603/604 Committee,” and

  Whereas, the Faculty Senate wishes to go on record regarding its concerns with the original Code 603/604 Committee proposal, insofar as it would have introduced vague language regarding possible sanctions affecting faculty, conflated the developmental purpose of post-tenure review with the process of discipline or sanction, imposed relatively lax evidentiary standards for serious sanctions of tenured faculty members, and adversely affected the rights of special faculty, among other problems; and

  Whereas, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Assembly has developed alternative language to address faculty concerns with the original Code 603/604 proposals in an effort to move matters forward and has requested faculty leaders throughout the UNC System to evaluate and comment on its alternative language; now, therefore,

The Faculty Senate of UNCW resolves:

1. The Faculty Senate supports the alternative language proposed by the Executive Committee of the UNC Faculty Assembly and endorsed by the Faculty Assembly at its September 28, 2007 meeting;
2. The Faculty Senate requests that, in the future, changes to the Code of the Board of Governors or other University policies directly affecting faculty be undertaken only with extensive faculty representation on relevant committees or task forces, open involvement in deliberations from the outset, and adequate opportunities to comment during the academic year except under pressing and unusual circumstances.
3. The Faculty Senate asks the Secretary of the Faculty to submit this resolution to the Chancellor and Provost of UNCW, and the President of The University of North Carolina as an indication of its substantial concerns with the original Code 603/604 Committee recommendations, its support for the alternative text prepared by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Assembly, and its request that in the future more extensive faculty representation and opportunities for review be accorded when developing policies affecting faculty.

Submitted by the Faculty Assembly delegation.

- Tammy Hunt:
  - 603/604 deals with employee dismissal procedures.
  - Faculty Assembly Executive Committee met with group regarding these proposed changes.
    - The above document reflect the changes they suggested: They requested that in future, when major policy changes occur, they happen during the academic year and involve faculty input.
    - Faculty Assembly meets again on November 16th; the Board of Governors will review this at their January meeting.
  - Question: If you can use unsatisfactory reviews as grounds for dismissal, then there would seem to be no point to tenure?
Raymond Burt: There is worry about a quota system developing as a result of building unsatisfactory post-tenure reviews as grounds for dismissal into the code.

- Another meeting is scheduled to hammer out the differences between the policy group and the Faculty Assembly Executive Committee so we can put forward one document.
- Discussion: senator supports this motion; just because a person is tenured, if they are not performing they can be dismissed; it will meet the needs of the public and the institution.
- [Motion 08-02-03] carried.

Committee reports

1. University Curriculum Committee submits the following motions:

   - [Motion 08-02-04] That the faculty senate approve the Department of Health and Applied Human Sciences’ Intent to Plan for a B.S. degree in Exercise Science. (HAHS Intent to Plan | Letter from HAHS)
     - Discussion:
       - Is an intent to plan approval really needed from Senate?
         - Yes; it is better for Senate to be involved at the beginning of the process than wait until all the planning has occurred and then question it.
       - Is there such a thing as exercise science?
         - It’s a recognized field of study.
         - What do they do?
           - Mechanics.
           - Kinesiology.
     - [Motion 08-02-04] carried.
   - [Motion 08-02-05] That the faculty senate approve the establishment of an Add-On Licensure in Teaching English as a Second Language in the School of education. (Add-On Licensure Info from UCC webpage)
     - [Motion 08-02-05] carried.

2. Ad-hoc Committee on Basic Studies revision.

   - Kim Sawrey, Chair:
     - The new committee started from scratch. Decided upon the same seven categories of study that the previous committee focused on.
     - Want the Basic Studies curriculum to be more interdisciplinary with more directed course choices.
     - Want there to be more study abroad opportunities.
     - Currently, there is a Freshman Seminar Working Group, which is addressing that program.
     - Across the board, writing skills need improvement among UNCW students. We are working with the appropriate departments on this issue.
     - Question: Have we dropped an emphasis on diversity issues for the Basic Studies curriculum?
       - No.
     - Link to Full Report in Word

3. Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice submits the following motion:

   - [Motion 08-02-06] Motion to (a) discontinue the reading of graduates’ names at Commencement, (b) read them only at individual department ceremonies, and (c) reinstitute the Commencement conferral of honorary degrees with the recipient providing a brief speech.
     - Question: What was the motive behind this motion?
       - Concerned that many faculty do not attend because they miss having commencement speaker
     - Question: Did you consult SGA?
       - No, once we have collective sense of faculty, then we will approach SGA.
     - Discussion:
       - Amount of faculty who showed up at convocation this year is indication that more would show up for speakers; in support of this idea.
Commencement is for students; it bothers me that they are not involved in this discussion. Question: Can we check with SGA first?

- Subsequent conversation would involve SGA.
- There is a university-wide commencement committee. This should be brought to Terry Curran.
- It would change Cameron’s way of doing things.
- If we vote today, this would mean this is our opinion.
- Even if we vote for it today, we probably won’t get our way. Too many want to keep it as is.
- Parents have spent thousands of dollars, and students a lot of time. Read the names. These are separate issues. We shouldn’t worry about our comfort.
- We have a very bland graduation. Let’s do something, most schools just graduate by schools.
- Students asked to have their names read. We didn’t pay speakers; they got an honorary degree.
- Chancellor: there are logistics that this doesn’t address. Last time we approved an honorary degree, the person chose not to come. We would have to grant several honorary degrees to see if people would accept speaking twice in one day.
- We want to work with the students on graduation. This motion doesn’t say why this would be good for students.
- This motion communicates that Faculty Senate doesn’t care about the students.
- For the students, this is once in a lifetime; often this is the first person in the family to graduate from college.
- There is no intellectual content to the ceremony. It’s worse than bland, it’s vapid. It loses what little import it has.
- Question: When once the last time this was raised with students formally
  - 4 or 5 years ago.
  - Student representative to the Commencement Committee continues to support the reading of names.
- This could make the ceremony much better for the students; it depends on how we approach the student committees.
- It’s an emotional experience for the students.
- It deteriorates toward the end.
- Let’s get a speaker first, then if they agree, give them honorary degree.
- Is there a distinction between graduate and undergraduates in this motion? We should not not acknowledge graduate students. I would approve a more general motion that we need to improve the commencement experience.
- Question: Is it possible to ask committee to run a survey of faculty? A survey would help us.
  - Yes.
- Is it possible to hear what the Chancellor and Provost think about this?
Chancellor: she remembers being bored in the past at graduations until she became president of a university and got to shake everyone’s hand. That’s when she realized how important it is. This doesn’t negate what has been said, however. But we never get a call afterwards saying that it was terrible having no speaker. There must be a middle ground. 14 faculty come to Princeton’s commencement and they spend thousands of dollars on speakers.

Provost: it really is the students’ day. There may be better ways to do this. We can analyze this carefully and respond to it.

- The official photographer gets photos of each student as s/he receives diploma. We can’t have him at each departmental ceremony.
- President: let’s not send motion to committee. Let’s vote down [Motion 08-02-07] and ask Sociology and Criminal Justice to take the motion back and work on it more – phrase it with the idea that the Senate wants to improve this ceremony.

  - [Motion 08-02-07] voted down.
  - Motion from the floor: [Motion 08-02-08] We refer [Motion 08-02-06] back to Sociology and Criminal Justice.

Old business

- No old business.

New business

- Can we be updated on the Millennial Campus project, which was sent to Chapel Hill in June?
- Can we ask that Academic Affairs pull the confidential vote by senior departmental faculty and the department chair’s letter from RPT dossier before returning to candidate?
  - This will be referred to Steering Committee.
- Michael Freeze (Math) introduced the following motion, motivated by interactions two weeks ago between students and speakers:
  - "That the Faculty Senate investigate the adoption of a professional code of faculty conduct which specifically enumerates faculty commitments to its respective disciplines and to its students. In particular, that the Faculty Senate consider the obligation of faculty as educators to support and respect diversity among individuals in all educational settings, and to protect students from abusive or demeaning speech based on race, sex (such as gender, marital status, and pregnancy), age, color, national origin (including ethnicity), creed, religion, disability, sexual orientation, political affiliation, and veteran status."
  - Please give context for this motion in agenda for November meeting.

Announcements

- Anthropology has challenged Sociology and Criminal Justice to raise funds for WHQR. Please help during the fund drive.

Adjournment

*Meeting adjourned at 3:57pm.*
Meeting called to order.

Roll call

Absent:

Departmental senators: Moore (University College), Simmons (Anthropology), McCartney (Biology), Cox (Creative Writing), Wray (Information Systems), Noland (English), Lisa Pollard (History), Chandler (Math), Lowery (Political Science), Clark (Cameron), Elikai (Accountancy).

Committee chairs: Lowrey (Bookstore), Brenner (Student Affairs), Gerard (University Advancement), Hurdle (Public Service), Townend (University Curriculum), Johnson (Research).

Approval of the April 2007 minutes

- April 2007 minutes were approved.

Special order of the day

1. Election of the Vice President, the Secretary, and the Steering Committee of the Senate

   - Nominations for Vice President open: Bruce McKinney.
   - Nominations for Secretary open: Liza Palmer.
   - Nominations for Steering Committee open: Eddie Caropreso, Sue Cody, L. Andy Jackson, Steve Pullum, Gene Tagliarini.
   - Motion from the floor [Motion 08-01-01]: positions of Vice President and Secretary be automatically voted in by virtue of the fact that they are running unopposed. Motion seconded and carried.
   - Elections proceeded to ballot for Steering Committee.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo:

   - We now have just under 12,000 students with an average SAT score of 1157. Our graduate students number over 1,100. There are 60 new faculty members. We have received donations and are moving forward with a professorship in jazz and in Jewish history.
   - We will soon be breaking ground on the nursing building and there are plans for a new academic building.
   - The Chancellor briefly discussed President Bowles’s UNC Tomorrow initiative.
   - She emphasized that senate members need to communicate with their faculty and noted that, while we have made miniscule diversity gains, there is much room for improvement. Retention is a major issue – perhaps host more faculty workshops about how to aid the retention efforts.

2. Provost Hosier (Chancellor DePaolo ceded the floor)

   - Introduced Dr. Stephen Mcfarland, new Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and based in the History Department.
   - Introduced Manuel Avalos, new Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and based in the Foreign Languages and Literatures Department.
   - Dr. Johnson Akinleye, new Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, was unable to attend due to a death in the family.
Lisa Castellino, Office of Institutional Research, has been promoted to Assistant Vice Chancellor.

- Sciences Building has been approved with an expected completion date of 2009; Psychology will be primary occupant at present.
- Hoping for Nursing Building on Chancellor’s Walk with an expected completion date of 2011.
- Search is beginning for Assistant Provost of the Office of International Programs; currently putting together a search committee.
- Dr. Debra Saunders-White has accepted an interim role of Associate Provost for Diversity, in addition to her current ITSD duties.
- Centro Hispano search is underway; priority review of applications happens on September 15th.
- Aretha Jones-Cook has accepted the position of Director of the Upperman Center.

3. President of the Senate Spaulding

- Results of the elections reported, as tabulated by Senate Secretary and Parliamentarian: Cody, Jackson, Pullum, Tagliarini.
- Provost is seeking volunteers for members of the Office of International Programs search committee. Forward names of interested faculty to Mark Spaulding.
- Nominations for Delegates to the Faculty Assembly Info
  - Two positions open; nominees do not have to be senators.
  - Nominations open: Raymond Burt.
  - Motion from the floor [Motion 08-01-02]: wait until October Senate meeting to make nominations. Motion seconded. Discussion: cannot wait as the first Faculty Assembly meeting is at the end of September.
  - Amendment to [Motion 08-01-02]: do not close nominations on floor but leave open for 7 days from today, with nominations submitted to Mark Spaulding via email. An online vote will then be organized. Amendment seconded and carried.
  - Points of clarification for [Motion 08-01-02]: nominees have to be full-time faculty members but not necessarily tenure-track or tenured. No nominations without the prior consent of nominees, please. Need at least four nominees, two for each open position.
    - [Motion 08-01-02]: carried.
    - Further nominations: Gene Tagliarini, Richard Satterlie, Kathy Roney.
- University support for faculty senate and president
  - Senate has no support: no office, no administrative help, no record keeping.
  - Faculty has gotten bigger, in addition there are more and new senior administrators.
  - The current state of affairs could be corrected with some infrastructural injection.
  - Considering whether to “incentivize” the office of Faculty Senate President: make it a 12-month appointment? Summer stipend? Research reassignment?
  - Hope to report on this issue again at the October meeting.
  - Please share ideas with the Steering Committee and/or Mark Spaulding.
- Communication with senators, faculty
  - No good listserv exists for current senators but rather includes everyone who has ever been a senator. When Mark Spaulding attempted to rectify this, there were complaints. We need a current listserv called “senators.”
  - Asks that Senate IT committee consider how we can utilize technology to improve communication with the UNCW faculty as a whole. We need a communications audit. Discussion: online Blackboard class? We need a forum to discuss governance solely. The forum needs to be voluntary, easy to use, and not automatic (unless faculty opt for this) so as not to discourage use.
  - Two immediate tasks: (1) Listserv of current senators called “senators”; (2) Senate IT committee consider ways to improve faculty communication. Senate IT committee will report back soon.
  - Recommends that senators consult Senate agenda ahead of time to be prepared for agenda items like nominations. Discussion: agenda setting needs to be more democratic (as opposed to imposed). Current process is that the Steering Committee sets the agenda based on submissions from faculty and administrators. Perhaps a brainstorming session during the first meeting of every year to set global agenda items for the year? Perhaps include “New Agenda Items” under “New Business” to build this into the
practice of meetings? That is the stated purpose of “New Business.” Steering Committee will consider this issue.

- Kathleen Berkeley, Center for Faculty Leadership on Sloan Award for Faculty Career Flexibility [Sloan Award Info]
  - Please help spread the word about the faculty survey going live on Saturday and closing on November 30th. It is a voluntary survey that will take about 20 minutes to complete; faculty can start and stop the survey when needed. We are currently at #25 for the Sloan Award. 40% response rate from tenure-track and tenure faculty is needed to get to the next level of the competition.
  - Next step in the process is writing an accelerated plan, 8- to 10-pages long, detailing what we would do with $200,000 prize money. Please forward ideas to Kathleen Berkeley. Discussion: we still need a faculty dining room.

- Regarding recent PPT presentation about proposed parking changes. Discussion: is this a draft plan? Provost: yes. Perhaps Sharon Boyd could present at the October meeting? Max Allen: that would be a long presentation. Chancellor: perhaps open fora could be held, regarding this issue. Mark Spaulding: hold open fora first, then Sharon Boyd can visit a future meeting to take questions if needed.

Committee reports

- Academic Standards committee is meeting to consider the issue raised last year about the lack of academic challenge and its relation to Basic Studies courses.
- Budget committee will report in October.
- IT committee will consider communications audit.

Old business

- No old business.

New business

- No new business.

Announcements

- No announcements.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.
Electronic Meeting
12-26 May 2008

Special electronic meeting conducted via email, presided over by President McKinney.

As was indicated in an email sent out to all senators on May 12, all senators must vote electronically (i.e. via email to President McKinney) on the following two Intent to Plan Motions by May 26:

- [Motion 08-09-35] That the Senate approve an Intent to Plan for: B.S. in Information Technology (More information from Computer Science in Word)
  - [Motion 08-09-35] carried.
- [Motion 08-09-36] That the Senate approve an Intent to Plan for: B.A. in International/Global Studies (More information from CAS in Word)
  - [Motion 08-09-36] carried.

N.B. A quorum was achieved for these Intent to Plan motions (we needed 38 to vote; 44 votes were cast); both motions carried (there were only two no votes and one abstention).
Meeting called to order at 2pm.

Roll call

Absent:
Departmental Senators: Barth (Public and International Affairs), Blundo (Social Work), Clark (Cameron), DePaolo (Chancellor), Graham (Economics), Hall (Social Work), Hines (Geography), Johnson (Film Studies), Pappamihiel (IT, Foundations, & Secondary Education), Pollard (History), Salwen (Music), Schuhmann (Economics), Seidman (History), Stiles (Management), White (Philosophy & Religion).

Committee Chairs: Brenner (Student Affairs), Caropreso (Evaluation), Gerard (University Advancement).

Approval of the March 2008 minutes

- March 2008 minutes were approved.

Executive Session

- In accordance with the provisions in the Faculty Handbook, we will go into Executive Session for the purpose of considering a candidate for an honorary degree.
  - Faculty Senate considered and voted on one nomination for an honorary degree.
  - The candidate received the requisite 2/3 favorable vote.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo

- Chancellor not present; floor ceded to Provost.
- Floor ceded to ken and steve
- Ken Spackman, Director of University Planning, & Stephen McFarland, Vice Provost: UNC Tomorrow Report and Discussion (No vote planned)
  - PPT presentation.
    - Overview of my presentation today.
      - What we’ve been asked to do.
      - Our response.
      - Why it’s good.
      - How you can learn more.
    - The purpose of UNC Tomorrow: To identify the needs of the state in the next 20 years or so and how we can sustain those efforts.
    - This will serve as the UNC system long-range planning process.
    - We are in Phase I right now.
      - How we prepare our students to be successful in the 21st century.
      - How we prepare them for a global career.
      - How we use our research to be more engaged locally.
      - How we deal with the issue of health.
    - None of this is new to UNCW. We have been engaged with this at UNCW for a long time – we are way ahead of the game.
      - For instance, in our 2002 self-study report, we had a section entitled, “Community & Regional Engagement.”
Every UNCW strategic goal links up with a UNC Tomorrow’s recommendation area. We developed those goals four years ago – we are already on the ball in this area.

- We used existing committees to address these UNC Tomorrow areas. This helped us to be more efficient about it and the efforts we make will likely be lasting as these committees are lasting. It also insured significant faculty input.

- I want to highlight a couple of our responses:
  - Annual compound rate of increase 2.8% from 2000 to 2007 for enrollment.
  - Annual compound rate of increase will be 1.7% from 2007 to 2017 for enrollment
  - We asked each of the seven committees to put forward their five top-ranked initiatives.
  - We then asked the Planning Council to prioritize the 35 initiatives
  - Each of the 35 is backed up with narrative detail, including what we have done in the past, resources needed, and then ideas for the future.
  - We further developed sixteen for the report.
  - Here's one example – this will give you an idea of what the formal Phase I response will look like:
    - The global readiness slide. There is narrative to back this up in the full report – it won’t be bulleted as it is in the slide.
    - This is the first time that UNCW has had a public transparent action plan to prioritize to meet future needs.
    - This is a really good outcome from all this hard work.

- Come to the 9am open forum at Burney on Friday (4/18) to learn more about the other sixteen priorities.
- The deadline to submit the report is May 1st.
- The deadline for Phase II is December 1st.
- Please send feedback to: unet@uncw.edu
- The full Phase I report will be accessible after May 1st at: http://www.uncw.edu/tomorrow/
  - The PPTs from the fora are linked to that site, too.

- Questions:
  - Spaulding: I have not been at all of the meetings – but the ones I have been at, I have seen that this is what UNCW Administration excels at. In my view, from a faculty member, this is watching the administration do very well what it should be doing for us.
  - We hear that the budget will be tied to the planning – I wonder if there will come a time when we ask for a building, for example, and are told our building isn’t green because it is not closely enough tied to UNC Tomorrow?
  - Spackman: I don’t think anyone knows for sure. I think this UNC Tomorrow planning process is so serious that when we ask for new money for anything, unless it is connected to something we have said, the likelihood that it will be high on the list of GA is low.
  - I think that the purpose of the buildings is key – not necessarily if it is green or not. The purpose is key and will need to be consistent with the UNC Tomorrow goals in some way. Recently, we have proposed three items that are so closely linked to the UNC Tomorrow goals, that they are on the agenda for the General Assembly.
  - Provost: We have seen the converse also; we have submitted some items and GA has said, well that is something that they won’t put forward to the General Assembly.
  - There have been some conversations about UNC Tomorrow guiding program establishment – can you assure us how this might affect us?
  - Raymond Burt: We were presented at Faculty Assembly with current program change – all program submissions. The new proposals indicate that GA will be more proactive in establishing programs. Whenever we send a new degree program, there will be a process where all the campuses can see how they can partner with this new program – can it be online, distance, etc. – and does it align with UNC Tomorrow guidelines. It does try to emphasize faculty input and academic values – they are going to apply a more watchful eye towards the new degree programs.
  - Report on Faculty Assembly meeting 4/4/08.
  - Bowles did start off by saying the UNC Tomorrow report would not work if
The first item on his priority list is not faculty salaries but campus safety. The second priority is faculty salaries – he is looking at a 4% raise across the board with additional merit and money to help with compression. The aim is to raise faculty salaries to 80% of the national average. Money for graduate students, K12 initiatives, and health needs are also priorities.

Regarding the branch campuses model, nine proposals for branch campuses have been made and four will be approved. They used Onslow as their model.

- Provost: We are looking at Coastal Carolina Community College, developing that relationship more, and a joint project of providing a service in the second two years, following the first two years at Coastal Carolina -- bringing our faculty up there for that service.
- Spaulding: Do you envision that departments would be recruiting with Jacksonville in mind – so, your job would be in Jacksonville?
- Provost: We have a model where the faculty would reside in Jacksonville and would operate there. Then the model where they travel back and forth. Finally, they could telecommunicate from Wilmington.

For Phase II, two important components hit us at home, recruiting and retaining quality faculty and revising tenure requirements. Notice that Phase II starts when most faculty will leave in May for research purposes. We as faculty should be invested in these issues before we return in August. We should talk to our junior faculty and determine what is needed to keep them here.

- Provost: We discussed this this morning – this is a critical issue. We are so slammed, trying to get this report done for May 1st. May 2nd is when we will start the Phase II report. We will be talking with Mark, Bruce, and Steering Committee to see how we can move forward on these issues. The issue is the speed we have to implement these decisions – possibly by December. We are going to have to work some over the summer. We already talked about how Bruce will be the first president to get a summer stipend, so he will be working on this, along with other faculty who are around this summer. It’s a very condensed timetable. All of us will be faced with the same issues as to how to process this report in the time allowed. There may be some major decisions – communication is key.

2. President of the Senate Spaulding

- Gene Tagliarini, Elections Officer: elections report (More information in Word)
  - N.B. The FPRC is required to include all professorial ranks among its members. No associate professor was slated to continue on the FPRC. Following the rotation prescribed in the bylaws, Division III should have the responsibility of electing an associate professor. However, both FPRC members from Division III were continuing; hence, there was no FPRC election in Division III this year. Accordingly, as prescribed in the bylaws, Division IV was assigned the responsibility of electing an associate professor to the FPRC.
  - Thank you to Carol Ellis and Steve Drew in going through the details of this process with me.
  - It is not without errors – those are mine and not theirs.
  - Questions?

- Report on Faculty Assembly meeting 4/4/08
  - Raymond Burt made his report earlier in the meeting -- please see above.

Committee reports

1. University Curriculum Committee submits the following motion:

- [Motion 08-08-33] That the Senate approve the following recommendations:
  - Add a 3-credit section of UNI 292 for the fall. (More information from UNI in Word)
  - Change the name of department to Department of Sociology and Criminology and change the name of undergraduate curriculum to Criminology and Criminal Justice. (More information from SOC and CRJ in
2. Academic Standards Committee submits the following motion:

- **[Motion 08-08-34]** That the Senate approve the following recommendation:
  - Pass/Fail Courses and Internships: On page 123 of the Undergraduate Catalog 2007-2008 add as the next to last bullet under PASS/FAIL COURSES: “Internships do not count in these elective pass/fail courses.”
  - Chair of ASC, Russ Herman.
  - No additional information to provide.
  - Discussion:
    - None.
  - **[Motion 08-08-34]** carried.

3. Basic Studies Committee report

- Chair of Basic Studies Committee, Kim Sawrey.
  - **PPT presentation.**
  - We haven’t progressed nearly as far as I thought we would a year ago.
  - I want to tell you about the range of things we considered. We educated ourselves about this process and tried to leave no stone unturned. We covered a lot of territory.
  - Most of our peers schedule periodic major revisions – like every five years – I think we need to do this here.
  - I hope we haven’t reached the point of stalling on this.
  - I’d like us to renew our commitment to undergraduate education – as the emphasis has turned more towards faculty scholarship here at UNCW. I hope we can return to a focus on undergraduate education that we had here maybe twenty years ago.
  - Question: Are there actually any schools that have implemented these things and know they have worked?
    - Lots of schools have implemented them, sure – but we don’t have any longitudinal data, no.
  - Question: Some of these sample courses, do they have prerequisites?
    - Some are already basic studies courses – but the others have few or none.
  - The experiential learning would be noted on diplomas – so we might see the better students challenging themselves with several of these “pillars.”
  - This is going to get picked at – until we revert back to what we are doing already. Let’s accelerate what we are doing here.
  - Questions:
    - Spaulding: Please note: The conversation about this will be restricted to a curricular discussion – not an operational one. At the conceptual level.
    - From the beginning, the Chancellor and the Provost have encouraged us to think big, that when it came to a discussion of resources, they would step in. How will the administration be able to support these changes? When will we discover whether this program is feasible?
      - Provost: Part of it will depend on an analysis of the existing courses to see if what we are doing already fits. If it is extensive, however, it will take time and resources.
    - The difficulty that some of us had had with previous efforts is that they are very ambitious. The problem is there is only a finite number of hours. Every time you put something in, if it doesn’t come out of a basic studies box, it comes out of a box in the student’s major. Some departments (like Physics), the major is very hierarchical and structural and the majority of our students is going on to graduate school (for PhDs) and those programs are hierarchical and not thematic or interdisciplinary, but discipline-specific.
What’s the relationship of this number of hours to what we have already?
  - It’s more – as much as 49, depending. We’d like you to consider this as a whole but realistically we know that it will be picked apart. It won’t take much to get us back down to where we are now. 46-56 is what is in our proposal.
  - Whether it is 46 or 56, will it depend on a choice of the student?
    - To a certain extent – if students continue with their high school language, then it will not be so much of a burden. If their language skills are poor, it will be more of a burden.
  - Has anybody talked to students about what they want?
    - I don’t think anyone has talked to students formally. My guess is that we would get lots of different responses, like we would get in this room. We can certainly get student input. Did the task force before us?
      - We did not but we should have.
  - It would seem very odd to me to discuss curricular changes without addressing the other elephants in the room. FTE is such a concern – is there a way that we can do this without getting wrapped up in FTE?
    - We are tied to this, I think. The chairs are certainly a knowledgeable group – my fantasy would be to set up a committee of chairs and let them work on this over a summer. They might come up with a competing program and then we could compare the two.
  - David Cordle: Maybe a better way to consider it as opposed to FTE is to think of it as the resources that go into the students. I would urge you always not to assume that a larger department with more resources is a better one. I don’t think that the concern about the impact on a department should be the first consideration in a matter like this. It is a concern, but if it is the first one, then the discussion stops there.
  - I liked the first bullet on your first slide – if we focus on the best learning experience for our students, then we will be on the right course.
  - What’s the difference between computer and digital literacy?
    - Anne Pemberton: We had the idea that digital literacy doesn’t just involve a computer – it also comes up in the UNC Tomorrow report.
  - Considering your 0-credit competencies, did the committee consider ethics?
    - It needs to be interjected – our committee included statements about ethics. But it could be avoided. So ethics needs to be added – financial literacy needs to be added, too.
  - Would there be a way that we could streamline the paperwork so that we could bypass all the curriculum committees to speed up the process?
    - We are looking at that – it is an option that hasn’t been taken off the table.
    - Provost: We don’t want to lose sight of the academic challenge. There have been a lot of reports on the floor of Faculty Senate about this recently. We have to fight against this sense that there is not academic challenge here. If we don’t address this by the courses we are offering, then I don’t think we have gained a whole lot.
  - At the risk of sounding like a wordsmith, could we use transdisciplinary instead of interdisciplinary? I think this is the piece that pulls it all together for me. Are we taking action on this today? What is our next step?
    - Spaulding: No. I think this is something that Steering Committee, Basic Studies, etc., need to sit down and create a plan for this to move forward. People reminded me the last time a major revision happened at UNCW, the Faculty Senate went to weekly meetings. That is what we might need to move to to hash out the particulars.
    - So this will define Faculty Senate meetings for the next academic year?
      - That and UNC Tomorrow.
      - I think this is different – we don’t vote on UNC Tomorrow.
      - I think the Basic Studies Committee has done an excellent job considering all the factions involved.
    - Round of applause.

Old business
- No old business.
New business

- Carol Pilgrim has received two proposals for intent to plan for two new majors – one from Computer Science and one from International Studies. They are in the pipeline now – it would very much help our colleagues if the Faculty Senate could consider them before the end of the academic year.
  - If there is no objection, we would propose to organize an electronic vote. We would post the documents and enlist Steve Drew to help with an evote.
  - Discussion:
    - Will it require a certain number of senators for it to be binding?
      - Ken Gurganus: I propose that the Steering Committee review the bylaws for electronic votes. The bylaws allow for electronic votes and discussion.
      - Spaulding: This would not bypass UCC or the other procedures that curriculum proposals go through.
    - Is there a possibility that we could move into that final meeting? Should we keep the space open?
      - I would be reluctant to call a final meeting.
  - Meghan Sweeney: Congratulations, Mark – this is your last meeting. You have done an excellent job.

Announcements

- No announcements.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:04pm.
Tuesday, 18 March 2008
2:00 p.m., EB 162
Meeting 2008-07

Meeting called to order at 2:03pm.

Roll call

- In an effort to streamline the Senate meetings, we will dispense with the calling of the roll.
- Any objections to this process?
  - Hearing none, starting today and in future, two sign-in sheets will be circulated around the room. Please initial only next to your name to indicate that you are present.

Absent:

Departmental Senators: Avery (Chemistry), Berkeley (Theatre), Blundo (Social Work), Clark (Cameron), Cox (Creative Writing), Cutting (Environmental Studies), DePaolo (Chancellor), Graham (Economics), Hall (Social Work), Henry (Geography), Kinard (Marketing), Lammers (Mathematics), McCartney (Biology), Moore (University College), Salwen (Music), Sawrey (Psychology), Schuhmann (Economics), Seidman (History), Simmons (Anthropology), Walters (Nursing), White (Creative Writing).

Committee Chairs: Brenner (Student Affairs), Caropreso (Evaluation), Combs (University Curriculum), Gerard (University Advancement), Patterson (Information Technology), Walker (Admissions).

Approval of the February 2008 minutes

- February 2008 minutes were approved.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo
   - Chancellor is not present today; she had to attend a biotech meeting.
   - Floor ceded to Provost.
     - I would like to introduce two people. Increasing our online presence is a continuing goal for UNCW. We now have two full-time employees to work with regarding the development of online courses.
       - Patricia McQuiston, the new Coordinator of e-Learning/Information Technologies, works jointly for the Information Technology Systems Division and the Division of Academic Affairs.
       - Dr. June Talvitie-Siple, the new Coordinator of e-Learning/Faculty Liaison, works for the Division of Academic Affairs.
   - Regarding Isaac Bear Early College, it’s during the third year that students will be moving into UNCW classes. Deron will speak to this process.
   - Ceded the floor to Deron Fort, Early College Liaison, regarding Isaac Bear Early College High School (PPT Presentation).
     - I gave a presentation to the Board of Trustees at the end of February.
     - I work out of Academic Affairs.
     - Isaac Bear is two things:
       - A partnership between UNCW and New Hanover County schools.
       - A collaborative effort to get motivated local students to make the transition to college.
     - Isaac Bear has a wide range of students from all backgrounds.
     - We’re about 1.75 of a year through the program.
     - Isaac Bear is on the edge of campus – they welcome visitors.
     - In August 2008, Cohort I is going into the 11th grade.
In 9th and 10th grades, they all are taking high school classes.
- They finish 4 years worth of core high school requirements in 2 years – but they can’t graduate yet.
- In 11th and 12th grades, they will take UNCW courses if they are ready.
- HAHS is running clinics that satisfy the Isaac Bear students’ PE requirements.
- Randall Library is Isaac Bear’s library – the library has been most critical from the beginning, giving the Isaac Bear students checkout privileges and instructional sessions.
- ITSD taught a digital literacy course that all Bear students took.
- Of those top 5 schools for EOC scores in the state, Bear students had the highest percentage of minority students taking the EOC tests.
- Please explore the website:  
  http://www.uncw.edu/isaacbear/

Questions:
- How is the program funded?
  The New Schools Project is an offshoot of the Governor’s office and the DPI – there is grant funding. Tuition and fees for UNCW courses are paid by the school system.
- Is SMEC involved?
  We are still in the early stages of working with them.
- How much are these students bound to come to UNCW after they graduate?
  They are not – but this is an excellent opportunity for UNCW to recruit. I personally hope that many of them will apply.
- For basic studies classes with large lectures, have you thought of doing a special grouping for Bear students in the discussion sections (like is done for learning communities here at UNCW)? I know that mainstreaming is a goal, but we find there is a big advantage to doing this.
  Yes – mainstreaming is the goal in this model. The model does not support as a whole having special groupings or a special methodology as we would not be seeing how these students are faring in the university.
  - I would just suggest that this is useful for our own students; you would not be doing anything different from what we do.
  - I appreciate that – it’s a good suggestion that we will explore.
- What plans do you have in place regarding social interaction problems between Bear and UNCW students (i.e. dating or amorous relationships, or discipline problems)?
  We will be doing some orientation sessions over the summer for parents and students, as we prepare them for this transition. We will be having very specific schedules for the Bear students that will hopefully help with this – obviously we can’t prevent everything from happening. I think with the early college students, we will be better prepared (than with other high school students taking classes on campus). We are going to make a very concerted effort to monitor these students and emphasize to these students and parents the personal responsibility involved with being on a college campus.
- Sometime our curriculum is for 18 and over – how do we deal with that?
  We’ve eliminated courses from their options where that is clear. We are also working on a consent form, working with legal counsel; a piece of that will be that parents are signing, acknowledging that they know that their children may be exposed to this content even in the approved classes.
  So if I am doing a lecture on abortion rights, I don’t have to get a permission form from Isaac Bear beforehand?
  - No.
- When they graduate from the program, the Bear students will have college credits?
  Yes – it will vary.
- What about retention – what do you do if they aren’t doing well?
  - At the UNCW level?
    - Yes
  - We will be monitoring them very carefully for this. They will be operating under the same rules and requirements as UNCW students. We will do everything we can to monitor that and
stay on top of it.

- Where in the registration queue are they?
  - We are working on that right now. We have a course placement and registration team. It has yet to be determined how exactly that will happen.
- Provost: Deron will be available to discuss this further. He can visit departmental meetings, too.

2. President of the Senate Spaulding

- I would like to make two introductions.
  - Sylvester Allen from the Staff Council. From now on, the Staff Council will be sending a representative to Faculty Senate and and vice versa.
  - Peggy Styes is our new administrative assistant. Some committee chairs have been contacted by her already. We are currently organizing our temporary space. We will be sending out an email soon, calling for any Faculty Senate documents that can be stored in our new space.
- We are going to have a crowded meeting on the 15th of April: an honorary degree nomination, a presentation on basic studies -- a rough structure will be presented and discussed -- and the UNC Tomorrow response is due May 1st.
- Questions?

Committee reports

1. Seahawk Respect Compact (More information in Word)

- Andy Jackson will speak to this.
  - I am serving as a liaison between the Campus Diversity Council (the chair of this committee is Tom Barth) and Faculty Senate.
  - Last year, the DAC divided up into a number of subcommittees.
  - One of these looked at the Campus Climate Survey – this subcommittee brought to the DAC a pressing concern. There was concern about campus respect for each other. Faculty, students, and staff thought their was a lack of respect and civility – and these were not small numbers. The subcommittee concluded that the DAC should do something to address this issue – they saw this as the number one concern, resulting from the survey.
  - At the same time, there were two other related events:
    - A motion, on this issue, was proposed in Faculty Senate and withdrawn when it was revealed we were drafting the compact. I expect if the compact fails, that motion will be back on the books.
    - We surveyed a number of campuses around the country while developing this document. Such compacts are quite common and can be found at such campuses as Virginia Tech, the University of South Carolina, and UNC Asheville.
  - The Seahawk Respect Compact has been endorsed by: the DAC, the Staff Council, SGA, and GSA.
  - And now we hope it will be endorsed by Faculty Senate.
  - After it is done with Faculty Senate, it will be sent to the Provost and Chancellor for their review, and to external bodies like the Board of Visitors and the Board of Trustees.
  - Regarding the nature of this document, we wanted it to be an aspirational document – we wanted to emphasize our campus values and culture. We want to make these values explicit – we will publicize this final product and not put it in a drawer. We will have it presented around the campus and use it as a source of expectations, expressing our aspirations. We want to give this a new push, a new attempt, to make our values of an open campus community explicit.
  - I'll turn it over to Tom Barth at this point.
  - Many people have worked on this document and I would just like to acknowledge them here: Tom Barth, Ann Potts, Beth Braxton, William Fleming, Liz Grimes, Andy Jackson, Patti Mason, Jennie McNeilly, Cheryl Sutton, Rick Thompson.
- Questions:
  - Are we being asked to approve this?
    - Spaulding: The members of the DAC would like the signature of the Faculty Senate President.
Steering Committee thought that we should seek the Faculty Senate’s instructions. If the Faculty Senate instructs the president to sign it, then he will sign it; if the Faculty Senate instructs him not to sign it, he won’t sign it.

- Motion from the floor: [Motion 08-07-31] That the Faculty Senate vote for the Faculty Senate President to sign the Seahawk Respect Compact.
  - [Motion 08-07-31] seconded.

  Discussion:
  - How is this going to change our lives?
    - We will take this and do what we can to make it part of our culture. It will be in classrooms, in the catalogue, stated before games. But it will ultimately be up to us in this room how we use this to change things.
  - Do you have some examples of what is wrong at the moment with our campus culture that we need this?
    - From the Campus Climate Survey. The subcommittee said that their greatest concern is the recurring theme of the lack of respect that came through the survey. Some statistics:
      - 35% of students reported being treated rudely by other students.
      - 30% of faculty reported being treated rudely by students.
      - 38% of staff reported being treated rudely by faculty.
      - 32% of staff reported being treated rudely by students.
    - This seems a serious thing, so why call it the Seahawk Respect Compact?
      - William Fleming: There was no magic in the choice of the term "seahawk". There is no major reason it should be called this – we just thought it would appeal more to students.
      - Barth: We were thinking about symbols. There was some talk that it may trivialize it, though. We are open to suggestions.
  - I applaud the committee’s efforts. There is one word that bothers me, though, and that is “celebrated.” I don’t think every difference should automatically be celebrated – it would trivialize ideas. It seems illogical to me. We want to respect people who discuss these different ideas. Not the different ideas, themselves.
    - I disagree with your interpretation – you are parsing a sentence.
    - Fleming: We are open to suggestions. But I want to caution you about changing this too much at the level of sentences.
    - Spaulding: The Steering Committee foresaw that this process of tinkering may occur. We will not be productive, given the other bodies that are being asked to review this. So unless there are aspects to this that we just could not endorse, I think we have to decide whether we have something in front of us that we could live with. We can send a suggestion along with the document, of course.
  - Doesn’t celebrate our differences appear in UNCW documentation?
    - Spaulding: Does anyone know if this does or not?
    - Barth: If you would trust us to take this further, we will make changes based on your suggestions here.
  - What has the effect of this been on other campuses? Has it helped or changed anything?
    - Barth: I honestly don’t know. We just thought this was right for us now. I would think that it would be all over the place – some people aren’t actively using it.
    - I was at one of the schools using this for a while. It is talked about in orientations and gives you a place to start from if problems do occur.
    - From all the graduate students that I have spoken with, they have wholeheartedly endorsed this. And it would be a perfect opportunity to outreach to Bear students, based on the earlier presentation.
    - Fleming: At Virginia Tech it is widely disseminated at orientations (faculty, students,
etc.). I think they have found it to be widely useful and beneficial.

- Move to amend the Seahawk Respect Compact (additions are underscored and deletions are struck through): "We foster an environment of respect for each individual even where differences exist and interaction with others."
  - Seconded.
  - Point of order: The motion on the floor refers to signing the document and not the text of the compact.
    - Spaulding: Is it in order for a motion to appear to amend the text?
      - The motion to amend is not in order.
- Motion to call to question: [Motion 08-07-32].
  - [Motion 08-07-32] seconded.
  - [Motion 08-07-32] carried.
    - [Motion 08-07-31] carried.
- Jackson: It seems logical that Ken’s concerns would be reflected in the minutes for the Chancellor to see.
- Spaulding: I think the Secretary has taken care of that.
- Barth: You have our word that we will pass that on.

Old business

- No old business.

New business

- No new business.

Announcements

- Sue Cody: Randall Library is doing a survey at the moment. Please encourage your faculty and students to take this.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 3:20pm.
Tuesday, 19 February 2008
2:00 p.m., EB 162
Meeting 2008-06

Meeting called to order at 2:03pm.

Roll call

Absent:

Departmental Senators: Black (Physics), Blundo (Social Work), Cox (Creative Writing), Graham (Economics), Hungerford (Psychology), Hurst (Psychology), Lapaire (Foreign Languages), Palmer (Film Studies), Salwen (Music), Schuhmann (Economics), Seidman (History), Spaulding (History), White (Creative Writing), Wray (Information Systems and Operations Management).

Committee Chairs: Brenner (Student Affairs), Caropreso (Evaluation), Gerard (University Advancement), Patterson (Information Technology), Walker (Admissions).

Approval of the January 2008 minutes

- January 2008 minutes were approved.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo

- Thanks to everyone for helping to assemble a quick response to UNC Tomorrow.
  - We had committees in place to help with this.
  - We were already largely going along this track.
  - We are ahead of the game.
  - I don’t think what will happen here will happen at other campuses – it won’t be an endeavor that turns us inside out.
- Provost search update.
  - Paul is going back to the things he likes best: teaching and researching. We will have opportunities to celebrate Paul’s achievements as Provost.
  - We have an aggressive timeline for this search so that we can get candidates on campus before faculty leave for the summer.
  - Please help get the word out. If you know people who would be good for this position, invite them to apply or nominate them. We have postcards to help promote the search. Get in touch with Bob Tyndall if you want the postcards. Spread the word at conferences, too.
  - I am having a series of listening sessions with departments to hear what we want out of this search. I will also have some open sessions, which should be announced tomorrow.
  - Any questions?
- Ceded the floor to Terry Curran, Associate Provost for Enrollment Management: Report on UNCW enrollment growth numbers. ([PPT presentation])
  - The UNCW plan continues to support retention efforts.
  - We want to increase student access, too.
  - A group of people is meeting regularly -- deans, ITSD, vice chancellors, etc. -- to decide how we want to respond to UNC Tomorrow.
  - I believe it is unrealistic for us to achieve this goal of a total enrollment of 15,545.
  - It is unreasonable for us not to grow.
  - It is important for us to keep this in mind as we work on our response. The preliminary report is due on 2/29/08.
  - We are hoping to get a response from GA after the preliminary report is submitted.
We invite feedback from everyone.

Questions:
- Why not grow the freshmen and be more restrictive with the transfers, given the quality gap between these two types?
  - I agree with you – it may be more logical to flip these numbers. But I have some doubts about how much further we can expand our quality with freshmen, too.
  - Chancellor: Would you talk a little more about narrowing the quality gap?
    - 3.14 is the average GPA of transfers.
    - The higher number of credits they have coming in, the more likely they are to graduate.
- This is mandated by GA? You will communicate your feelings against these numbers as the report moves up the chain?
  - Yes, we will.
  - Chancellor: Some of these campuses want to increase their enrollments by more than the projected numbers.
- Seeing that there are state systems that are regretting their increased enrollments at the expense of their quality of education, I would hope this is communicated to President Bowles.
- Where are the Isaac Bear students in this?
  - They are not anywhere in these numbers
  - So that is an added layer?
  - They are reducing their size from 100 to 80.
- So they are not envisioning growth by 2017?
  - Provost: I don’t think they have projected out that far.
- Since the extension program is where we want to target our growth, how will that happen?
  - Dr. Johnson Akinleye: There is concern that if the extension program grows so fast, we will be diverting resources away from our campus students. I don’t think that will happen, given technology and the ability to hire PT instructors in the extension areas.
- What are video conference capabilities?
  - Dr. Johnson Akinleye: We have a number of sites in the Watson School of Education and Randall Library.
  - Are there any plans to use this globally?
  - Dr. Johnson Akinleye: Not yet. But we are willing to consider it.
- I see a 25% increase in enrollments but I don’t hear anything about a 25% increase in faculty or space.
  - We would need an additional 300,000 square feet of space to meet this model and over 200 faculty spots, according to Ken Spackman.
  - We can achieve a lot of this, given our planning already in place. It allows us to respond more intelligently than our sister campuses.
  - Chancellor: In future, capital requests would be based on growth needs and space utilization.
  - Provost: We are only three campuses who need more space.
- In addition to the projected buildings, what else do we need? Do we need additional buildings to accommodate this model?
  - Yes. Bowles will be able to address building needs for the campuses. We will need 20 faculty per year, based on this model.
  - Can we make it a more attractive place to recruit faculty and graduate students to? Could we have a conversation about tuition waivers for spouses and children, moving expenses, start-up packages, etc.?
  - Do we have specific numbers about what the Hispanic population will mean for us directly?
    - Not yet. But we know that many will be first generation college attendees, which means a whole different set of services that they will need.
  - Do we really have the freedom to be that proactive to decide and define who we are (given the Chancellor’s call)? And who is the we?
    - I think this body is a “we.” You all have input in that – we are more than open to hearing your feedback and thoughts. We, as a group, need to have input on who we are and where we
want to go.

- Is anybody factoring in as to what the General Assembly will actually do? We have seen that the total funding of the UNC System is going down. Are we making it clear, this is the money that we need but where it comes from is unclear?
  - I don’t know that I have an answer to this.
  - Chancellor: I don’t think any of us does. Erskine has said he hates unfunded mandates. But I know he feels deeply that we have to respond to the growing needs of this population. Our argument for the last 5 or 6 years has been so consistent. I am so grateful that ECU and Charlotte want to be bigger campuses because it will allow us to stay the size we want to be.
  - Is there a place in the model for faculty retention?
    - I don’t think so. It’s in the UNC Tomorrow report.

2. Vice President Bruce McKinney

- UNC Tomorrow Phase I (due 01 May 2008)
  - This is how the UNC System is going to meet the challenges of the 21st century.
  - Phase I is on an incredibly accelerated timeframe.
    - Global readiness.
    - Increasing access to higher education.
      - Onslow County is the one area that does not have good access to one of the campuses.
    - Improving public education.
    - Economic community and community development.
    - Health and wellness of NC citizens.
    - Meet environmental challenges.
    - Outreach and engagement.
    - Changes to internal policies and processes.
  - The Provost is using standing committees to address these issues.
    - Global readiness.
      - Basic Studies Task Force.
      - International Programs Advisor Board.
    - Increasing access to higher education.
      - Diversity Committee.
      - Office of Admissions.
    - Improving public education.
      - Watson School of Education Administrative Team.
    - Economic community and community development.
      - Committee on Economic Development.
    - Health and wellness of NC citizens.
      - Health Affairs Task Force.
      - Health Center.
    - Meet environmental challenges.
      - Sustainability Committee.
    - Outreach and engagement.
      - Carnegie Community Engagement Classification Committee.
    - Changes to internal policies and processes.
      - Chancellor’s Cabinet.
  - Questions:
    - Who is addressing public education?
      - The Watson School of Education Administrative Team.
    - Does it ever come out of those committees for discussion?
      - Chancellor: I don’t have the timeline in front of me.
      - Provost: There is an interim report in mid-March. If you have an interest in any of these things, please take a look at the full UNC Tomorrow report. If you want to help serve on the committee, let me know.
Chancellor: Please make sure you look at the full report online because the issues are not open-ended but have specific needs.

UNC Tomorrow Phase II (due 01 December 2008). (More information: Stuff that really, directly affects faculty in Word, Full Report in PDF)

- Chancellor: They did push this deadline back from September 1st because we pointed out: how are we going to get faculty input if they are not on campus?
- Questions:
  - We are supposed to have the RPT procedures amended to reflect UNC Tomorrow by December 1st?
    - Yes.
  - What are the proposed high-need programs? Do we know what they are yet?
    - Provost: These have yet to be determined – they probably will come out of these activities.
- Please visit:
  - http://www.nctomorrow.org/
  - http://www.uncw.edu/tomorrow/
- If you have a question, feel free to send it through Mark and he will redirect it appropriately. And when I come on as Faculty Senate President, please feel free to email me, too.

Committee reports

1. University Curriculum Committee submits the following motion:

  - Sue Combs, Chair of the UCC: While we applaud the efforts of the task force, we had some concerns that we hope the Provost can address today.
  - Provost: This has been a long process that has developed throughout the last year, thanks to the hard work from representatives of all the stakeholders. What I am looking for from you are comments and questions as we move this forward. I would like to invite your comments at this time.
  - Sue Combs: There are 4 members of the UCC here today and there are Task Force members here, too.
    - Can you say more about the timeframe for processing this report?
      - Task Force Representative: The information has been there in various forms. So what about this report do people have questions about?
    - We were concerned about the partnership, about the SON losing its autonomy, about no mention of care of the sick, and about how RPT affect SON faculty? We fear that as SON, we will be marginalized. We want to work with our colleagues – we welcome that, we look forward to that, but we have these concerns.
    - Candy Ashton: The transdisciplinary model helps us to embrace similarities and differences. It is based on this idea of parity. Autonomy was another guiding principle. It is easier for us to accept this than SON, which has been on its own for a while.
    - SON is a professional institution – how do we preserve that integrity when we try to strike parity with the other units?
      - Candy Ashton: All the other departments are professional, too. We align better with this new model than in CAS.
    - I have not read the report so my answer might be in the report – how is this going to affect the allocation of resources within CAS?
      - Provost: The resources in those current departments will move with those departments. We are working to seek additional resources from the Legislature to help start up. It does need to be its own college to address the health needs of the community.
    - I want to commend the Task Force on a fantastic effort. One suggestion that would make me feel more comfortable would be if there was some indication that this new school will interact strongly with departments of CAS. So will there be the outreach to those other departments, instead of this new school drawing in lots of resources?
    - These departments seem very dependent on PT faculty and lecturers. There is going to need to be a huge reversal – PT faculty don’t do research. How is that going to be accomplished?
- It is more typical of professional schools to utilize PT clinical faculty. But you are right.
- There is no addressing of SON’s loss of parity with other professional schools on this campus – this is viewed differently by nursing accreditors.
- One concern also with that is SON has been trailblazing in helping the UNCW achieve its diversity initiatives. Now we are taking that autonomy from them, given the abysmal work we have done in the area of recruitment.
- What is our obligation here today? Are we voting on a report?
  - Provost: I need to know these issues and concerns so that I will be aware of them as we move forward.
  - Candy Ashton: Everyone on the Task Force was. Related faculty have had plenty of opportunities to participate in the discussions. You can’t please all of the people, though.

**[Motion 08-06-29]** That the Senate approve the following recommendations:
  - Approve NSG 406 (3) (Leadership and Management in Nursing) as Oral Intensive. (More information from NSG in PDF: [Link 1], [Link 2])
  - Approve CHN 101 Introductory Chinese I and CHN 102 Introductory Chinese II - both new courses - **AND** approve for Basic Studies - Foreign Language. (More information from FLL in Word: [Link 1], [Link 2], [Link 3], [Link 4])
    - Let’s separate these two approvals out and vote on them separately.
  - Discussion:
    - SON Representative: This is only renumbering – it has already been approved as an oral intensive course.

**[Motion 08-06-29]**, as amended, carried.

**[Motion 08-06-30]** Approve CHN 101 Introductory Chinese I and CHN 102 Introductory Chinese II - both new courses - **AND** approve for Basic Studies - Foreign Language.
  - **[Motion 08-06-30]** carried.

2. Academic Standards Committee. (More information: [Freshman Perceptions of the Level of Academic Challenge](#))

  - Russ Herman, Chair of the ASC.
    - If the students have these perceptions, perhaps faculty are not communicating their expectations and objectives as effectively.
    - Our data has improved from 2004-05 to 2006-07.
    - We need to clarify the balance between memorization and critical thinking skills.
    - Please feel free to read the longer report.
    - Mark needs to identify who this goes to because it is out of the hands of the ASC.

3. Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice regarding [Motion 08-02-06].

  - Kim Cook and John Rice, Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice.
    - We met with SGA regarding [Motion 08-02-06] and left hopeful.
    - But we just heard back from SGA that they don’t want to change it.

**Old business**

- No old business.

**New business**

  - Aaron Wilcox, Chair of Buildings and Grounds Committee.
    - Could we have some response to the Phase 3 housing?
    - Will Academic Affairs consider pulling the letter, indicating the departmental votes, from the RPT packet that the candidate sees? Just from the report that the candidate sees and not the official file?

**Announcements**
No announcements.

**Adjournment**

*Meeting adjourned at 4:01pm.*
Tuesday, 15 January 2008
2:00 p.m., EB 162
Meeting 2008-05

Meeting called to order at 2:03pm.

Roll call

Absent:

Departmental senators: Barth (Public and International Affairs), Cox (Creative Writing), Cutting (Environmental Studies), Elikai (Accountancy & Business Law), Hall (Social Work), Huber (Elementary, Middle, and Literacy Education), Huntsman (Geography and Geology), Lammers (Mathematics & Statistics), Lugo (Mathematics & Statistics), McCartney (Biology & Marine Biology), McKinney (Communication Studies), Moore (University College), Roney (Elementary, Middle, and Literacy Education), Salwen (Music), Seidman (History), Wray (Information Systems and Operations Management).

Committee chairs: Brenner (Student Affairs), Gerard (University Advancement), Patterson (Information Technology), Walker (Admissions).

Approval of the December 2007 minutes

- December 2007 minutes were approved.
- If you are not receiving the minutes, via the faculty all distribution list, please let someone know --the beginning of the semester would be a good time to do so.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo

   - Happy New Year to everyone.
   - I just learned some good news that I wanted to share with you all: Molly Corbett Broad has been named the next president of the American Council on Education (ACE).
   - A lot or you have called and written about no longer being able to use state funds for student travel – when that directive came down, we scrambled to find more funds to make this possible. David McKoy of the State Budget Office came out with a clarification about this, which is more confusing than ever. GA helped to clarify – we are now allowed to use state funds for educational student travel. Employee students can travel in the course of their job duties; non-employee students, traveling for educational purposes, will be reimbursed from the general fund as are other state employees. But we need to be very careful that these funds are used for educational purposes or the state will take it away again.
     - Question: Has there been an infraction?
       - Not here at UNCW.
   - I just got back from a Board of Governors' meeting at the NC School of the Arts.
     - It is clear what is on Bowles’ mind.
       - K-12 education – the state wants higher education to play a more important role in this area.
       - UNC Tomorrow – the final report has just come out from the commission. We received two hard copies – it is available electronically on the UNC Tomorrow website (please see: http://www.nctomorrow.org/). We have been asked to come up with a response team. Faculty Assembly is asking for strong faculty representation (Mark Spaulding: at least 50%). If you are interested in serving on this team, please let me know.
   - I want to let us know things before they hit the media. SGA has been working very hard towards establishing a shuttle to downtown. A recommendation has been made that we not support this. The students have called the media to attend the SGA meeting about this. I feel very strongly about communication on campus – I want
UNCW to be allowed to solve its own problems and not have them played out in the media.

- **Question:** Haven’t the students the right to impose a fee on the students to pay for this bus? Do you have a line-item veto to overrule this?
  - It’s not a matter of money – it’s about calling in the media.

- **Introduced Pat Leonard, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs.**
  - **Pat Leonard:** they tried to get outside money to support this and they considered a user charge.

- **Question:** What is the predominant reason against this?
  - **Pat Leonard:** SGA did an excellent job with their proposal – they did their homework. WAVE transit will not agree to the shuttle until UNCW signs off of it. If we did, we become liable for any incidents. What we would then have is a bus that will drop students from their on-campus housing to off-campus – this is a safety issue. From a philosophical standpoint, we embrace harm-reduction methods. 85% of our students tell us they don’t drink and drive. We already have a taxi discount service in place. Establishing a shuttle is sending the wrong message.

- **Chancellor:** our research into other schools, too, fed into our decision about this.

- Ceded the floor to the Provost.

- **UNC Tomorrow is something we all need to pay attention to.**

- **Responsibility and accountability for campus communications:** primarily email. The accountability for email is a concern. We need to be accurate with what we communicate – particularly with broadcast messages. We would welcome discussions in departments or here in Senate to talk about the idea of accountability.
  - **Question:** I need a specific example of what you are talking about. My colleague has started a listserv that is exchanging a lot of different information. So are you talking about that issue? Or people with authority sending emails? The right to be wrong is an academic freedom issue.
    - I am asking you to check sources, verify information, and be correct with the information you share, before sending messages out.
  - **Question:** Do you have an example?
    - There was one incident over the holidays. The message had some inaccuracies in it and went to a large group of people – it caused a lot of problems for people.

- **Beginning in February, a new survey instrument will replace FSSE. The HERI (Higher Education Research Institute) survey will replace FSSE.** HERI will provide information on job satisfaction, workload, job duties, etc. Please take it seriously and provide the responses that the survey is asking for. This will help with SACS – it will give us more datasets to help with SACS.
  - **Question:** What’s its relationship with FSSE? How can we shift to it after three years of FSSE?
  - **Introduced Lisa Castellino, Assistant Vice Chancellor.**
    - **Lisa Castellino:** it’s not a replacement for FSSE. Basically, this spring is an off year for NSSE and FSSE. FSSE wasn’t going out to the entire population, only to a sample. We have an opportunity to test HERI this year to see if it will help in future.
  - **Question:** We get so many surveys that say they will only take 5-10 minutes but they take 30-35. Why?
    - Lisa works on this to make sure there is accuracy in surveys and that we are not being over-surveyed. You’re right – I have experienced this, too.

2. **President of the Senate Spaulding**

- There are two discussions going on in Steering Committee at the moment.
  - **Regarding support for the Senate, Steering Committee, and President, we benchmarked other institutions. The Provost has been generous.** We have an administrative assistant who is just starting now. We have space – so we will be sending out a call for all Senate records out there. We are close to getting a summer stipend for the President. We are also looking at a course reduction for the semester after the President's term ends.
  - The Senate President is often asked to supply names of faculty volunteers for different service opportunities. At present, we do not have a good method for getting that information from the President to the faculty. We are working on a method that will help get more faculty involved in the types of projects they are interested in. We’re wrestling with that.
- Any questions?
- Departmental Name Verifications for Elections. (More information from Elections Officer in Word)
  - We are updating the accuracy of the voting divisions to reflect departmental name changes. If your department is not accurately represented in this document, please let us know.
- Introduced Gene Tagliarini, Elections Officer.
  - Gene Tagliarini: this is relevant for the autonomous committee selections coming up. Certain committees stipulate certain numbers from specific divisions. Thanks to Steve Drew and Carol Ellis for their help with this.
- Question: Provost: is there any rebalancing of the divisions that needs to happen?
  - Mark Spaulding: Division I has 163; Division II has 137; Division III has 167; Division IV has 148. So they aren’t that far off.

**Old business**

1. Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice submits the following revised motion, as amended by Steering Committee with additions (underscored) and deletions (struck through):

   - **[Motion 08-02-06]** In an effort to expand faculty participation in the Commencement Ceremonies at Trask Coliseum as a celebration of student and faculty achievement, to make it a more meaningful event for all participants, and,

   Whereas, we believe the current Commencement without the conferral of *either* an honorary degree and *or* speaker limits the celebration as an intellectual milestone, and,

   Whereas, we believe that Commencement ceremonies are opportunities to honor students’ achievement as well as faculty involvement in that achievement, and,

   Whereas, we believe that Commencement is a celebration of our collective intellectual accomplishment,

   We resolve the following:

   1. the Trask Commencement Ceremony should restore the conferral of honorary degrees *when appropriate*, and invite a suitable speaker the degree recipient to give a brief graduation speech
   2. that reading students’ names individually be celebrated at the Departmental ceremonies where they will be greeted by the professors who guided their educational pursuits
   3. that reading students’ names be discontinued at the Trask Commencement Ceremony

   With faculty senate endorsement of this resolution, we intend to take this conversation to the appropriate bodies for continued consideration, especially Student Government Association.

   - The floor is open for discussion:
     - I speak in favor of this. I simply agree that if this is implemented there would be a lot more faculty participation in Commencement. And remember, this is not something that will happen simply because we approve it. This just means we can start the conversation with other government bodies on campus. It expresses the sense of the faculty that this is pretty much what we already believe based on how many of us attend Commencement.
     - The whole purpose of this motion is to make Commencement more meaningful for the students.
   - Any objections? Hearing none, let's vote.
   - **[Motion 08-02-06]** carried.
   - Mark Spaulding: the Senate now owns **[Motion 08-02-06]** – we passed it. Do we have volunteers to talk to SGA? Will the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice do it?
     - Senators for Sociology and Criminal Justice: yes.
   - Question: We have a SGA representative in attendance today – do they wish to speak to this?
     - Megan Jelley, SGA Chief of Staff: I feel better, hearing these comments today. Some of us
were worried about [Motion 08-02-06] being all about the faculty.

- **Question:** I assume [Motion 08-02-06] is only referring to undergraduates and not graduate students?
  - **Mark Spaulding:** let’s start the conversation with SGA and then move forward with GSA after.

**Committee reports**

1. University Curriculum Committee submits the following motion:

   - **[Motion 08-05-25]** That the Senate approve the following recommendations:
     - Approve THR 165 Script Analysis for providing Computer Competency. ([More information from THR in Word](#))
     - Approve THR 487 Senior Seminar: Design and Technology as Oral Communication Intensive. ([More information from THR in Word](#))
     - Approve THR 355 Directing I as Oral Communication Intensive. ([More information from THR in Word](#))
     - Approve Program Change in Theatre – Total number of hours for graduation – (Major: from 48 hours to 43 hours; Minor from 18 hours to 19 hours). ([More information from THR in Word](#))
     - Approve Intent to Plan – B.S. in Oceanography (Proposal from Department of Geography & Geology). ([More information from GGY in Word](#))
     - Approve – Change prefix of all classes from CRJ (Criminal Justice) to CRM (Criminology). ([More information from CRJ in Word](#))
     - Approve – Change in number of hours required for the CRJ major from 42 to 39 credit hours. ([More information from CRJ in Word](#))
     - Approve – Designation of CRJ 495 (CRM 495): Senior Seminar as Oral Communication Intensive. ([More information from CRJ in Word](#))
     - Approve - Increasing number of hours for the B.A. in Math to accommodate the Applied Learning requirement (would require 1-3 additional hours in Option 1 – from 45 to 46-48). ([More information from MAT in Word: Link 1, Link 2, Link 3](#))
     - Approve PAR 225: Women and Religion for Basic Studies – Humanities/Philosophy and Religion. ([More information from PAR in Word](#))

   Do we have any problems with voting on [Motion 08-05-25] as one?
   - **Tim Black,** Senator from Physics & Physical Oceanography: the Physics & Physical Oceanography Department has a problem with the Oceanography intent to plan from the Geography & Geology Department.
   - **Mark Spaulding:** Let’s vote on [Motion 08-05-25] as amended (with the Oceanography intent to plan item taken out).

   - **[Motion 08-05-25] as amended** carried.

   Now we can discuss the Oceanography intent to plan item as [Motion 08-05-28].
   - **Tim Black:** this is the first we have heard of this. We have been trying to beef up our recruitment in this area – having a minor in Geography and Geology would affect our enrollment.
   - **Richard Laws,** Chair of Geography & Geology: we discussed this with the chairs of the sciences for about two years. It has gone through a lot of vetting. We are only asking permission to plan. The planning committee should include members from other departments. The attachment has a suggested interdisciplinary curriculum – if Physics & Physical Oceanography wants to be involved in that, that’s great. But if you think this is a worthwhile degree program to have on campus, then vote yes regardless of where it is housed or who controls it. Vote no, if not.
   - **Tim Black:** I think there needs to be a consensus before this proceeds as to where this degree is housed. This impacts our future direction. This is a sensitive issue. I would be interested to know what Fred or John or Curt thinks.
Richard Laws: there weren’t any objections from there.
Carol Pilgrim, Associate Dean, College of Arts & Sciences: I can speak to the spirit of why CAS approved this. We have a lot of Oceanography experts on campus – this degree program would be a wonderful opportunity for students and faculty.
Question: Has anyone thought to create a Department of Oceanography?
  - Richard Laws: I don’t think that is an option as there is a Department of Physics & Physical Oceanography.
Tim Black: yes there are a lot of ways to approach the ocean. The ocean as a biological system is Marine Biology. The ocean as a physical system is Physics. I am sorry to say this in Senate because it sounds like I am mad at Geography & Geology. I would have said this in a departmental faculty meeting if it had been brought to our attention there. I just don’t see how we can feel good about this being handed off to another department. I think it needs to be discussed in DeLoach Hall before being brought to Senate.
Richard Laws: the ocean also has a chemical system and a geological system. This degree program will be interdisciplinary in nature. I am sorry this wasn’t brought to your department. This has been discussed for two years. If Curt didn’t bring it to you, I’m sorry.
Tim Black: I think it would be better for all to let us discuss it amongst ourselves first and then let us decide whether we endorse it.
Sue Combs, Chair of the University Curriculum Committee: we supported this wholeheartedly because it was an intent to plan.
Question: Does the intent to plan planning committee be required to include those departments?
  - Mark Spaulding: yes – it says right there in the intent to plan document.
  - Richard Laws: yes – they will be invited to be involved.
Question: Is there a signature from Physics & Physical Oceanography on the UCC forms?
  - Sue Combs: no – we get paperwork from CAS.
Question: Is there a signature on the CAS paperwork?
  - Carol Pilgrim: the intent to plan is a GA document – it does not require signatures.
All in favor of [Motion 08-05-28] Approve Intent to Plan – B.S. in Oceanography (Proposal from Department of Geography & Geology)?
  - [Motion 08-05-28] carried.

2. Academic Standards Committee submits the following motion:

  - [Motion 08-05-26] That the Senate approve the proposed posthumous degree policy. (More information from ASC in PDF)
  - Does the Chair of the ASC wish to say a few words?
    - Russ Herman, Chair of ASC: this summer I was approached a couple of times about creating this policy. Over about 20 years, two have been awarded. We looked at what was happening at other schools. We discussed it – changed things, added things, deleted things. This is currently only for undergraduates.
      - I think this is an excellent idea – I had to educate myself about this issue and look at what is happening at other schools. But I think there is a problem with the wording of it. We are at war now – we might have students coming back with brain injuries or students going to hospice. Why limit it to posthumous? Why wait until they are dead to award them this if we know they are going to die, if this is about compassion? I am not moving this – although, I would like us to see if there are other circumstances that can be considered. I am not sure that this needs to be in the catalogue. And if it needs to be, let’s consider some other scenarios.
      - I think it should be in the catalogue – I think we should continue the discussion after this. We are a community – we have to take care of each other. This could have some impact on advancement and recruiting.
      - My best friend in college died during the second semester of her junior year. Her degree was awarded – it helped the healing for her family and friends. It was important for us to hear her name called out at graduation.
      - I think this is an important issue – but I would be against extending this beyond people who have
died. A degree is an award and a credential.

- I will point out that the document says that the permanent record would note that it is a posthumous degree – so not a credential as I understand it. I am saying that this doesn’t clarify anything – once we publish it it will open up more questions.
- I am in favor of awarding degrees posthumously. My question to ASC is why do we need to publish it in the undergraduate catalogue? Is there some other place we could put it?
  - Russ Herman: the catalogue is the chief source of information – people looking for information about this will go there. If the Senate wants to vote down that aspect of it, that can happen.
- Question: Right now, the Chancellor can do this?.
  - Chancellor: yes – I get these requests periodically. I always turn them over to the Provost.
  - I think it is a bit ridiculous – do we prevent someone who has only 15 and not the needed 20 credits from graduating according to this policy? If we are going to codify it, let’s not paint ourselves into a corner – let’s call it an exceptional circumstances policy.
- I notice that no one is proposing any amendments to [Motion 08-05-26] so we are probably focusing on the posthumous degree.
  - Mark Spaulding: yes – quite right. Unless someone wants to propose an amendment we should be debating [Motion 08-05-26] as written.

- [Motion 08-05-26] carried.

3. The Honor Code Task Force offers the following motion:

- [Motion 08-05-27] Whereas, concerns about the adequacy and efficacy of the UNCW Honor Code have been expressed by members of the UNCW academic community; and

  Whereas, Provost Hosier, in consultation with Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs Leonard, Faculty Senate President Spaulding, SGA president Thorpe, and GSA president Mason, has appointed a student-faculty Honor Code Task Force to examine our current policies on academic honesty, to consult widely with the academic community, and to propose any recommendations to the academic community; and

  Whereas, the Honor Code Task Force has met and produced a preliminary report; and

  Whereas, the Honor Code Task Force believes that any establishment, consideration, or revision of an honor code must be broadly participatory, involving all affected campus constituencies; and

  Whereas, the Honor Code Task Force is seeking a mandate for its mission from all of those constituencies; therefore,

  Be it resolved, that the Faculty Senate expresses its support for the mission of the Honor Code Task Force, with the understanding that the Task Force will report to the Faculty Senate in the course of its deliberations and will submit any recommendations and proposals to the Faculty Senate for approval.

- Introduced Chairs of the Honor Code Task Force: Adrienne Strain (SGA), Richard Veit (English), and Mike Walker (third Co-chair, not present).
  - Richard Veit: the existing policy is not an honor code per se but a policy on cheating. Provost Hosier appointed a task force (consisting of students, faculty, and administration) to look at this. We have met and looked at the research and at what other universities are doing. What we found is that any honor code handed down from on high doesn’t work. So we aimed to be broadly participatory – we are seeking a mandate from Faculty Senate, SGA, and GSA.
  - Richard Veit presented the Honor Task Code preliminary report (please see: http://people.uncw.edu/veit/hctf/reports/preliminary_report.html); the Honor Task Force recommends establishing a modified honor code at UNCW.

- Adrienne Strain: we need to develop the text of the honor code. We need to make it a part of our culture. We need to start from the bottom up – start with the students and ask them to devise some sort of reinforcement or commitment to the honor code. We talked about the idea of a slogan in
every classroom and lab, for instance. The statement will always be there as a reminder to the students and faculty. All faculty would be asked to read the honor code and discuss it on the first days of classes. This naturally leads to holding students accountable when they don’t live up to the honor code. We want to host open fora – SGA likes this format. We want to be inclusive with this initiative and involve SGA, GSA, faculty, and administration, etc.

- Mark Spaulding: should we limit our discussions to the “be it resolved” section of [Motion 08-05-27]?
  - From the floor: Yes – let’s limit ourselves.
  - Mark Spaulding: there seems to be consensus on this.
- [Motion 08-05-27] carried.

New business

- No new business.

Announcements

- No announcements.

Adjournment

*Meeting adjourned at 3:40pm.*
Tuesday, 9 December 2008
2:00 p.m., Lumina Theater (Fisher Student Center)
Meeting 2009-04

***Please note that the January 20, 2009 meeting will be held in FSC Wrightsville Beach Room 2017, starting at 2 p.m.***

Meeting called to order at 2:06pm.

Roll sign-in

- Attendance sheets circulated.
- Absent:
  - Departmental senators: Abrams (Geography and Geology), Avery (Chemistry and Biochemistry), Barth (Public and International Affairs), Black (Physics & Physical Oceanography), Blundo (Social Work), Bradley (Computer Science), Clark (Dean, Business), Cordle (Dean, CAS), Cox (Creative Writing), Elikai (Accountancy & Business Law), Evers (Accountancy and Business Law), Freeze (Mathematics & Statistics), Graham (Economics & Finance), Hall (Social Work), Hritz (Health & Applied Human Sciences), Huber (Elementary, Middle, and Literacy Education), McCartney (Biology & Marine Biology), Moore (Dean, University College), Palmer (Film Studies), Spaulding (History), Townend (History).
  - Committee chairs: Caropreso (Evaluation), Chandler (Bookstore), Ellerby (University Advancement), Gill (University Curriculum), Hurdle (Public Service & Continuing Studies), Olsen (Faculty Welfare), Patterson (IT), Wilcox (Buildings and Grounds).

Approval of the November 2008 minutes

- Point of order: Do we have a quorum?
  - President Mckinney: Good point. We need 58.
  - We have 56.
  - Now we have 57.
  - I am sure we will get one or two more people. Let’s move onto the Chancellor’s Report.
  - [N.B. After the Chancellor's Report was finished, it was determined that a quorum was achieved and the agenda was subsequently followed in the original order.] November 2008 minutes were approved.

Special order of the day: Election of the Senate President.

- Nominations for President open: Bruce McKinney.
  - Nomination seconded.
- Motion from the floor [Motion 09-04-08]: To close the nominations for President and elect Bruce McKinney as President.
  - [Motion 09-04-08] seconded.
- [Motion 09-04-08] approved.

Special order of the day: Nominate four faculty members for Faculty Assembly delegates.

- Nominations for Faculty Assembly delegates open:
  - Colleen Reilly.
  - Steve Pullum.
    - Declined.
  - Mahnaz Moallem.
  - Raymond Burt.
  - Kathleen Roney.
  - Carlos Rodriguez.
    - Declined.
Motion 09-04-09: Motion to close the nominations for Faculty Assembly delegates.
- [Motion 09-04-09] seconded.
- [Motion 09-04-09] approved.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo.
   - Good afternoon.
   - I know it is a stressful time of year for everyone.
   - I just want to mention the budget – we are still at 4%. No news is good news.
   - The 4% cut is based on a 5% deficit in revenues at this point. And that is 1.2 billion dollars. Suddenly, the figure from Bev Perdue is 3 billion – they are including the shortfall from the health insurance, and raises for all of you. So the deficit hasn’t gotten bigger. I will continue to update you as I get additional information. I don’t expect any more until late January or early February, when the General Assembly meets.
   - At the end of the semester, we go through a great number of celebrations. I congratulate all of you who were mentioned by graduating seniors. I read all of them and it is very gratifying to see how students value you pushing them and making the extra time for them. I thank you for this.
   - Carrie Clements did a great job at her Discere Aude event.
   - Kate Bruce is North Carolina Professor of the Year – Kate, are you here? No? We applauded you.
   - Is Madeleine Bombeld here? She just sent this to me – I love this. I love walking through the library and seeing everyone studying. This semester, for the first time, we have just extended the hours to 24/5 and now at 24/7 for finals.
     - From Bombeld:
       - "Chancellor DePaolo – I thought you would be interested in hearing a brief summary about Randall Library’s 24/5+ schedule (open Sunday at 10 am for 24 hour service through Friday at 7:00 pm, Saturday 10 am – 7 pm) experience this semester. As you know, we implemented this schedule on August 20, 2008 when classes began and with the exception of fall break, Labor Day, and Thanksgiving break have operated on this schedule. Starting Sunday, November 30 at noon we opened for our 24/7 schedule and will not close until Friday, Dec. 12 at 9 pm.
         - Our expanded hours were not widely used until mid September and the total from the 17th through September 30 was 286 persons. That total comes from capturing the persons entering the library between 12 midnight and 7 am each of those days. In October that number nearly tripled to 724 persons and in November we had 666 total visits during our 24/5+ schedule days. The library has had two milestone days in terms of numbers and those totals are as follows: between 12 midnight and 7 am Monday morning we had 198 persons come in and between 12 midnight Tuesday and 7 am we had 148 persons enter the building!"
   - Congratulations to all of you – I think this is a great initiative at this university.
   - This is a great time of the year – I hope you have a wonderful break, a terrific holiday season, and that, on Saturday, I see as many of you there as possible at graduation.

2. President of the Senate McKinney
   - UNC Tomorrow Update link http://www.uncw.edu/tomorrow
     - I don’t have a lot to report about this – I will just say they all did a great job so quickly to draw this report together.
   - Ad Hoc Committee on Departments and Schools
     - The Provost asked us to form this committee.
     - The committee has now been formed.
     - I got a lot of interest in this committee – I had to stop so the committee wasn’t too big. But you are not silenced – please share your input with us.
     - The committee will be looking at our peers – hopefully, they will have that done by the end of January, and can wrap up the whole process by the end of the spring semester.
   - Questions?
The committee is charged with defining what a department, school, and college are?

We are looking at our peers to see the criteria that they use to designate schools and departments.

Was this because of some of the problems with the new health college?

That may be – I was charged by the Provost.

Does the committee have any authority or official voice?

I don’t think so – let me ask the Provost, though.

Provost: No. We have to get approval from GA and the Board of Governors.

Where does the authority lie?

Provost: GA.

President McKinney: How much of what we give you will be accepted?

Provost: We’ll probably negotiate it. I am depending on you all to do the research. And we will certainly take into consideration the committee’s recommendations.

Search for Founding Dean CHHS

This was put on hold for a month due to budget cuts.

The committee came up with five finalists.

Three will be invited for interviews.

But this is on hold for the moment, due to budget reasons.

Committee reports

1. Senate Steering Committee and Faculty Handbook Appeal from Non-Reappointment. (More information from Steering in Word)

Steering has asked for more time to make this a little more refined before we bring it to the Senate

Questions?

So whatever happens today won’t impact the Faculty Handbook?

No – we are just discussing it at this point.

Can you summarize the situation for us?

Floor ceded to Eileen Goldgeier.

Last February, the Board of Governors revised the Code.

Many changes were made to faculty policies, including discharge, non-reappointment, etc.

Campuses were notified last March that we would have to revise our policies to make them compliant.

Originally, this was due on October 1st. But GA recognized that this would be hard, with faculty away during the summer.

GA has now given us until March 1st.

So we started with the non-reappointment policy.

The major issue that GA recommended campuses look at is whether an attorney could be present during a non-reappointment hearing.

Question: All of these three options would be compliant?

Goldgeier: Yes, but the first question is whether an attorney can be present and if so, can they participate?

Question: So basically, GA recommends that an attorney can be present – we just have to determine whether they can participate or not?

Goldgeier: Basically, our policies are a little murky and I have recommended to Steering that we make them more clear.

Old business

No old business.

New business

Eddie Caropreso and SPOT “Visualizations

No, this will not be happening today. We have had bad luck with laptops in the Fisher Center, in the
past. So this will be rescheduled, probably in January or February.
  • From my understanding, it will help you visualize your SPOT data in correlation with those of your colleagues.
  • **Ad Hoc Committee on Multi-year Lecturer Appointments and Faculty Senate Committee Membership**
  • I have had some lecturers come to me with questions about their benefits from the UNCW.
  • I want this committee to look at whether we can improve the situation for the lecturers on campus. If you are interested in serving, please let me know.
  • I won’t be chairing this committee.
  • **Questions?**
    • Lecturers don’t have a service obligation. I would hope the committee would consider that they teach four courses and not be looking to add to their workload.
    • We are not looking at adding more work for the lecturers. We want to look into how we can give lecturers a voice on Faculty Senate committees.
      • I was under the impression that full-time lecturers are like tenure track faculty in that they have service but no research obligations?
      • That’s right; full-time lecturers do have service obligations but no research expectations.

**Announcements**

• No announcements.

**Adjournment**

*Meeting adjourned at 2:37pm.*
Tuesday, 11 November 2008  
2:00 p.m., EB 162  
Meeting 2009-03

***Please note that the December 9, 2008 meeting will be held in Lumina Theater (Fisher Student Center), starting at 2 p.m.***

Meeting called to order at 2:03pm.

Roll sign-in

- Attendance sheets circulated.
- If you were mistakenly noted as absent for the October meeting, please let President McKinney know via email.
- Absent:
  - Departmental senators: Ashe (English), Barth (Public and International Affairs), Black (Physics & Physical Oceanography), Blundo (Social Work), Buttino (Film Studies), Cordle (Dean, CAS), Evers (Accountancy and Business Law), Graham (Economics & Finance), Hall (Social Work), Lammers (Mathematics & Statistics), Lapaire (Foreign Languages & Literatures), Moore (Dean, University College), Nice (Theatre), Porter (Marketing), Roer (Dean, Graduate School), Shynett (Music), Ward (Chemistry & Biochemistry).
  - Committee chairs: Caropreso (Evaluation), Chandler (Bookstore), Gill (University Curriculum), Hurdle (Public Service), Olsen (Faculty Welfare), Patterson (IT), Reid-Griffin (Financial Aid), Wilcox (Buildings and Grounds)

Approval of the October 2008 minutes

- October 2008 minutes were approved.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo

- Good afternoon. I won’t take a while because I am going to ask someone else to speak to you and that may take a while.
- Just about the budget, we are having a series of open forums about the budget reductions because everyone is contributing good ideas. Briefly, we anticipated a 2% cut at the beginning of the year; we were waiting for another 2% cut, which has already come; we are now planning for another 2% -- for a total of 6%. There are a series of reductions that we are putting into place and we are planning for others. We are trying to avoid layoffs, midyear tuition hikes, and we are trying to avoid an impact on the classroom as much as possible. The closer we get to 6%, the more impact the classroom will feel, unfortunately. We will continue to discuss this as openly as possible -- if you have suggestions, please share them. The budget is really complicated -- there are different pots of money. You can’t, according to state regulations, mix those pots. My best example of this is a couple of years ago when we were building the Fisher Center, and I remember people complaining -- why were we building this building, and not using the money to buy pens or paper or travel? Those pots can’t be mixed. So I encourage you to come to these sessions -- Charlie Maimone has slides and information to share at them.

- Chapel Hill is being cut -- but it affects only 22% of their total budget. Our state appropriations are closer to 40% of our total budget. So it affects us more deeply than a place like Chapel Hill.
- So I would like us to be creative and not just think about reduction -- but are there ways that we can increase those pots of money?
- Which brings me to the Comprehensive Campaign

Floor ceded to Mary Gornto, Vice Chancellor of University Advancement.
- It’s a pleasure to talk with you today about securing public support for UNCW.
- There is a Faculty Senate University Advancement Committee. It’s being chaired by Janet Ellerby; she could not be here today, though, due to a death in the family. But Chris Gould, who was a past chair of
that committee, is here today.

- What I am talking about today has been discussed by that committee.
- I would like to introduce Janell Johnson, the Director of Annual Giving. She more often interacts with faculty/staff -- she works on that side of the campaign.
- There are three campaigns -- I’d like to talk about their similarities and differences.
  - **SECC.**
    - This is an annual campaign run through the state of North Carolina agencies and institutions and is connected with the United Way.
    - This is entirely separate from the efforts of the Advancement division.
    - Because we raise our own money as well, we cannot be a designated recipient in the SECC.
    - This is very separate from the other two UNCW campaigns.
  - **Faculty/Staff Campaign.**
    - This is an annual campaign to try to generate support for the university.
    - This is important for the overall fundraising efforts.
    - You have heard about the goals to raise alumni support.
    - This is equally important -- when we go to outside donors, they want to see that the alumni, the governing bodies, and faculty, staff, and students of UNCW are supporting us, as well.
    - 736 employees gave last year, for a total of just about $250,000 -- about 35% participation. This was up from a couple of years back when we had only 17% participation rate.
    - Faculty were at 39% -- up from 37%.
    - Faculty and staff donors -- like any donors -- can designate the gift to go anywhere they want; you can split your payroll deductions in any way you want.
  - **Comprehensive Campaign.**
    - This is a multiyear major campaign, planned to last seven years.
    - It started in 2005, and will end in 2012.
    - This is not about bricks and mortar.
    - We tried not to use “capital” to describe this campaign because we don’t want to confuse donors who will be thinking about buildings.
    - This is to support the endowment -- this will grow the endowment.
    - We are still low in our endowment, relative to our peers.
    - We concentrate on five areas:
      - Student excellence.
      - Examples: merit and diversity and athletic and international scholarships.
      - Faculty excellence.
      - Examples: distinguished professorships, development fund for prominent junior faculty, post doc fellowships, science and technology resources.
      - These were identified by the Provost and deans as critical to our success.
      - Academic excellence.
      - Regional engagement.
      - Annual fund.
    - Every gift that has been made to UNCW since July 1, 2005 is part of the Comprehensive Campaign.
    - They are very interrelated -- the annual campaign is part of the broader Comprehensive Campaign.
    - We are seeking significantly larger gifts than faculty and staff typically give -- although we do have many generous faculty and staff donors.
    - 2/3 of our ultimate dollar target we need to get during this current nuclear period of the campaign -- our target is in the $55-75 million range.
    - We have gone through a reorganization to maximize our communication and success with donors.
    - The Faculty Senate Advancement Committee established the Faculty Merit Scholarship, which is currently at $19,986 with an outstanding $6,000 in pledges. When those come in, we will have met the $25,000 minimum.
    - We will then like to bring the recipient of this scholarship to meet you here when that first award is given so that you can see the impact your work has had.
As of today, we have secured in gifts and pledges just under $35 million -- approximately $25 million is in hand. The remaining is from firm pledges -- it is not uncommon to have a number of outstanding pledges. It is perfectly acceptable during a comprehensive campaign.

Student giving.
  - This cultivates future alumni to give back once they leave campus.
  - Under Janell, working with Student Affairs and the senior class, we saw a significant increase in student giving.
  - 453 students gave last year -- 291 had their gifts designated for the aquarium in Randall Library. The rest typically gave to their areas for a total of $10,120.
  - As of today, we have had $4,150 in gifts from students.
  - People do continue to give during a downturn in the economy.
  - On behalf of my office and the Faculty Senate Advancement Committee, I thank you for letting me come here today.

Questions?

2. President of the Senate McKinney

- **PPT presentation.**
- Let's start with Faculty Assembly first.
- Floor ceded to Raymond Burt, Faculty Assembly Representative.
  - This is a new policy already passed by the Board of Governors.
  - In the past, all of our degree programs were initiated by the individual campuses.
  - The change that has already been approved now enables not only the campuses to do this but also General Administration.
  - I don’t know how much this will be applied.
  - The graduate deans are in dialogue with GA about the process.
  - If we have a new program proposal (and what I am about to say isn’t set in stone yet), it will go before a disciplinary panel, populated with representatives from the other system schools, which will review it through the lens of UNC Tomorrow.
  - I think this is a loss of autonomy to individual campuses and to faculty senates with their control of the curriculum.
  - The wording of the discontinuation of degree programs – the wording suggests that GA can make these recommendations now, too.
  - In effect, these changes has already occurred and been approved.
  - I wanted to add to the issues related to Faculty Assembly, which Faculty Assembly will be focusing on this year:
    - Faculty recruitment, retention, and development.
    - Non-tenure track and part-time faculty– making sure that their rights are preserved, as well.

- President McKinney: Returning to my PPT presentation, budget cuts.
  - I am going to try not to repeat what the Chancellor has already said.
    - Question: When will the convention travel rules go into effect?
  - If you have already been approved, you are okay. Otherwise, effective immediately.
    - Chancellor: Just to put this in perspective, the University of Florida is letting 400 of its faculty and staff go.
  - Please go to a budget forum.
  - If anyone has any concerns, I am the sole faculty representation on the Senior Budget Committee – please let me know.
    - Question: What about searches?
    - Provost: We haven’t frozen any at this point but we may have to down the line.
  - Each graduation will have a speaker – we are going to select speakers from the faculty.
    - Pat Leonard: We are going to develop a process similar to what we have used for convocation. Hopefully by January, we will have something to bring to you.
  - Questions:
    - Is the School of Nursing included in the 5:30-7:30pm Friday slot?
Yes – sorry that was a mistake.
  * Is this meant to replace departmental graduations?
No – this doesn’t prevent you from doing what you have done in the past.
If you have any concerns that you would like brought to Faculty Assembly, please let me know. If you
have any ideas for saving money, please let me know – all the small suggestions you have will add up and
save the university some money.

3. Faculty Assembly Representative Kim Cook

  * Kim Cook is not here today.

Committee reports

1. Basic Studies Report (More information from Basic Studies in Word)

  * Kim Sawrey, Chair of the Basic Studies Committee.
    * I will be brief.
    * I would like to clarify the committees – there is an Assessment Committee that Ken Spackman is chairing.
The Basic Studies Committee provided that committee with a set of student learning outcomes.
    * We have made some good steps, I think.
    * The Basic Studies Revision Task Force that existed before the Basic Studies Committee came up with a
list of learning goals.
    * We have worked from them.
    * The last substantial change to Basic Studies came in 1973 – this is based on the research I did looking at
past catalogues.
    * There are some departments with bigger degree programs that want less Basic Studies hours, others that
would like more.
    * Let's think of Basic Studies as an ecosystem – it’s not that our current system is broken. But since 1973
our students have changed and the way the world views Basic Studies has changed. The question to ask
is: Are we accomplishing as much as we can for our students?
    * General education should prepare our students to be good citizens in the 21st century.
    * We need to emphasize student writing skills, quantitative skills, diversity skills – this all came from the
Task Force.
    * The Basic Studies Committee took that and tried to incorporate it with some new things:
      * Interdisciplinary.
      * More applied learning in classrooms.
      * Something that students accomplish throughout their time at UNCW.
    * After looking at tons of research, there is a limited number of ways that you can revise the general
education requirements.
    * We have had a lot of pressure from all sides.
    * What we have tried to do is create a situation that will minimally disturb this ecosystem. The changes we
have made will create minimal havoc there. But we hope that we have created a situation that will
encourage curricular innovation.
    * When the changes happen, they are not going to be set in stone – they are flexible and can change with the
needs of our students.
    * With that as preface, let me provide more on our schedule.
    * We are working on a report.
      * Chapel Hill, for example, created 16 subcommittees to work on their Basic Studies curriculum.
    * We are working on a draft report which we hope to deliver to Steering before Thanksgiving.
    * We will then deliver to faculty – Chairs, please discuss it with your faculty.
    * Chairs will then send back one-page reports, which we will post for people to see.
    * We then will revise the report with an aim to get it back to you in time for the January meeting – perhaps
even in the form of an agenda item.
    * I hope everyone got a chance to look at that executive summary linked off of today's agenda.
2. The University Curriculum Committee submits the following motion:

- **[Motion 09-03-06]** That the Senate approve the following recommendations:
  - **Art & Art History**
    - Approve change in oral competency for ARH 476 or 495 (Oral Competency Letter)
  - **Cameron School of Business**
    - Approve Cameron School of Business to create OPS Course Prefix (OPS Course Prefix) and prefix changes for the following courses:
      - POM370 to OPS370
      - POM371 to OPS371
      - POM372 to OPS372
      - POM374 to OPS374
      - POM375 to OPS375
      - POM377 to OPS377
      - POM470 to OPS470
      - POM472 to OPS472
      - POM475 to OPS475
      - POM477 to OPS477
      - POM491 to OPS491
      - POM495 to OPS495
      - POM498 to OPS498
      - POM499 to OPS499
  - **Cameron School of Business/Department of Computer Science**
    - Approve Cameron School of Business/Department of Computer Science to create a new multi-disciplinary degree program in information technology (IT Major proposal)
  - **Chemistry**
    - Approve the creation of a Combined BS/MS Degree in Chemistry
  - **Computer Science**
    - Approve Computer Science to create 3+2 programs (see 3+2 Review Form | 3+2 Documentation)
  - **Creative Writing**
    - Approve Creative Writing Proposals to 1. increase number of hours for Publishing Certificate from 10 to 12 and 2. increase hours in the major from 51 to 54 (see Publishing Certificate Form | Catalogue Copy | CRW 322-B Form | CRW 323 Form | CRW 322 Syllabus | CRW 323 Syllabus Change in Major Hours | CRW 322-A Form | CRW 322-B Form | CRW 322 Syllabus)
  - **Environmental Studies**
    - Approve EVS program change in degree hours from 67 to 67 or 68
  - **Geography and Geology**
    - Approve creation of BS in Oceanography degree (Oceanography BS | BS OCN Curriculum)
  - **Health & Applied Human Sciences**
    - Approve REC 359 for Computer Competency
    - Approve HAHS/REC changes in degree requirements (2008-09 REC degree changes | #138 | #139 | #140 | #141 | #145)
    - Approve HAHS/REC creation of REC option in Parks & Recreation Management (REC Option proposal)
    - Approve HAHS request to create new degree program in Exercise Science (see EXS UCCProgram 10282008 | EXS Request to Implement Oct212008 | EXS Catalogue Description Oct212008)
    - Approve PED 266 for Computer Competency (EXS UCCcomputer 10282008 | PED 266 Computer Competency Syllabus)
    - Approve PED 359 for Oral Competency (EXS UCCoralcomm 10282008 | PED 359 Oral Competency Syllabus | PED 359 Oral Competency Presentation Guidelines | PED 359 Oral Competency Presentation Evaluation)
  - **History**
    - Approve an increase in hours for History major from 43 to 46 hours.
Watson School of Education

- Approve SEC prefix for WSE secondary programs
- Approve Watson School of Education Proposal to create ESL minor (see ESL Minor Form | Catalogue Copy | Rationale | EDN 311 Title Change | EDN 311 | EDN 311 Deletion Form | EDN 316 Pre-requisite Change (contingent upon EDN 311 changes) | ENG 321 Syllabus | ENG 320 Syllabus | EDN 418 Syllabus | EDN 417 Syllabus | EDN 316 Syllabus | EDN 265 Syllabus)
- Approve EMLE proposal to revise the elementary education program with academic concentrations (Elementary Education Program Overview and Rationale)
  - Approve the following course changes:
    - EDN 410: EDN 410 Syllabus | EDN 410 Form
    - EDN 414: EDN 414 Syllabus | EDN 414 Form
  - Delete the following courses
    - EDNL 340, Literacy Lab: EDNL 340 Form
    - EDNL 322, Math Lab: EDNL 322 Form
- Approve ITFSE proposal to revise the secondary education program (WSE Secondary Education Program Overview and Rationale) and to create the following new courses:
  - SEC 200 Teaching, Schools and a Global Society: SEC 200 Form SEC 200 Syllabus
  - SEC 210 Diverse Learners: SEC 210 Form Sec 210 Syllabus
  - SEC 220 Field Experience Block: SEC 220 Form SEC 220 Syllabus
  - SEC 300 Curriculum Design, Technology and Learning Assessment: SEC 300 Form SEC 300 Syllabus
  - SEC 310 Reading and Literacy in the Secondary School: SEC 310 Form SEC 310 Syllabus
  - SEC 320 Field Experience Block 2: SEC 320 Form SEC 320 Syllabus
  - SEC 403 Theory and Practice in Teaching Secondary English 9-12: SEC 403 Form SEC 403 Syllabus
  - EDN 404 Theory and Practice in Teaching Secondary Mathematics: SEC 404 Form SEC 404 Syllabus
  - SEC 405 Theory and Practice in Teaching Secondary Social Studies 9-12: SEC 405 Form SEC 405 Syllabus
  - SEC 410 ESL Topics for Secondary Teachers: SEC 410 Form SEC 410 Syllabus
  - SEC 421 Field Experience Block 3: Secondary Teaching: SEC 421 Form SEC 421 Syllabus
  - SEC 422 Field Experience Block 3: ESL: SEC 422 Form SEC 422 Syllabus
  - EC 430 Seminar- Leadership, Reflection and Management Practices: SEC 430 Form SEC 430 Syllabus
  - SEC 431 Practicum: SEC 431 Form SEC 431 Syllabus
- Approve ITFSE proposal to delete the following courses:
  - EDN 321: 321 Form
  - EDN 356: 356 Form
  - EDN 402: 402 Form
  - EDN 403: 403 Form
  - EDNL 403: 403 L Form
  - EDN 404: 404 Form
  - EDNL 404: 404 L Form
  - EDN 405: 405 Form
  - EDNL 405: 405 L Form
  - EDN 406: 406 Form
  - EDNL 406: 406 L Form
  - EDN 408: 408 Form
  - EDN 409: 409 Form

- I just passed out one last motion, related to the GIS Concentration in Computer Science, that did not make it to the agenda.
Any individual items that people want to discuss?
- David Gill as UCC Chair has done an excellent job – being UCC Chair in October is like being a tax accountant in April.
- I would like to add the Computer Science proposal to [Motion 09-03-06].
- [Motion 09-03-07] To amend [Motion 09-03-06] to include the GIS Concentration proposal from Computer Science, which was circulated during this meeting.
  - [Motion 09-03-07] seconded.
- [Motion 09-03-07] approved.
- [Motion 09-03-06] approved.

Old business
- No old business.

New business

1. Dick Veit (ENG) submits the following motion:

   Whereas, retired UNCW faculty who are not teaching are accorded the privilege of free parking when they make visits to campus, and
   Whereas, retired faculty who are teaching in the phased retirement program are rightly expected to pay for parking when they are teaching, and
   Whereas, some retired faculty in the phased retirement program teach only in one semester of each year and have no teaching or other responsibilities in the other semester, and
   Whereas, it is reasonable that those faculty members should not be expected to pay for parking in semesters when they have no duties on campus, and
   Whereas, like other retired faculty, they may wish to make occasional visits to campus in semesters when they are not teaching; therefore,
   Be it resolved, that retired faculty in the phased retirement program shall be expected to pay for parking only in semesters when they are teaching and shall be accorded the same free parking privileges accorded to other retired faculty during semesters when they are not teaching.

   This motion was withdrawn by Dick Veit yesterday.
   He worked something out with Sharon Boyd, so he withdrew it.

Announcements

1. Mary Gornto UNCW Advancement

   Please see above under Chancellor DePaolo's Report.

2. Seahawk DOCKS Database

   Randall Library announces a new faculty research database. It will allow your research to be automatically listed in Google, making it easy for other researchers to find your publications.
   This new database is called Seahawk DOCKS (Digital Online Collection of Knowledge and Scholarship). (Please visit: [http://libres.uncg.edu/ir/uncw/](http://libres.uncg.edu/ir/uncw/))
   To launch the database, the library is sponsoring a free luncheon. The topic will be Seahawk DOCKS and scholarly publishing. Heather Joseph, executive director of the national organization SPARC and former chief operating officer for BioOne, will present and lunch will be provided. Please attend to find out how you can include your work in the online collection. The luncheon is this Friday, November 14. To RSVP or for more information, contact Rachel Radom, (radomr AT uncw.edu).

3. Bobby Miller ITSD

   It’s been a quiet group today.
Quick announcement.

We are updating our email system – Exchange 2003 to Exchange 2007. We converted students over the fall break.

The biggest improvement is with OWA:
  - More flexible display.
  - Enhanced searching.
  - Open attachments without having to download them.
  - Auto completes the address field.
  - You can access your folders and documents on the Sammy server.

We will convert faculty and staff on Commencement Day – that evening.

It shouldn’t change your Outlook in your office.

We are one of the first sites to work with virtual servers – a lot of green benefits – on the cutting edge, with respect to the nation.

Questions?
  - You said it is going to be on commencement day – since grades are due three days later, will there be any implications?
  - There should be no impact – there should be no service interruption.
    - Chancellor: I had heard that when you first logon you had to do a double login?
    - That was to get students directed to the right site. This shouldn’t affect faculty.
    - Is there a reason that we couldn’t delay this until after grades are due? I would hate this to impact students submitting their work.
  - Yes – we can delay it until that Tuesday after Commencement.

Floor ceded to Leah Kraus.

In conjunction with the shift to Exchange 2007, we want to coordinate this with getting everyone on Office 2007. There are about 20% on campus who don’t have it yet. You can email us (tac AT uncw.edu) -- in the subject line, you simply put "Office 2007" and note the office computer location. We do have copies to check out for your personal computers at TAC.

PCs need to be on Office 2007.

Macs need to be on Office 2008 – again, email TAC with the subject line "Office 2008."

Questions?
  - Some of the smart classrooms are still on 2003?
  - That is our first push – we are trying to get those done over winter break by January. If the classroom is not how you need it, please pull up an email and let us know.
  - Some of us teach in classrooms that we don’t own.
  - Then please still email us and we will work it out with the department that owns the classroom.
    - Considering all the budget stuff, wouldn’t it be better to delay these changes for six months?
  - That’s a good question – we pay for this every year. It’s included in our campus license.
    - But Windows 7 will be out soon – and then we will have to change again.
  - It actually saves us money in the long run to get everyone on the same system.
    - Do students still have access to the Citrix server?
  - Yes.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 3:18pm.
Meeting called to order at 2:05pm.

Roll sign-in

- Attendance sheets circulated.
- Absent:
  - Departmental senators: Abrams (Geography and Geology), Barth (Public and International Affairs), Blundo (Social Work), Buttino (Film Studies), Chapman (Provost), Cordle (Dean, CAS), Elikai (Accountancy & Business Law), Evers (Accountancy and Business Law), Huber (Elementary, Middle, and Literacy Education), McCartney (Biology & Marine Biology), Moore (Dean, University College), Olson (Art & Art History), Pierce (Interim Dean, Nursing), Rodriguez (Management), Roney (Elementary, Middle, and Literacy Education), Seidman (History), White (Creative Writing).
  - Committee chairs: Caropreso (Evaluation), Chandler (Bookstore), Patterson (IT), Reid-Griffin (Financial Aid), Wilcox (Buildings and Grounds).

Approval of the September 2008 minutes

- September 2008 minutes were approved.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo

   - [N.B. President McKinney's report was delivered first during the meeting.]
   - Sorry I was late.
   - I was going to call on Charlie Maimone anyway – thank you.
   - Comparatively, we are doing okay. I was talking yesterday to a friend at Citadel in SC – their state appropriation, after cuts, is at 16%. We are more than double that. FL is decimated. In GA, they are furloughing staff, including faculty. They already had a 10% cut. They have now merged all the technical campuses and closed about half of them.
   - I know that you are all nervous.
   - I think this is a time for us to think creatively. It’s not like we haven’t faced this before. Let’s look at things another way – to rise to the challenge of looking at this university as a whole and say, "How do we get through this?" We are already hearing that parents can’t afford private colleges in this economy so they will be turning to quality public institutions like us. The institutions that will benefit from this downturn, all the analysts say, are those that are focused and mission-driven. We are trying to make our mission as clear and tied to what we do as can be. But think about what we value most about who we are. And try to suspend that normal turf mentality that we all understandably, naturally have. Let’s think long term and not short term. This is a university community that can do that. It won’t be easy but we can do it. As Charlie mentioned, we will have open forums. We will make this process as transparent as possible.
   - The chancellors are having a meeting at the end of the month – so in about the next two weeks we should learn a lot more about the state situation and the system situation.
   - But as I said in my memo yesterday, I urge you all to be prudent now and start to hold back money now because there is nothing worse than having a budget cut in January after money has been obligated.
   - I think we are already ahead of the game but I want us to get through this as unscathed as possible. I know we can.
   - Anyone here from Human Resources that can speak to the situations with the health system and retirement?
     - Human Resources representative: I am here to answer questions.
     - We sent a memo around today from the state about retirement.
     - The health system, on the other hand, there is a deficit there. We may have to be prepared for rates going
up. We may have to take a hit there.

- Any other questions about anything? I wanted to be giving this talk yesterday during the market surge!

2. President of the Senate McKinney

- UNC Tomorrow
  - Reports are due on December 1st.

- Faculty Assembly
  - First meeting just happened.
  - Major concerns for Faculty Assembly are:
    - Assessment and accountability.
    - Chancellors who have served less than two years – not our situation thankfully.
    - Online courses.
    - Possibly going to trimesters – three semesters running year round.
    - Faculty salaries – we are near the 80th percentile.
  - Floor ceded to Kim Cook, Faculty Assembly Representative.
    - It was a cool meeting – my first meeting.
    - I felt very proud to be there from UNCW.
    - UNCW has had an important effect on Faculty Assembly for a very long time.
    - The legacy of shared governance – the policy that Dick Veit drafted – it has been a very important document for Faculty Assembly.
    - It is gratifying to me that we have such a strong reputation within the system.

- Most pressing issues for us right now:
  - SACS.
  - UNC Tomorrow.
  - Basic studies.
  - Budget.
    - Floor ceded to Charlie Maimone, Vice Chancellor for Business Affairs.
      - We have had a permanent reduction of $908,000.
      - We are working on scenarios that would protect our operating budgets.
      - When the money arrived, we set aside 2%.
      - We received information from that state budget director. We have received a 2% reversion. We set that money aside.
      - But we do anticipate additional cuts. We can manage an extra 1% budget cut, should it be cut, using money held in abeyance (i.e. extra tuition dollars). We are anticipating an additional 2% or 3% cut.
      - We might be able to cut money in our four-year computer cycle.
      - However, if we get another 2%, we will probably have to start squeezing.
      - Questions?
        - Thanks for your remarks. One thing that people have to keep in mind is that these are reductions are from state contributions – not our total budget. Our state contribution is equal to about $100 million (or 40% of our total budget).

Committee reports

1. UNC Tomorrow Report Update

- Stephen McFarland, Vice Provost.
  - PPT presentation.
  - Phase I report is available online or I can send you a copy.
  - Now we are in Phase II.
    - My concern as a historian, when you talk about I and II – will there be a III? Not sure about that at this point
  - Existing degree program review
If you haven’t heard about this, then your program probably isn’t under review.

- Reviews will go through departments, then deans, then the university community.
- New degree program review.
- Review of workforce challenges.
  - Prepare for widespread faculty retirement.
  - Faculty subcommittee is chaired by Larry Clark, Dean of Cameron School of Business.
    - Floor ceded to Larry Clark and Chris Gould, Director of the Center for Faculty Leadership.
  - PPT presentation.
  - The issues that we have been asked to explore:
    - Is there a thoughtful planning process to address our workforce needs? The answer right now is no.
    - Do we have gaps and surpluses between the present and the future with respect to leader and worker shortages? Yes.
    - Barriers to recruiting retaining.
    - Diverse multi-generational diverse workforce.
    - Have we prepared a systematic process to prepare for replacements – succession planning? It’s great, incidentally, that Chris Gould as Center for Faculty Leadership Director is involved.
    - Lack of childcare on campus.
    - Spousal hires.
    - Full recognition of partner status.
    - Healthcare center and how that will be made available to faculty.
    - Salary compression.
    - Lack of family tuition.
    - Mentor support for new assistant professors.
    - Classroom space, office space, support space. For instance, someone said recently, “Don’t take offense, but Cameron is a dump – we need a new building.”
    - Center for Faculty Leadership.
    - Watson School has a good leadership program that could be emulated by others.
    - There is no good program to groom faculty for administrative roles, though.
    - So this is what we have been doing in the context of the seven questions (seven committees working on each question) – of course, the eighth question is: "Anything else that wasn't covered in the previous seven?"
    - Please take a look at the members of the committee – please give feedback to these members as needed. The committee works great as a team.
  - Questions?
    - Was there thought put into the gender and ethnic makeup of the group?
    - Yes – we were thinking of how this would ultimately impact faculty and students.
- The reports will be distributed, then video conferences with all the schools, then the budget proposals – Phase II should be reflected in our budget requests, in fact.
- Tenure and rewards system review.
  - 40% of our faculty have been here less than five years.
  - 60% less than ten years.
  - In terms of the graying of the professoriate, we are a very young campus.
  - UNC Tomorrow’s concern is that outreach and applied research be reflected in the tenure review process.
  - We need to outline a process to achieve this.
    - Question: Are these terms (i.e. "outreach" and "applied research") defined?
    - They have left that to us to determine – GA and UNC Tomorrow have not defined them. They have tried not to be heavy handed about this.
    - So we need to evaluate and outline a process.
  - This committee is led by Nelson Reid, Social Work, and Mark Galizio, Psychology.
    - Floor ceded to Nelson Reid.
    - PPT presentation.
Our PPT is a little redundant with Steve’s.
There is no definition of engagement – there is a direction implied in terms of this engagement, however.
The Commission Report implies that the campus should address these issues in a comprehensive way.
President Bowles like to refers to the future of the system as demand-driven.
Our processes for reviewing faculty reflect standards in the disciplines.
There is the feeling, though, that there is a disconnect between how we evaluate versus how the state would evaluate.
So how can we rectify these two things?
I want to emphasize the “tenure, promotion and incentive system” part of the statement from the commission.
This is not an effort to turn humanities departments into departments like Social Work, etc. – we are not looking to radically change the nature of disciplines.
We are charged to create this process.
The committee now will not recommend policy changes – but a process for identifying those changes.
The form of the report.
- A statement of UNCW’s “involvement and engagement in applied research and outreach” as it is right now.
- The definition of scholarly engagement and service that will guide the review.
  - What constitutes peer review and satisfactory evaluation of these things?
- Comment on the current RPT policy regarding definition as established above.
  - The language is not consistent at this point with scholarly engagement and outreach.
  - We will recommend that the next committee incorporate the other activities that faculty are involved in, in the new guidelines.
- A statement on the necessity for: (a) clarity of engagement and service objectives at university and AA levels and (b) at the departmental level.
- Recommendations as to the membership of the committee that will implement this process – it has to be a faculty-based committee.
- We have to recommend a timeline.
Hope this gives you a feel for what we are doing.
Do not look for a report that will specify the policy changes and how we will revise the Faculty Handbook.
There will be a longer, deliberative, and participatory process for this.

Floor ceded to Mark Galizio.
- UNCW has a long history of engagement with research and the community so we will really rise to this challenge.

Mission review.
- To review our mission with UNC Tomorrow in mind.
- Ken Spackman, Director of University Planning, is Chair of the committee.
- PPT presentation.
  - History of recent mission review.
  - Our BOG mission statement was approved in 2001.
  - We went through a broad process in 2005 to make changes.
    - It has been approved by the BOT.
    - But has been pending by the BOG since April 2005 – on hold because of this.
  - We want to add to what we already thought were good changes from 2005.
    - We sent survey to everyone via email.
    - We hosted open forums in September.
After every step, there were reviews and modifications made by the Planning Council.
- We are very close to having a final form of the new mission.
- Next week, we will have some rapid-fire approval steps.
- 2162 people were invited to comment via the survey.
  - 86.8% approved – unqualified support or support with suggestions for improvement.
  - There were over 300 suggestions for improvement.
- The next slide has a lot of text – don’t read it. It is for effect – the intent is that if you see just a little bit of red, in track changes mode, then everything was good. If you see a lot of red, you will see we took your suggestions to heart.
  - One of the most common suggestions was that it is too long – shorten it.
  - The current recommendation is 119 words – we have shortened it. The 1990 version had 609 words.
- This captures: why we exist, how we are different. It describes our approach to teaching, learning, research, and service, and responds to UNC Tomorrow.
- We want to thank all those involved for their work done and that to come, and those who participated in the survey.
- Ken will now talk about a SACS fifth-year interim report survey.
  - PPT presentation.
    - SACS is our regional accreditor.
    - Those of you who were here in 2000-2002 – you know what that is about.
    - Everything has changed now.
      - There is no more self-study – there are different kinds of things that need to be prepared.
      - SACS has been told by the federal government that it ten years is too long to wait for reviews. You need to do something about this sooner.
      - SACS developed a process for this last spring – they gave us instructions as to how do this in August. The report is due in March.
      - We are in the first cohort to do this – about 40 or so institutions.
      - We are asked to respond to fourteen items that are a subset of the 78 standard items in our 2012 review.
      - This gives us a practice run for what we will have to do in 2012.
    - The basic compliance areas:
      - Admissions policies.
      - Recruitment materials.
      - Student achievement.
      - Program length.
      - Curriculum appropriate to mission.
      - Calendars, grading, refunds.
    - Complex compliance areas:
      - Faculty resource adequacy to support mission.
      - Student support programs and services.
      - Physical facilities adequacy.
        - We will provide a video walking tour of facilities.
      - Educational program assessment, including student learning assessment.
        - Expected student learning outcomes.
        - Demonstration that assessment has been occurring.
        - And documentation that changes have been made based on these assessments.
    - Our process:
      - Eleven working committees.
      - A steering committee for the eleven.
      - We had an organizational meeting on September 19th.
    - Our timetable:
      - By the first part of December, we expect preliminary committee reports from the easy
- By January 12th for the complex ones.
- Final reports by February 2nd.
- March 27th is the deadline for the SACS report.
  - The plan will be to submit everything on DVD.
  - SACS evaluators are like people in this room – faculty and administrators.
- The expected outcomes from this process:
  - A model process and report.
  - Identification of UNCW policies or procedures that need strengthening.
  - Familiarization for lots of people with SACS requirements.
- To look ahead.
  - This year, the fifth-year report.
  - 2011-12, prepare compliance certification.
  - 2009-10 – we may do a compliance audit, depending upon our fifth-year report.
  - When it comes to 2012, the least of our worries will be our compliance certification.
  - 2011-13 – we have to develop a QEP (Quality Enhancement Plan) on some aspect of student learning that the whole university can agree on; we will report on our success in 2018.
- There is an elaborate process for doing so and precedent from other institutions.
- So 2010-11 – selection of our QEP topic.
- So basically, we will be working on SACS every year.
- It has the potential to give us good evidence to make decisions on.
- Questions?
  - There is a natural tendency to view this fifth-year report as a SACS lite. Ken, can you comment on what the SACS president said to you at a conference this summer?
- The consequences of not being in compliance in the ten-year review can be significant: warning, probation, accreditation withdrawn. If we are not accredited, students can’t get federal aid and we can’t get federal money for grants.
- What are the consequences for the fifth-year report not being in compliance?
- Precisely the same consequences as with not being in compliance for the ten-year. It used to be in SACS that you could be in partial compliance – that no longer exists. Either you are or you aren’t.
  - What will your role be in the coming years? Speaking personally, that will be important – I think it unlikely that we will find someone better qualified and best able to communicate to the faculty than you.
- Thank you – that’s very persuasive. There are now efforts to have teams to work on SACS – it used to be just one person could manage this. Part of what will happen this year will be that we will be able to see how we will have to generate teams to respond to this.
- Chancellor: Mark, the point is well made that we all want Ken’s involvement in some way in this.

2. The University Curriculum Committee submits the following motion:

- [Motion 09-02-05] That the Senate approve the following recommendations:
  - Delete SPN 309: Technologies de la Information (currently meets computer competency)
  - Approve: SPN 305: Conversation and Composition, for pre-requisite
  - Approve: PED 101: Physical Activity and Wellness for a change in course description from PED 101: Foundations of Physical Activity
  - Approve SWK 496-497: Field Practicum I, II for computer competency and prerequisites. (More information: [SWK 496-497 Computer](#) | [SWK 496-497](#)
  - Approve name change of minor program to Africana Studies from African American Studies
  - Approve name change to AFN 130 Africana Studies from AAS 130: African American Studies
  - Approve ARH catalog description for major. (More information from ARH in Word)
The PED 101 change was already approved last year – not sure how that got there. So we will be voting on everything in this motion except the PED 101 line.

Any discussion?

[Motion 09-02-05] approved.

3. Basic Studies Report

- Kim Sawrey, Chair of the Basic Studies committee.
  - We are in the process of delivering a report from the old Basic Studies committee to the new committee, of which Ken Spackman is Chair.
  - Floor ceded to Ken Spackman.
    - I can speak to the role of the committee that I am chairing.
    - I don’t know what the parliamentary plan is for today.
      - President McKinney: We just want some informational background.
    - There is a Basic Studies committee of the Senate.
    - They have been looking at student learning outcomes within Basic Studies – that has been their most recent charge.
    - We are near step one of the process of student assessment.
    - I am chairing the committee of faculty, whose charge is fairly simple: to develop the mechanism to assess these outcomes for implementation no later than 2009.
    - This information is needed for accreditation.
    - It will give us good information to use to support changes in the future for Basic Studies modifications.
    - Basic Studies Assessment committee:
      - Ken Spackman of Mathematics and Statistics, Committee Chair.
      - Martin Posey of Biology and Marine Biology.
      - Don Furst of Art and Art History.
      - Carrie Clements of Psychology.
      - Becky Porterfield of the Cameron School of Business.
      - Abdou Ndoye of the Watson School of Education.
      - Carol Heinrich of the School of Nursing.
      - Jackie Lauer-Glebov of Academic Assessment.
    - We started our activities about 5.5 weeks ago.
    - We just received a report from Kim’s committee. They did excellent work on the student learning outcomes.
    - We developed for our own committee use, a 13-step process for what we are going to do with the student learning outcomes when we get them.
    - We made recommendations to the Mission Review committee, of which I am also Chair.
      - Our previous mission statement had a sentence that said we seek to stimulate learning, etc.
      - So one of the things that we did is to make a tight internal consistency between the mission statement and the student learning outcomes. So we took the student learning outcomes that Senate endorsed awhile ago – there were eight of them. And we connected them to the mission statement. There were some that were represented – others that weren’t. So we included the ones that weren’t in the new mission statement.
      - Learning goals for our UNCW graduates – we put these learning goals in the context of our mission, explaining why the faculty think these are important and why they are important for students.
      - So we are thinking of this as being a four-year process, as the Basic Studies committee has.
      - We developed a process and a timeline for implementing a survey for faculty who are teaching Basic Studies classes this semester.
        - This is not an opinion survey.
        - We want to present the student learning outcomes to the faculty teaching Basic Studies – are these appropriate to your goals for your classes?
        - We want to make sure these student learning outcomes align with what we are already
doing – how well are we doing what we are trying to do now?
  • To do the direct assessment of student learning, one needs to evaluate directly student work – a paper, a lab report, a presentation – some student work has to be examined to determine whether some learning outcome has been achieved. So what student work has already been collected that will demonstrate these student learning outcomes? We don’t want to add work to students – we want to be minimally disruptive.
  • The survey will be just three questions. The third will be a request for the instructor to describe his/her own evaluation of how well the students are achieving these student learning outcomes. This is actually a legitimate form of evaluation – not the best, but it does give us data.
  • So the point I am trying to make is that the assessment committee is building on the work of the Senate and the Basic Studies committee – we may have to make slight adjustments to the language in order to assess them adequately. But we are going to take the content of those student learning outcomes and apply them to assessment.
  • So we have mapped 35 student learning outcomes onto the eight Senate-endorsed learning goals. We have already made some interesting discoveries that will be in our final report.
  • We think we have accomplished a lot and are ready to embark on the next assessment portion.
  • We would like to assemble the entire package of the assessment rather than doing it piecemeal.
  • How does that fit with your thoughts, Kim?
    • Kim Sawrey: Very well – thank you.

Old business
  • No old business.

New business
  • No new business.

Announcements
  • SeahawkDOCKS: Library’s Institutional Repository
    • Randall Library is creating an online collection of faculty research. It will allow your research to be automatically listed in Google, making it easy for other researchers to find your publications.
    • The online collection will be called SeahawkDOCKS.
    • To launch the collection, the library is sponsoring a free luncheon. The topic will be SeahawkDOCKS and scholarly publishing. Heather Joseph, executive director of the national organization SPARC and former chief operating officer for BioOne, will present and lunch will be provided. Please attend to find out how you can include your work in the online collection. The luncheon is on November 14. To RSVP or for more information, contact Rachel Radom; her email is on the invitation.
    • Handout invitations are going around about this now.
    • Lunch is going to be here in this room on Friday, November 14th, from 11:30am to 1pm.
  • Kemille Moore
    • Please visit: http://www.uncw.edu/commonreading/
    • If you would like input into the title for next year’s common reading program, please visit that url.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 3:47pm.
Meeting called to order at 2:08pm.

Roll call

- Attendance sheets were distributed.
- Absent:
  - Departmental senators: Barth (Public and International Affairs), Blundo (Social Work), Evers (Accountancy and Business Law), Hall (Social Work), Huber (Elementary, Middle, and Literacy Education), Hungerford (Psychology), Hurst (Psychology), Kermani (Early Childhood and Special Education), Moallem (IT, Foundations, and Secondary Education), Noland (English), Simmons (Anthropology), White (Creative Writing).
  - Committee chairs: Caropreso (Evaluation), Patterson (IT), Wilcox (Buildings and Grounds).

Approval of the April 2008 and May 2008 (electronic) minutes

- April 2008 minutes were approved.
- May 2008 (electronic) minutes were approved.

Special order of the day

1. Election of the Vice President, the Secretary, and the Steering Committee of the Senate (More information from Bylaws)

- Nominations for Vice President open: Curt Stiles.
  - Motion from the floor [Motion 09-01-01]: To close the nominations for Vice President and ask the Secretary to cast the ballot.
    - [Motion 09-01-01] seconded.
    - Discussion:
      - No objections to [Motion 09-01-01].
    - [Motion 09-01-01] carried.
- Nominations for Secretary open: Liza Palmer.
  - Motion from the floor [Motion 09-01-02]: To close nominations for Secretary and ask the Secretary to cast the ballot.
    - [Motion 09-01-02] seconded.
    - Discussion:
      - No objections to [Motion 09-01-02].
    - [Motion 09-01-02] carried.
- Nominations for Steering Committee open: Andy Jackson, Steve Pullum, Gabriel Lugo, Carlos Rodriguez.
  - Question: If we don’t get any more nominations, do we have to vote?
    - No we don’t have to vote.
  - Nomination: Sue Cody.
  - From the floor: I move that nominations be closed.
    - So moved.
    - All in favor.
  - It was reported later in the meeting that, as a result of anonymous ballots, the following four people were elected to Steering Committee: Sue Cody, Andy Jackson, Gabriel Lugo, Steve Pullum.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo
Welcome to the first Faculty Senate meeting.

The room was abuzz – I want you to remember this because the April and May meetings were very quiet.

I want to talk about some things that I had mentioned in the Fall Faculty Meeting, but which bear repeating.

Last year, at this time, we faced a major cut.

This year, we were given 4 million – but we might face a reversion in the middle of the year. So we are going to hang on to some funds in case this happens – we are going to spend our time working on a plan as to how to spend it in case we don’t have to give it back. The extra money is from the increase in enrollment. We were planning for 1950 – we are now at 2100. Two things happened – more students accepted our offers than our models could have predicted. In February, GA looked at our numbers of out-of-state students so we had to balance this against state appropriations – in order to have that balance, we had to take more in-state students. Our SAT scores have held steady. As you may know, there is a 3% merit pool for faculty – this should come in the September paycheck.

The raises for SPA was 2.75% or $1100, whichever was higher.

I want to put this in context – we have had in the last few years, much-needed, much-deserved pay increases. I wish we could do that this year. But I keep thinking back to what is happening in Georgia – they’re not paying their faculty for certain days. They don’t have to come in but they aren’t getting paid. And Georgia is looking at a 10% cut.

If we have a 3% reversion, we can handle that without impacting core research and teaching – so there will be minimal impact to the academic side.

I want to mention UNC Tomorrow – we are now in Phase II planning. Phase II, I have always said, is at the heart of what we do. It’s going to look at reappointment, promotion, and tenure guidelines – we don’t have to redo them right now but we have to look at how we do it. It’s also going to look at the programs we offer. And then we will have to look at our mission – how not to be duplicated within the system.

Hannah Gage of Wilmington has become Chair of the UNC Board of Governors – she is the first woman to be Chair of the Board of Governors, the first person from Wilmington to be elected Chair, and the first UNCW Trustee to be elected Chair. She knows and she has stated that we are the best in the system – she has always fought for us. In talking to her, I know that some of the things she is focusing on, is that whole idea that we have got to figure out how to be affordable and accessible in some way. She will be chairing the board meeting this week --- I will report back. The topics she raises, though, are the things we need to think about. So graduation rates, distance education, etc.

At the Fall Faculty Meeting, you probably heard Mark Blackwell, SGA President. This is the first time I have ever heard an SGA president talk about how to improve the graduation rates among students – let’s help him with that.

Basic Studies is a high priority. We have been working on this for five years. I remember challenging everyone about this five years ago – dream the best experience for our students. Right now, we have a much more pragmatic pressure on our head – and that’s SACS. We all know SACS – I sometimes judge my career by how many SACS reviews I have been through. Everything you do at an institution – the only question they ask is how are you assessing it. So it’s not enough that we know we are doing the right things and doing our best. I urge you to volunteer for SACS committees – we will try to gather the most amount of money to send as many people to the meeting in December.

I want to call on Martin Posey, who has served on the SACS Commission and can comment on this.

- Posey: A high percentage of institutions going through accreditation -- about 40% -- are going through some sort of remediation for assessment.

Any questions?

I am going to turn things over now to Provost Brian Chapman to say more.

- Provost Brian Chapman:
  - I want to express gratitude to be able to serve as Provost here. It’s been a long dream of mine to be here. You have got a lot to be proud of here at this school. Coming here as an interviewee, I was struck by how committed everyone is here to UNCW. We have some outstanding academic programs. When colleagues at my old institution heard I interviewed here, they came up to me to talk about a lot of our programs here that they knew about. Outstanding grantwork and publications come out of this place. You have a beautiful campus, inside and out. Basically, I am just excited to be here.
  - I wish I hadn’t come at a time of a budget cut. It’s a little difficult to come here under these
circumstances—it’s been a rough time for me.

- When I interviewed for this position, it was made clear to me that you wanted a Provost who would make decisions and move the university forward. I took that decision seriously – perhaps too seriously. It’s taken me a few months to learn that we do have a different campus culture – we do move more slowly here. You want decisions to be made but you don’t want them to be made too fast or if they will affect you.

- I have been hearing rumors – I want to address them.
  - Rumor 1: I don’t agree with shared governance. That’s not true. I worked extensively at my other institution with the Faculty Senate. I do believe in shared governance – and that it’s important that we work together.
  - Rumor 2: I don’t believe the faculty owns the curriculum. That’s not true either. Now there are some situations where I would have to step in, if you wanted 80 Basic Studies hours, for instance. But with shared governance, there has to be a give and take.
  - Rumor 3: I dissolved the Basic Studies Committee. I sent a letter to thank the committee so that they know that I know the work they have done. I was under the impression that a new committee would be appointed this year, so I wanted to acknowledge the previous committee’s work. A few weeks ago, I met with Kim Sawrey, Ken Spackman, David Cordle, and Steve McFarland to talk about how Basic Studies will move forward. We are in the first cohort for SACS that have to submit a five-year progress report. There is a line for Basic Studies assessment. They assume that all universities started assessing their Basic Studies curriculum in 2002. They will assume that we will have 2-3 years of assessment data when we submit our report in March. We don’t have that. We are going to be in compliance with 13 of the 14 requirements for the report. The Chancellor will have to sign a report about number 14, the Basic Studies line, that we are not in compliance. The one escape clause is that we can come back and say: But we have a new curriculum and a new assessment plan. To make sure we have this in place, I have asked three different groups to do three different things. We need an assessment protocol for Basic Studies, headed by Ken Spackman (who has had more SACS experience than anyone, probably). The Faculty Senate Basic Studies Committee will take the existing Basic Studies curriculum and make sure that it works across the board. To identify the courses for each of the categories. Linda Siefert is going to be working on the syllabi themselves to make sure they have all the common learning outcomes carried through. We are going to be not in compliance and the Chancellor and I will take some heat on this. We have a need for speed because that report is due to SACS by the end of March. So we need to be done by December.

- I am going to try to visit all of the departments over the next coming months – I want to tour your facilities and find out what we can do to make the lives of the chairs and the faculty easier. Bruce McKinney, as Faculty Senate President (or a Steering Committee representative) will accompany me on these tours.

- I am going to have some open forums so people can come and talk to me, ask questions, get to know me.
  - October 1st, 12-1:30pm in the Clock Tower Lounge.
  - October 16th, 12:30 -2pm in the Clock Tower Lounge.
  - Because of the budget cuts, we will only have lemonade and cookies.

- That’s my plan – I want to have plenty of opportunities to have open communication with everyone.

- We need to work on distance education – we are way behind some of the other universities. Especially since GA just sent an email a few weeks ago, stating that a UNCW student can take a distance education course at any of the other system schools and those credits will transfer -- and the other institution will get the money.

- Any questions?
  - This may be a rumor, but I have heard that all the instructors on this campus will be forced to attend a sexual harassment session. Why?
  - Why don’t you ask GA? This is handed down from them.
  - Is this true for every UNC campus? Every faculty member?
  - Yes.
I was interested in the implied link in your presentation between the Basic Studies curriculum and the UNCW’s inability to get started on assessment? They don’t seem related to me.

- Basic Studies is not ready and not ready to be assessed.
- We could have an assessment plan in place for the existing curriculum – the Basic Studies revision has not held that up surely?
- Yes and I am not sure why that is.
  - You could leave the Basic Studies curriculum as it is and redraw the boxes?
    - Chancellor: Tim, yes we could. But the complication is that Erskine is asking the campuses when the last time Basic Studies was revised.
    - But it may be premature to revise the curriculum before assessing the curriculum? Maybe not.
  - My department– our Basic Studies classes are maxed out: 40-50 students. But our distance education courses are limited to 25 – if we have to teach more distance education courses, we won’t have enough faculty to cover our classes.
  - Twenty-five is not necessarily an essential number for distance education. It kind of depends on the faculty member's ability to manage and innovate. There are a lot of options you have – you will have to work that out on your own. I don’t want to dictate that.
    - If we ask the Basic Studies Committee to stop the revision and do something else, this will be the second time that they have been taken off their task. They were stopped last semester to address the UNC Tomorrow report.
  - I think we have to concentrate on learning outcomes and hold off on the revision until we have some assessment data so we will have some basis to make these revisions.
    - I am just pointing out that they can’t be doing two things at the same time and wonder why people wonder why the committee doesn’t progress more.
  - I’ll try not to respond to that.
    - I’m not sure that is a helpful approach.
  - Some of the other campuses have done this in two years. We are the outlier here. Five years is an extraordinary amount of time when others have done it in two.
    - I think it needs to be said that we are academics – we are building the dreamscape. And now at the same time, I am understanding that this Basic Studies curriculum is needing to satisfy other requirements. I was not aware of that – we didn’t understand what the political imperatives were. So to hold us responsible, to spank us, so to speak, when we were not aware of these pressures is not productive.
  - You are right – I don’t think the two committees were given the proper charge. This is one of the reasons I want to open up communication so that we are all aware of these issues.
    - We need to understand what the real criteria and requirements are – not just the committees – so that we can fulfill all of the mandates. The administration needs to be sensitive to the fact that we need to be able to be informed enough to help in this process.
    - I am on the Basic Studies Committee – do I take my orders from you or from the Faculty Senate?
    - No – you answer to Faculty Senate.
      - So I can expect a charge coming from the Steering Committee?
    - I gave the directive to Kim Sawrey.
      - Yes, but that came from you and not Steering Committee.
    - I will work with Faculty Senate in future.
      - Just an observation – given the need for speed here. When they bring their report to us, there won’t be much room for debate.
  - We have until December.
    - Can I ask Kim what the timeline is?
      - Sawrey: Fast.
      - Chancellor: Steve, you bring a good point – there needs to be debate about this.
    - To be clear about this, we are not going to debate the revised curriculum – but the learning outcomes.
    - If I can just get back to this problem of ownership, we own the curriculum and we own the
learning outcomes, too. We own the curriculum in the sense that you tell us what you need and we implement it – a constrained ownership?

- Chancellor: Maybe if you make a distinction bet the curriculum and the process to develop the curriculum.
- Whatever you all decide, we [the administration] are responsible for it.
- Thank you.

1. President of the Senate McKinney

- UNC Tomorrow Phase I is online – there is no way that I could cover it in less than 45 minutes. I encourage all of you to go to the homepage and type in UNC Tomorrow – it will bring you to the entire report and the executive summary, which is 25 pages (Phase I reports).
- Phase II involves:
  - Review of existing degree programs.
  - Review of proposed new degrees.
  - RPT guidelines.
  - Faculty and staff recruitment and retention.
  - Mission review.
- I encourage you to get in touch with me if you want to be involved in any way in the UNC Tomorrow process – I am happy to make you ex officio on committees.
- The Chancellor covered the budget – I won’t go into that.
- We are searching now for the “founding dean” of the new Health College.
  - I encourage you to get in touch with me if you want to be involved in any way in the UNC Tomorrow process – I am happy to make you ex officio on committees.
- The Chancellor covered the budget – I won’t go into that.
- We are searching now for the “founding dean” of the new Health College.
  - To see the position description, please visit: http://www.uncw.edu/hr/dean.html
- Cathy Barlow: We have to revisit the timeline – the person will start on July 1st.
- Enough has been said about Basic Studies unless anyone wants to offer any other input?
- Floor ceded to Mark Spaulding, Immediate Past President of Faculty Senate.
  - I genuinely regret that Ray Burt who was to give this report had to leave.
  - This is regarding revisions to post-tenure review from GA.
  - There was a substantial give and take at Faculty Assembly about this issue.
  - Faculty Assembly, the Senate of Senates, and GA have reached a compromise. That compromise is reflected in a directive that has come from GA to the campuses. We must make these changes this fall.
  - We will have a motion from Senate to authorize the Steering Committee to change the language and report back to Senate.
  - Question: When will this take effect?
- The things that we have to modify:
  - Annual review may be considered, but additional assessment required.
  - PTR to consider only areas of work responsibility.
  - Committee selected by faculty-agreed upon process in department; faculty members do not select members of their review committee; department chair must consult with PTR committee; outcome must be reviewed at least one administrative level higher.
  - PTR may provide additional recognition; negative review must include a statement of primary responsibilities and specific deficiencies; faculty response shared with next higher administrative level.
    - Andy Jackson: This is what we have now pretty much. We just call it a plan for improvement or remediation plan. So it says basically, be specific.
    - Mentoring of peers encouraged, at least a semi-annual review with chair on progress (after a negative action); modified duties should be considered in corrective plan.
    - We must alter our policies to comply with these directives.
    - Question: Who selects the members of the post-tenure review committee if not the faculty member? The chair?
  - Your department will have to develop their own process that will exclude that one scenario.
  - Discussion?
  - [Motion 09-01-03] The Faculty Senate authorizes the Steering Committee, in consultation with the
Provost's office, to draft the language of this policy to conform to the directives from GA and bring it back to Faculty Senate

- **[Motion 09-01-03]** seconded.
  - Discussion:
    - Could we just make a note that we should clarify the parts that caused confusion?
    - Ray Burt is continuing at Faculty Assembly – we should be well represented there.
    - Should there be a part about the departments needing to revise their handbooks in accordance with these new guidelines?
      - Yes – that’s right.
      - It’s my understanding that departments have to submit their handbooks to the deans.

- **[Motion 09-01-03]** carried.

- President McKinney: If any departments have problems with this, please come to me.
- Nominations for Delegates to the Faculty Assembly. ([More information from Bylaws](#))
  - We are short one position.
  - Parliamentarian: The role of the Senate is to nominate two people and the whole of the faculty will vote.
  - Nomination: Kim Cook.
  - Motion from the floor **[Motion 09-01-04]**: That the nominations be closed.
    - **[Motion 09-01-04]** seconded.
    - **[Motion 09-01-04]** carried.

- Call for Faculty Senate Committees to meet, confirm membership, and elect chairs.
  - Please be patient with the transition of power.
  - I will be meeting with Liza to firm this up.
  - We need chairs – we will be sending an email to confirm all this information to you after the meeting. We need to get this done.
- Basic Studies Report.
  - Kim Sawrey, Chair of Basic Studies.
    - In light of what we heard today, I can be very brief.
    - **PPT presentation.**
      - The Basic Studies Task Force was charged in January 2004.
      - The Basic Studies Committee was charged in January 2007.
      - We reviewed and revised the seven goals of the General Education program.
        - We amended the wording in a few instances.
      - We started an information-seeking process to learn as much as we could about the process from a variety of sources.
        - There is a committee website, if you want to follow our steps. ([Basic Studies Committee website](#))
      - We organized a series of faculty open forums. We met with department chairs. We worked on the UNC Tomorrow report, at the request of the Provost. We created a model which was presented last spring at Senate. We served as a focal point for discussions on the state of student writing. We met with students.
      - We generated common student learning outcomes over the summer for the new components in our model.
        - We have those in pretty good shape – our plan had been to present those in the next few weeks along with the full-blown ideas at the October meeting.
        - Now that is on the back burner.
        - Now we are going to work on assessing the current Basic Studies curriculum – oh, how I wish the initial Task Force had been charged with that assessment portion. We were only charged last week with this part.

**Committee reports**

- No committee reports.
Old business

- No old business.

New business

- No new business.

Announcements

- Eleanor Covane, Gerontology.
  - I promise to be brief – I don’t want to be flip about this. I want to thank you for this very important work – I am too impatient to serve on the Faculty Senate.
  - I am here to tell you about a pilot project. It’s called SOS – Senior Outreach Service Program.
  - It's administered in the division of Public Service – it falls under the umbrella of the Osher Life Long Learning Program.
  - But I am here to tell you how the faculty can be involved.
  - The mission of the Senior Outreach Service Program is to link senior experience and resources in partnership with UNCW students and faculty members to enhance learning and scholarship and to assist the community through outreach service projects.
  - SOS volunteers can become a growing resource – they can help with UNC Tomorrow goals, especially with regard to campus/community engagement. Some examples of how they can help:
    - Grantwriters.
    - Project leaders.
    - Coordinators.
    - Assessment monitors.
    - Intergenerational mentors for students.
    - Research assistants.
    - Guest speakers.
  - This is a very educated group of people – these folks have expertise. They include persons who were employed as corporate executives, college administrators, accountants, teachers, and health care practitioners. With me today is Dr. Clauston Jenkins, whose credentials include a PhD in English from Chapel Hill, and who served as legal counsel at NC State for ten years and who served as College President at St. Mary's in Raleigh.
  - SOS volunteers have reached a stage in life where generativity, giving back to others, is most important to them.
  - SOS volunteers can help you do the things you don’t have time to do.
  - Assuming that RPT guidelines will change – this is the kind of program to help you with that.
  - Questions?
    - Some of our departments would be very interested in this but would be looking for volunteers with very specialized skills – do we come to you?
    - You can contact me via email: covane AT uncw.edu. Or by telephone: x23435. You can also contact Shari Ricks in the Division of Public Service.
      - Is this on the website?
    - There is a link off the Public Service site. (SOS website)
      - What are the types of skills that your companions will be offering? Tutoring and research skills?
        - Those and then some. One of the guys has written twelve books on statistics.
  - Ken Spackman, Academic Affairs.
    - You will find an email from UNCW research, regarding a mission review for UNC Tomorrow. It's one question, I promise, one text box reaction. The deadline is this Friday. There will be two open forums announced this week.
      - Comment from the floor: I already did it – it took less than two minutes.
    - Thank you!
Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 3:48pm.
Tuesday, 5 May 2009
2:00 p.m., Warwick Center Ballroom 4
Meeting 2009-09

***Please note that the May 5, 2009 meeting will be held in Warwick Center Ballroom 4, starting at 2 p.m.***

Meeting called to order at 2:04pm.

Roll sign-in

- Attendance sheets circulated.
- Absent:
  - Departmental senators: Abrams (Geography and Geology), Barth (Public and International Affairs), Black (Physics & Physical Oceanography), Blundo (Social Work), Brown (Health & Applied Human Sciences), Buttino (Film Studies), Chapman (Provost), Clark (Dean, Business), Cox (Creative Writing), DePaolo (Chancellor), Evers (Accountancy & Business Law), Glew (Management), Hall (Social Work), Huber (Elementary, Middle, and Literacy Education), Hungerford (Psychology), Hurst (Psychology), Jackson (Psychology), Lerch (Anthropology), McCartney (Biology & Marine Biology), Nice (Theatre), Olson (Art & Art History), Roberts (School of Nursing), Roer (Dean, Graduate School), Sawrey (Psychology), Shynett (Music), Stiles (Management), Taggart (Environmental Studies), Townend (History), Wray (Information Systems and Operations Management).
  - Committee chairs: Caropreso (Evaluation), Chandler (Bookstore), Ellerby (University Advancement), Gill (University Curriculum), Hurdle (Public Service & Continuing Studies), Olsen (Faculty Welfare), Wilcox (Buildings and Grounds).

**Special Addendum:** Subsequent to the May meeting, Gabriel Lugo, Elections Officer, reported the results of the election on May 14, 2009 to Steering Committee:

**Autonomous Committee Membership Results 2009**

To determine the new memberships of the three autonomous faculty committees for the 2009-2010 academic year, an election was recently conducted. Here are the election results.

**Hearings Panel (HP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division I</th>
<th>Division II</th>
<th>Division III</th>
<th>Division IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noland, Dan</td>
<td>Pabst, Ann</td>
<td>McNamee, Steve</td>
<td>Thomas, Carol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgerton, Clyde</td>
<td>Lugo, Gabriel</td>
<td>Albert, Midori (2ndterm)</td>
<td>Ravija (2nd term)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furia, Philip</td>
<td>Ward, Dick (2ndterm)</td>
<td>Sawrey, Kim</td>
<td>Evers, Pamela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mollenauer, Lynn</td>
<td>Ballard, Tim (2ndterm)</td>
<td>Horan, Jennifer</td>
<td>Smith, Robert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sheridan, Earl (2nd term)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Professional Relations Committee (FPRC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division I</th>
<th>Division II</th>
<th>Division III</th>
<th>Division IV†</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fonvielle, Chris</td>
<td>Gurganus, Kenneth</td>
<td>Keith, Julian</td>
<td>Moallem, Mahnaz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† The ballot for FPRC is required to include no more than one member from each of the three professional schools. Because of the rule, only two viable candidates were on the ballot.

Committee on Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (CRTP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division I</th>
<th>Division II</th>
<th>Division III</th>
<th>Division IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kirschke, Amy</td>
<td>Hosier, Paul</td>
<td>No election</td>
<td>No election</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Assembly

Burt, Raymond

Reilly, Colleen

Approval of the April 2009 minutes

- April 2009 minutes were approved.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo

- Chancellor DePaolo not feeling well today and is unable to attend.
- Floor ceded to Max Allen, Chief of Staff.
  - Good afternoon. The Chancellor is disappointed not to be here today – she wanted to share a few words about end of semester with you all.
  - She wanted me to say that she is deeply humbled for the Senate’s support this year during challenging times. The economic problems are real. But we planned well and she feels confident that we will weather the storm.
  - She is aware that she has not been the bearer of good news recently. But she appreciates all the emails she has gotten – she has received some good feedback.
  - The House Education Budget Committee was to meet this week – Erskine Bowles was supposed to testify tomorrow. That meeting has been cancelled. We are hearing grim news – pretty stark and large percentage cuts. Remember that this is just a step in the process, though. We are hearing about 12-20%
cuts – but this is not cause for alarm at this point. Whatever the House comes up with, it will still go to committee and then the governor for approval. We will be monitoring this situation throughout the summer. We will try to keep all the faculty, including Bruce McKinney, involved in any discussions.

- Questions?
  - Any update on the parameters of the furlough? Faculty Assembly has suggested that it should not apply to 9-month faculty.
    - We don’t – right now it applies to every state employee. We just don’t know – there are a lot of questions with all of that. Wish we could have more clear guidelines. William, anything to add?
    - William Fleming: There are thousands of questions. We are supposed to get final word from GA by today. Long story short, if you get a paycheck in May and June, it will be reduced by .25%. It will be reduced by the order of the governor. There are some ancillary questions, regarding students, temporary employees, etc. If you are getting a paycheck, the furlough will apply.
  - Will this apply to temporary employees?
    - Fleming: Right now, we think yes.
  - If faculty are teaching Summer I, will that be subject to core reduction?
    - Fleming: We have that in a question to Chapel Hill.
  - Will more furloughs be coming in July? The first of many to come, maybe?
    - Allen: There are a number of rumors going around about this but we have no knowledge of this at this point.
    - It’s a .25% of your base, right?
      - Allen: Yes. It will be .25% of your annual salary.

2. President of the Senate McKinney

- Let's start with a discussion about the furloughs [See number 3 under "New Business"].
- [After the discussion about the furloughs finished.] No report. But the main reason for this meeting is the discussion and vote on the honor code. So I will turn it over to Rob.

Committee reports

Old business

1. UNCW Honor Code: Dr. Rob Burrus

- **[Motion 09-08-31]** To approve the UNCW Honor Code. ([More information in Word](#))
- Floor ceded to Rob Burrus.
  - I promise I won’t talk about budget or furloughs.
  - PPT presentation.
  - In the last Senate meeting, I gave a 10-minute PPT presentation on the new recommendations for the new Honor Code. Today, I've got some slides in review.
  - Any feedback?
    - I don’t remember hearing a timetable?
      - Our goal is to implement this for the fall 2009 semester. The Dean of Students Office believes this is feasible.
      - Mike Walker: Absolutely.
    - Have you thought about the downsides of this? Some parts of the code are intrusive. How does this impact student rights? I’m not sure we have thought this through yet. If there are things that faculty are not allowed to talk or report about students?
      - Walker: Student rights are fully accorded in this document as in the first document. This was important to use as we were crafting this document. I feel in many ways the current document does that. The students accused of this behavior will be explained the code and their rights. We will work with faculty and students so that they understand this.
Burrus: The current document, most honor codes at other universities do have similar types of language, to the effect that as a member of a community it is your duty to report instances of academic dishonesty.

- We are setting up a system to catch cheats and not encourage students to be honest.
  - Walker: I think what you are responding to in the code are in the initial conversations that we have with the students. The document itself is the process and procedure for addressing instances of dishonesty. It has more teeth to it than the previous document. Previously, there was no tracking centrally.
  - Honor Code committee member: I’d like to clarify this concern – people may not be aware that there were 3-4 students on this committee. They indicated that they wanted a community of integrity but that we needed parameters to achieve this.
  - Walker: Thanks for those points. We also wanted to acknowledge that the university is in a different place than it was with that previous document.

- I have a question about evidence and what the outcomes would be in a hearings situation? We may have no physical evidence other than an observation.
  - Burrus: Faculty members have to use their judgment to determine whether to move forward with the allegation.
  - If a faculty member has no evidence other than his/her own observations, is that sufficient?
    - Yes.
  - If the faculty knew that, this would have a much stronger effect. And we should make sure students know that.
    - Walker: It would be up to the student, if s/he still insists that s/he did not cheat after the hearing.
  - That’s a different answer – you are telling me that the faculty member’s word won’t carry the day. So you are saying we both have our say in the hearing and the panel will decide who’s right?
    - Walker: Right, if the student contests the allegation.
    - President McKinney: We have the Student Body President here – can you comment?
    - Student Body President: I think we think it is time – it hadn’t been updated in 23 years. We thought it was fair.

- Does this incentivize students turning each other in? If you start to create these pathways, isn’t there the possibility that people will do it falsely? And is there some way to deal with this?
  - President McKinney: In my experience, students only move forward with this if they feel they have good evidence.
  - What percentage of the students who protest the charge, appeal?
    - Walker: Presently, there are few instances of reporting anyway. A student who is not happy about the outcome of any situation in the state of NC, there is an appeals process they can participate in.
  - On the second offense, will that hearing be automatic and the student be required to attend, as well as the faculty member?
    - Walker: Yes.
    - Do we want to encourage that – to engage in another hearing?
      - Walker: For that student to lose their place here, there has to be a process to address that.
      - Frankly, I don’t report all my instance to you because I am afraid of getting caught up in all these meaningless mechanisms.
      - Walker: I understand.
    - This applies to graduate students as well, I assume?
      - Yes – Roer said any Fs they receive as a result of cheating is an automatic dismissal.
  - This could get tricky with transfer students – they might come in with a spotty record from their old institution.
    - Walker: The current application process does not ask about academic integrity offenses. So a transfer student does have a clean slate in that regard. If they were suspended from a NC institution for cheating, we would see that.
  - I would encourage the Dean of Students Office to address that if a student pleads guilty to a second offense, then a hearing can be avoided.
Another situation I can envision, student A might have claimed to see student B cheating and student B didn’t but all would be dragged into a hearing automatically.

A follow-up to Mark’s point, maybe you saw in the Chronicle about using restorative justice processes to address student matters like this. I wonder if we can do that instead of this punitive measure?
- This does have an aspect of that because we will be explaining at every step of the way to the student why their actions were wrong and how they can correct that behavior.

Has Council seen the document?
- Yes.

I have a couple things on my mind. Every time I hear the Honors Council I get confused and think of the Honors Program.
- Good point.

Who are the Honors Council members?
- For undergraduate offenses: 4 students, a faculty member from the Campus Conduct Board, and a faculty member appointed by the Dean of Students.
- For graduate offenses: 4 graduate students, a faculty member from the Campus Conduct Board, and a faculty member appointed by Roer.

Point of clarification: Regarding, does this provide an incentive for students to falsely accuse other students? This code includes lying – so would they not be guilty of an Honor Code violation if they did this?
- Yes.

So a false allegation would be a violation of the Honor Code?
- Yes.

These are wonderfully positive words – the Honor Code the students sign. Couldn’t we make it more scary?
- Our goal was to try to be positive because an Honor Code to me is something you live by. The code is something positive, I think.

Motion from the floor: [Motion 09-09-36] I’d like to make a motion that we change “mastery of existing knowledge” with “pursuit of knowledge.”
- [Motion 09-09-36] seconded.

[Motion 09-09-36] approved.

If a student signs the pledge and sees someone cheating and does not report it, is s/he in violation?
- President Mc Kinney: I would think so.
- As an enrolled student, they have the same obligations today as they would with this new document.
- Student Body President: It would be a rare thing for a UNCW student to turn in another student. We may want to revise this and deal with it on a case-by-case basis.

What is the rationale for the modified version and not a traditional code?
- McCabe has said there have been lots of success with a modified code – we see this as a step in the process of moving toward a more traditional code. The students have to be on board with this. We thought we would see reduced cheating behavior as a result of this.

Motion from the floor: [Motion 09-09-37] I move that we call to question.
- [Motion 09-09-37] seconded.

[Motion 09-09-37] approved.

Motion from the floor: [Motion 09-08-31] approved.

2. Graduation Locations (More information: [http://www.uncw.edu/stuaff/transitions/commencement-graddates.htm](http://www.uncw.edu/stuaff/transitions/commencement-graddates.htm))

- President Mc Kinney: I’d like to remind everyone about the graduations this weekend. There are 4 graduations. You may have gotten an email about the bomb threat on the 9th. They have investigated that – they are going to secure the premises and carry on.

New business
1. Other Health Plan Options

- President McKinney: Someone came forward about this but then never contacted me directly about it.
- Fleming: The re-enrollment started yesterday and runs through the end of May 29th. There will be an open forum about the changes tomorrow morning in Lumina.
- President McKinney: If anyone knows of better deals, please let me know so I can share this with the faculty.

2. Paperless syllabi

Steering Committee submits the following two motions, regarding paperless syllabi:

[Motion 09-09-33] Resolved, That the Faculty Senate amend the following sentence from Course Policies & Syllabus in the Faculty Handbook:

"Except for distance classes, for which course policies must be posted online, a hard-copy handout must be distributed, whether or not the information is posted on a course website."

to read as follows:

"For online classes, course policies must be posted online. For other classes, either a hard-copy opening handout must be distributed or the information must be posted on a course website or emailed to the class."

- President McKinney: This was drafted by the Parliamentarian for me.
  - Discussion?:
    - I just wanted to get clarification – what does "hard-copy opening handout" mean?
      - We can amend that to "hard-copy handout."
    - There should be some concrete statement so that it won’t be so fluid.
      - Maybe a friendly amendment?
  - Parliamentarian: If there are any changes made to the syllabus mid-semester, it states that the students have to be notified and it has to be applied equally to all students involved.
    - I want to emphasize that the faculty have the right to change the syllabus in the middle of the semester, if they so choose to.
      - Parliamentarian: The current Handbook allows for this – this motion would not change that.

[Motion 09-09-33] approved.

[Motion 09-09-34] Resolved, That the Academic Standards Committee and University Curriculum Committee review the Course Policies & Syllabus section in the Faculty Handbook and forward recommendations that may result to the Faculty Senate.

- Discussion?
  - Question: Is this a request that the committees in question attend to this? Would this be a one-time thing or ongoing?
    - President McKinney: This will be a charge given to the committees in the fall in August.
  - Question: As long as we are talking about paperless objects: Can we endorse that various communication from the administration be electronic as well?
    - Point of order: We already voted on that motion.

- Any other discussion?
- [Motion 09-09-34] approved.

3. Furlough for non-leave earning employees
• [This section of the meeting preceded the "Old business" section of the agenda.]

• Floor ceded to Jess Boersma, Foreign Languages and Literatures.
  - I think it is important for the Faculty Senate to ask that the issues related to furloughing 9-month faculty be addressed. I would like to ask GA to identify an appropriate way for 9-month faculty to be compensated in a comparable way as leave-earning personnel. I would like GA to take a position on this.
  - At this time, I would like to open this up for discussion:
    • As long as our statement recognizes that a bunch of the faculty are slackers.
    • Boersma: This has to do with Digital Measures, too – how much do we actually work? How is that communicated to the community and Raleigh, in general? There is a public perception that we only come in for two days to teach and that's it. I think a lot of us are working until 2 or 3 in the morning from home. Is there interest? Does the Faculty Senate want to put something forward about this?
      • Has anyone heard what teachers in the school systems do? I heard that they have to take it from time in the classroom and that they will then have to hire subs to cover the time.
      • Public school teachers are taking the time on teacher workdays.
      • Question of order: Is it appropriate to discuss something that wasn’t on the agenda?
        • Parliamentarian: Bruce is the leader of the meeting and can use his judgment.
        • President McKinney: I think it is important enough to discuss.
      • I think we should address this – we are all doing more than 40 hours a week. I was up late last night grading. In CAS, we calculate credit-hour equivalencies for non-teaching work. We in CAS, we take it seriously what faculty are doing beyond their teaching. I'd like to hear other people talk about how the furlough affects others. I think it is unfortunate that it applies to people who earn $50,000 or less. It is a regressive tax and is disturbing. These are some of the considerations that we should discuss.
      • The furlough process applies to everyone across the board, regardless of how they’re paid. There wouldn’t be an opportunity for 9-month faculty – can you furlough people who have already worked? Moving forward, I think it is political suicide to say university faculty should be exempt from this. When everyone else in the state has to do this, it would be political suicide.
    • Boersma: My point is not whether we should be exempt. My understanding of this was that GA was in favor of different levels of implementation. But do we want to say, we want this to be addressed? The message we are telling the rest of the community is that we can do more for less. I agree we have to be careful. This may have already been done but it has not been communicated to me, at least.
      • Mark Spaulding: I would urge that we communicate to Erskine some level of our concern. I don’t think today we are going to articulate a position on all these challenging issues. I propose [Motion 09-09-35] that we move to charge the President to request to Bowles appropriate compensation to EPA and 9-month faculty. Steering Committee could work with Bruce to draft this – poke Bowles to talk about this.
      • 10 hours is not a big deal but if more furloughs are likely, then it could be. What we need to communicate is our need for a formula to address this so it is balanced across all our duties.
  - [Motion 09-09-35] seconded.
  - Discussion?
  - [Motion 09-09-35] approved.

Announcements

• No announcements.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 3:17pm.
Tuesday, 21 April 2009
2:00 p.m., Lumina Theater, Fisher Center
Meeting 2009-08

***Please note that the April 21, 2009 meeting will be held in Lumina Theater, Fisher Center, starting at 2 p.m.***

Meeting called to order at 2:06pm.

Roll sign-in

- Attendance sheets circulated after the Chancellor's report.
- Absent:
  - Departmental senators: Avery (Chemistry and Biochemistry), Barth (Public and International Affairs), Blundo (Social Work), Brown (Health & Applied Human Sciences), Chapman (Provost), Evers (Accountancy & Business Law), Huber (Elementary, Middle, and Literacy Education), Hungerford (Psychology), Kinard (Marketing), McCartney (Biology & Marine Biology), Pierce (Interim Dean, Nursing), Sawrey (Psychology), Scharf (Biology & Marine Biology).
  - Committee chairs: Caropreso (Evaluation), Chandler (Bookstore), Ellerby (University Advancement), Gill (University Curriculum), Hurdle (Public Service & Continuing Studies), Johnson (Research), Olsen (Faculty Welfare), Wilcox (Buildings and Grounds).

Approval of the March 2009 minutes

- March 2009 minutes were approved.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo

   - Good afternoon. I know you have a long agenda so I will keep my remarks short.
   - The most pressing thing is the budget and you have heard from me numerous times about this. We are at a point where we are getting further information – still trying to get clarification. Our most immediate concern is the April 9th directive from the Governor. We are still trying to figure that out – what constitutes an exception and what we should avoid in any case, with a view to the budget cuts.
   - The House at the moment is devising their budget – it is not going to be as beneficial to the universities as the Senate one was. We are still waiting to hear about the final cut numbers – they should come to us in the next couple of weeks. I caution you not to panic when you hear the numbers – I am sure they will be in the 10-15% cut range. This process is far from over – it has to go to conference still.
   - Regarding the Governor's directive – things are up for discussion, like commencement – do we have to ask for an exception to have commencement? That’s just one example – there are many. Many of the rejoinders automatically are to say, it is ridiculous to have to ask for exceptions for certain things and how do we get around them? We are in an extreme lockdown – one, there is no way around this, two, if we do, such exceptions will jeopardize the amount of the cut we will then incur. I ask you all to be prudent and cautious and to work with us on restrictions that we will continue to put out there as we have clarification on these. We talked at forums and the spring faculty meeting about using trust funds – I am not sure we can do that or if it would be wise to do. I really appreciate your response to this unremitting bad news. We know we are not alone in any of this, which helps us to be sane. If you read yesterday, Meredith College cut salaries and retirement benefits. Duke is talking about 1000 layoffs. They are obviously hurting at least as mush as we are. I ask you to maintain the level of sanity that you have maintained throughout this.
   - Questions?

2. President of the Senate McKinney

   - Faculty Assembly Report
We had a teleconference – there was no money to pay the delegates to attend Assembly.

PPT presentation.

In light of the budget situation, a lot of the committees they were talking about forming they might not have the money to support now.

There is a committee that Stephen Demski asked us to form on how regional engagement can be channeled into scholarship.

We are facing a 3.2 billion dollar shortfall now – the figures on my PPT slide were from March 27th.

It is nice to see we are looking at a way to make service important to RPT considerations – a reward for service. We have a lot of people who are really engaged in the community and I do think it is important to recognize people who are engaged in the community.

Questions?

We will now go slightly out of order and turn to William Fleming's report.

March 10 Retreat White Paper (More information in Word)

Continuing after William Fleming's report, our particular thought driving the meeting was that UNCW could be optimized.

More importantly, these are just a few ideas – the goal is to create a committee that would work over the summer with a view to presenting them in the fall – a standing committee to look at these issues.

Questions?

- What’s going on with this now?
- Can you bring it up on the screen?
  - We offered the white paper to the Administration. I have a feeling there might be some useful ideas there given the current budget situation.
- Can you summarize the recommendations for us?
  - Some suggestions we came up with:
    - Reducing total overall credits for graduation to 121 – Chapel Hill and Appalachian State already do this.
    - Doing away with remedial math courses.
    - Consistent application of AP credits
    - Researching what the optimal class sizes would be.
    - Investigating academic fees in addition to student fees – several schools already do this.
    - Reducing the number of computer labs on campus – we were curious what impact this would have on instructors, though, as far as loss of hands-on classroom space.
    - Doing away with UNI 101, although I have since learned that this is an important component to the first-year experience.
- Regarding the standing committee – there is nothing discussed here as to whom they would report to. Some of this, for instance, would impact Academic Standards.
  - I think the idea here that the committee would generate ideas and then refer them to the appropriate committee.
- Would these then go to Faculty Senate before sending on to the Administration?
  - Yes, of course. They would be brought before the Faculty Senate committee first, then the full Senate. Membership on this committee is the final concern – the idea being that we aren’t going to leave this and skip on to the next thing. We would like to find the specific Faculty Senate committees that could investigate these issues further.
- Athletics is not identified in this document.
  - An oversight – we didn’t cut them out.

Committee reports

1. Research Committee and Scholarship Awards Criteria submitted for approval by Senate: Dr. Dan Masters (More information in PDF)

[Motion 09-08-25] To approve the proposed Scholarship Awards Criteria.

- I was asked by a member of the Administration to look into this – we have a lot of criteria for
teaching awards but not for research awards. I charged the Research Committee with this.

- Floor ceded to Dan Masters (on behalf of Committee Chair Dan Johnson).
  - The Research Committee will take over responsibility of reviewing research award portfolios, as decided at a previous Senate meeting. What we have done now is set up a procedure for application and criteria. The bulleted list covers the main criteria.
  - We requested that the value of the award be boosted from $5000 to $15,000 over three years – this would match the teaching awards. We are hoping that can happen.
  - Questions?
    - You are not excluding research that is not applied?
      - You do not have to satisfy each of these criteria to be considered.
    - I think the figure is a little off – $1500 and not $5000. I think this is great but I think this is geared a little more towards the hard sciences and not the humanities.
      - It is not intended to orient this away from the humanities – the committee is made up of a lot of humanities scholars.
    - I have a concern about point two – it seems to be about research administration and not research itself. Research achievements should be more important than research administration.
      - First, these are not in ranked order. Second, we are thinking this is an award that comes at the end of someone’s career and that person would be involved with research administration.
  - President McKinney: Is the hard sciences vs. humanities issue still a concern to everyone?
    - Masters: It’s interesting that the chair of the committee was driving this and he is in the Music Department.
      - Regarding the fifth point, guidance of students, isn’t this really a teaching activity?
      - Yes, it could be seen this way. But work on honors theses can feed into your own research.
    - We could have someone who is primarily a research administrator and guiding honors theses winning this. We are really going to have different awards each time.
      - We modeled this on the teaching awards. Will the winners do all of this? Probably not. But people who satisfy more of these criteria will move forward.
    - I find this extremely exclusive, coming from Creative Writing. A submission to journals would hardly rank for us – we are looking for book publications.
      - With a very diverse committee, we went through this to make sure this was as broad as possible.
    - Looking at the statement above, you wouldn’t consider someone in a creative field – you would be looking more at someone who had research administration experience.
      - This is not to denigrate your efforts, but I don’t think a “focused” agenda is better than a diverse agenda.
  - President McKinney: Okay, what I am hearing is possibly to have one award for creative endeavors and one for science?
    - Masters: We looked at that but thought it would be better to write criteria for one award.
    - I wonder what kind of documents you will be looking at to support these applications?
      - These are the supporting documents.
    - Right, but you say “Evidence of national/international peer recognition” – what would that involve?
      - The CV would be the first place we would look for that. The written statement. Maybe get a list of people from outside the university who could write letters to speak to recognition.
    - I don’t think we need to reward administration in a research award.
      - You are missing the point. We are talking about people who serve on boards of organizations. Service or administration of research in a field. We tried to create a language that was comprehensive to all that activity (editing a journal, etc.).
I too appreciate the need for criteria. As a I look at this it is skewed to the sciences. I can imagine a Pulitzer Prize-winning author only meeting four of these out of nine.

- President McKinney: I would hope the committee would consider a person if they only hit three points but those points were bullseyes.
- I think adding “creative agenda” at the end of the first bullet is a token effort.
- Call to vote: a close vote necessitated a head count: 29 votes in favor, 26 against.
  - Parliamentarian: A simple majority is needed.
- **[Motion 09-08-25]** approved.

2. Committee on Multi-Year Lecturers: Dr. Craig Galbraith

**[Motion 09-08-26]** To approve the following resolution proposed by the Committee on Multi-Year Lecturers:

All faculty members acknowledge the gravity of the current budget crisis, and that this crisis will, most likely, negatively impact the university community. While companies around us are folding and employees being dismissed, often with focus on the bottom line of a budget as opposed to the debilitating human toll, it becomes even more imperative that the university community provide a positive role model.

Across campus, full-time lecturers hold positions in which they make an on-going and dedicated contribution to the university. These positions have been created judiciously as a result of sustained classroom need, a need which does not appear to be lessening since enrollments numbers have shown no signs of significant reduction. By creating these positions and providing full benefits, the university has declared its intent to act in a professionally ethical manner.

While part-time faculty are hired to handle temporary flux in enrollment, the gaps left by faculty on reassignment, disability leave, etc, we do not want this designation to be used as a means of avoiding employee benefits which are associated with full-time employment. Since many of these dedicated lecturers are the primary or sole source of family income, and since these lecturers provide both academic consistency and a high level of productivity (often holding key departmental administrative positions), the Faculty Senate hereby resolves that these lecturers' positions be guarded as much as possible during the proposed budget cuts.

- Six months ago we formed a committee to look at the role of lecturers and the benefits they receive.
- Floor ceded to Craig Galbraith (on behalf of Committee Chair Kelli Fellows).
  - Here at UNCW, full-time lecturers have all the rights of tenure-track faculty. At UNCW, they are only allowed 1-3-year contracts – many campuses offer longer contracts. There are a number of issues that we will be looking at; we will be coming back in the fall with more recommendations.
  - We are trying to address here a budgetary strategy to reduce full-time positions to part time.
  - This is a non-binding resolution.
  - Questions?
    - One figure that the Chancellor mentioned was 10-15% cuts – is the intent of this motion that should furloughs be allowed, that full-time lecturers would do this also?
      - We didn’t look at the issue of furloughs – presumably if that is allowed, there would be a seniority process in place so they would not be as affected.
    - Have there been discussions about what it means for a department who loses the full-time position? They may have skill sets that will be hard to find in part-time people.
      - That really motivates the motion.
    - It seems to me that if we pass something like this, it is a toothless lion. If everything is on the table, how would this impact other faculty?
      - This is a non-binding resolution – this expresses concern for a fellow faculty member. Just as I would recommend that a tenure-track position not be reduced, full-time lecturers have the same rights in the Faculty Handbook.
[Motion 09-08-26] approved.

- Chancellor: I really commend you for taking the moral high ground. I ask for clarification on “guarded as much as possible” – does that mean in relation to other cuts?
  - Galbraith: Speaking for the committee, somewhere these cuts are going to be spread across departments. Our chief goal is to protect the integrity of the classroom.
- Chancellor: But that is not what it says, Craig – this suggests an either/or.
  - Galbraith: I guess I don’t see the either/or in it – I think it says that these individuals are important to the academic process.
- Can I ask, Chancellor, what you mean by the either/or – what is the or? Tenure-track lines?
  - Chancellor: Tenure-track lines – yes.
  - I don’t read it this way.

- President McKinney: The spirit of this is we feel these people are important and we want to protect them as much as possible.
  - Galbraith: As a Faculty Senate, when we hear that universities are taking full-time positions and making part-time positions out of them, we want to prevent that as much as possible.
- Chancellor: I don’t think we disagree. I am just looking at this from a rhetorical standpoint.
  - Tim Black: I will just say as a representative person – we have no full-time or part-time people in our department. I didn’t read this as an ultimatum to Administration. We would like to feel that we believe as a moral standpoint that these are people who have committed themselves to a greater degree to the university – not that staff don’t either. They bring a value to the academic enterprise. One full-time lecturer is much greater than the sum of four part-time lecturers.
- Chancellor: I take the resolution seriously enough to want to understand it and honor it as much as possible.

Point of order: This motion has already passed. No further discussion allowed.

[Motion 09-08-27] To amend the membership guidelines for the Faculty Professional Relations Committee (Autonomous Faculty Senate Committee) to include representation for the rank of senior lecturer/senior assistant librarian/associate librarian. (More information in Word)

- President McKinney: This is strictly a case of representation.
  - Parliamentarian: Parliamentary point – if you click on the link you will get more information. This is just a small point – I want the Senate to understand what they are doing. This is a bylaws change because it strikes out "professorial." Section 8a – to be consistent, you need to amend Section 8, which requires BOG approval. At some institutions, they define professorial to exclude lecturers.
- Motion from the floor [Motion 09-08-32]: I move that we postpone [Motion 09-08-27].
  - [Motion 09-08-32] seconded.
  - Mark Spaulding: I think it has got to go back until we see what the consequences are.
- [Motion 09-08-32] approved.

3. The University Curriculum Committee submits the following motion:

[Motion 09-08-28] That the Senate approve the following recommendations:

- Approve deletion of NSGL 345 and the addition of one credit hour to NSG 345
- Approve International Studies Authorization to Establish (see Rationale | INT 105 | INT 490 | Computer Competency | Oral Competency | Authorization to Establish | Major and Curriculum | CAS and CSB Chairs' Approval)
• [Motion 09-08-28] approved.

4. The Academic Standards Committee submits the following motions:

[Motion 09-08-29] That the Senate approve the following motion, regarding Pre-majors:

As stated on page 85 of the Undergraduate Catalogue 2008-2009

Schools, departments and programs with admission requirements have a pre-major, and that academic unit provides discipline-specific advice. Students accepted into pre-major status should have a high probability of completing the admission requirements in the major within two semesters of acceptance.

Such students would have completed at least 24 semester hours at UNCW and should be within one semester of declaring a major. However, there are hundreds of students who are in pre-majors and are not making progress towards declaring a major. There are many juniors who get stuck in the pre-major without a defined path towards a major. In order to alleviate this problem, the following motion was put forth and approved by the Committee:

Academic Standards moves that the following new paragraph be added to the section Declaration of Major on page 85 of the Undergraduate Catalogue 2008-2009:

Students are not allowed to earn more than 35 semester hours while in the pre-major category. If a student exceeds 35 hours, he/she must meet with the Dean of the college or school to discuss a course of action.

Russ Herman, Chair of Academic Standards: Basically, students should not be allowed to earn more than 35 semester hours while in pre-major status.

Questions?

• How is this going to be enforced? I fear that we will pass it and nothing will happen.
  • The Registrar's Office actually put this forward.
  • Carol Pilgrim: Unfortunately, the Registrars left – there could be a way to track it in the degree audit, I believe.

• Why 35?
  • Well, 35 is roughly a year. The idea is to get them out – we're talking about several hundred students.
  • Any particular reason why they must meet with the Dean?
    • That is what it typically says in the catalogue.

• [Motion 09-08-29] approved.

[Motion 09-08-30] That the Senate approve the following motion, regarding New Retention, Dismissal and Readmission Policy:

A reformatting of the section on Retention, Dismissal and Readmission is suggested and major changes to the policy are underlined. Also, the retention table has been greatly simplified. Academic Standards moves the following changes to the policy:

RETENTION, DISMISSAL AND READMISSION (pg. 91 of the Undergraduate Catalogue 2008-2009)

The University of North Carolina Wilmington both encourages and requires scholarship. In order to remain at the university, all students enrolling fall 2010 and later must meet the grade point requirements outlined below.
RETENTION CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Quality (GPA) Hours and Transfer Hours</th>
<th>Good Academic Standing</th>
<th>Academic Probation</th>
<th>Required Grade Point Average for Eligibility to Continue in the University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 45</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.75 – 1.99</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 – more</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transfer students are placed in the above retention chart based on total hours transferred from all institutions attended. Transfer students’ grade point averages are computed only on quality hours attempted through the University of North Carolina Wilmington.

ACADEMIC PROBATION

An undergraduate is automatically placed on academic probation when the cumulative GPA drops below 2.0.

1. **Students who fall within the academic probation category at the end of any semester will be limited to enrolling in no more than 14 hours in the following semester.**

2. **A student on academic probation is expected to show satisfactory academic progress by the end of the next semester, regardless of the number of hours attempted. Satisfactory academic progress is generally defined as improvement in the GPA earned at the end of each semester during the probationary period. A student is expected be in good academic standing within 30 credit hours after being placed on academic probation.**

3. **When a student is placed on academic probation, it is the responsibility of the student to arrange regular meetings with his or her academic advisor to consider specific academic intervention strategies.**

ACADEMIC DISMISSAL

Students who do not meet the minimum grade point requirement for retention at the conclusion of the spring semester will be academically ineligible. The student will be allowed to make up deficiencies during this university’s summer sessions immediately following the spring semester in which the ineligibility was declared.

- If a student is not in good academic standing at the conclusion of the summer sessions, the student will be dismissed from the university and will not be permitted to enroll for two consecutive regular semesters (fall and spring).
- **Full-time (at least 12 hours) students who earn a 0.0 GPA in any semester will be dismissed from the university and will not be permitted to enroll for two consecutive regular semesters.**
- Readmission in both cases above is contingent upon the results of the Re-enrollment Review.
- If a student is allowed to re-enroll, he/she must see an academic advisor before registering for classes. See also ADMISSIONS-FORMER STUDENTS (Re-enrolling).
- Academically dismissed students may enroll in any summer session.

Students who have been academically dismissed for the first time may seek administrative review of mitigating circumstances for authorization to **enroll in the following semester under an academic contract.**
Students seeking a review must submit the required appeal form and a written statement outlining their circumstance to the appropriate dean. The appeal must be submitted to the appropriate dean within 10 days after the end of the last semester (spring or summer) in which a student is registered. Students must understand that the submission of an appeal does not guarantee the student will be allowed to enroll. The appeal process may take several days to be completed.

After a second declaration of academic dismissal, will result in dismissal from the university. Eligibility for continued residence or for readmission can be restored only by completion of sufficient work only during the summer sessions at the University of North Carolina Wilmington.

- President McKinney: Discussion?
  - There was one part of this that I was concerned about. There was a point about appeals for seeking the review – they must be submitted to the appropriate dean ten days after the end of the semester. I could see a situation where a student would need more days – is there a valid reason why it is ten days?
    - Herman: Like all of these things, we need to specify a timeframe. There are other appeals processes that students can take advantage of. This affects things like graduation and GPA needs in order to enter the next semester.
    - But this says if a student is dismissed, they must submit an appeal in ten days citing their mitigating circumstances. That strikes me as awfully short. A student who suffers some real crisis – that might not be a lot of time for them. I am not trying to be troublesome but if there is a really good reason for this, I'd like to know.
    - Pilgrim: The vast majority of these appeals happen at the end of Summer II. So they should be in summer school anyway at the end of Summer II; we encourage the students to attend to this as soon as possible. We tend to get students lining up on the first day of school to appeal.
  - Suppose a student is dismissed, then they are permitted to take summer classes?
    - Pilgrim: If they return to the retention level, then they would be fine to continue in the fall and would not need to appeal.
  - Suppose a student doesn’t appeal and they bring their GPA up, will they be okay?
    - Pilgrim: They should be okay.
  - That doesn’t seem to say this.
    - Pilgrim: We have a mechanism to deal with a retroactive withdrawal.
  - Well, the way this is written, they’re out.
    - I think having ten days is a good lesson for students – if I am in the real world, you have a responsibility to tell the dean or your professors. I think having them take on the responsibility of their education – I think this is a strong overall message for their socialization to the world.
    - I agree – they need to take care of this sort of thing.
- President McKinney: We could argue about this all day but I think we should vote.
  - Pilgrim: Just to clarify, we always have ways to work with students to deal with deaths in the family or other such crises.

[Motion 09-08-30] approved.

Special Order of the Day

1. Budget Page demonstration: Terri Joynes
   - Beverly Vagnerini, ITSD: Quick note of clarification. The budget page is under Business Affairs (see link: http://www.uncw.edu/ba/finance/Budget/index.html). This is about something else.
   - Terri Joynes, Technology Research and Development.
     - We are working on creating a reporting environment more accessible to the community. You can access this now.
     - Go to UNCW home page>Faculty & Staff>SRSS Web.
     - What you are seeing now is more than you will see. You are going to all have a folder called “UNCW
reports.” You can print, export. It’s very easy to navigate. There are other reports out here – award lists by grants, for example.

Questions?
- You typed in 200920 for the spring – what is the code for the fall?
  - 10 is fall, 20 is spring, 60 summer.

Matt Gayford, Technology Research and Development.
- Transient study applications are now available via SeaPort for students to submit applications to take classes at other institutions. This is live in SeaPort – so far, it has handled over 250 requests.
- Questions?
  - I heard a rumor that SeaPort is being phased out – is that true?
    - ITSD representative: We got a grant to build a better SeaPort – the application and function would remain the same.
  - The rumor was that everything would be shifted to Blackboard – is that not true?
    - ITSD representative: That is separate. It only applies to faculty who use a certain function for syllabi.
  - Am I supposed to go in and look at a student’s transcript to determine whether a student is eligible to take this course? What’s my role in this as department chair?
    - ITSD representative: Your role has not changed. It just reduces the foot traffic. The Registrar is still doing due diligence on this. All we have done is put a workflow process to this.
  - You could be a little clearer in the form that the faculty person is just approving that the student can take the course somewhere else.
    - ITSD representative: If it would be helpful to put a disclaimer about that, we would be happy to do that.

2. State Health Plan Changes: Mr. William Fleming

- William Fleming, Assistant to the Chancellor for Human Resources.
  - Just to share with you what we know at this point. We had hoped that all this would be ready to go so that we could start an Open Enrollment Period while faculty were still on campus. It got held up.
  - 90/10 plan will likely go away.
  - Routine eye exams are going to go away, as part of the State Health Plan – there will still be the vision option through NC Flex, however.
  - We expect an increase in co-pays and deductibles, as well as in drug co-pays
  - Plan will probably move from fiscal year to calendar year, which should help as it will be concurrent with the NC Flex program
  - What will likely survive is the creation of the Blue Ribbon Committee, which will be made up of six House representatives, six Senate representatives, and Governor appointments.
  - There are still some questions with regard to individual coverage – there has been discussion about beginning to charge for individual coverage so that dependent coverage would not have to go up so much.
  - Questions? I am not going to go over rates today, incidentally, as they will most likely change anyway.

Old business

- No old business.

New business

1. UNCW Honor Code: Dr. Rob Burrus

[Motion 09-08-31] To approve the UNCW Honor Code. (More information in Word)

- Rob Burrus, Co-Chair of Honor Code Committee:
  - PPT presentation.
  - In a Planning Council meeting, during an exercise on how we could improve the experience at UNCW, I suggested a revision to the honor code. Mike Walker, Dean of Students, co-chairs this committee with
me.
- There were a lot of people who wanted to see this move forward. We have to have buy-in from students and faculty.
- President McKinney: This is an important issue that probably warrants a good discussion. We can vote on this at the next meeting. So let’s postpone this as there are a lot of concerns about this, I am sure. We will postpone it along with the issue of representation raised by the Ad Hoc Committee on Multi-Year Lecturers.

Announcements

- No announcements.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:10pm.
Tuesday, 17 March 2009
2:00 p.m., Lumina Theater, Fisher Center
Meeting 2009-07

***Please note that the March 17, 2009 meeting will be held in Lumina Theater, Fisher Center, starting at 2 p.m.***

Meeting called to order at 2:00pm.

Roll sign-in

- Attendance sheets circulated. Senators were instructed to initial next to their name or the person for whom they are subbing.
- Absent:
  - Departmental senators: Black (Physics & Physical Oceanography), Blundo (Social Work), Bradley (Computer Science), DePaolo (Chancellor), Dumas (Economics & Finance), Hall (Social Work), Huber (Elementary, Middle, and Literacy Education), Kinard (Marketing), Lammers (Mathematics & Statistics), Moore (Dean, University College), Porter (Marketing), Reinicke (Information Systems & Operations Management), Townend (History), Wray (Information Systems and Operations Management).
  - Committee chairs: Caropreso (Evaluation), Chandler (Bookstore), Gill (University Curriculum), Hurdle (Public Service & Continuing Studies), Olsen (Faculty Welfare), Wilcox (Buildings and Grounds).

Approval of the February 2009 minutes

- February 2009 minutes were approved.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo (no report expected as Chancellor cannot attend the meeting)
2. President of the Senate McKinney

- March 10 Retreat
  - 30 faculty members and administrators met at Caffe Phoenix.
  - Regarding how people were invited, members of the Steering Committee were included, as well as people I have known during my time on this campus – I apologize if you wanted to come but weren't invited. I wanted to keep the retreat small and effective.
  - As a result of this retreat, an Ad Hoc sub-group was formed. Members include:
    - Raymond Burt,
    - Kim Cook,
    - David Weber,
    - David Webster,
    - Dan Masters,
    - Bruce McKinney,
    - Carrie Clements.
  - This sub-group's meeting was productive – we will be bringing a report and motions to Senate in April, as will the Committee on Multi-Year Lecturers and the Research Committee awards.

- Seahawk Respect Compact
  - I received a few emails about what to do and what we are doing about the compact.
  - Floor ceded to Tom Barth:
    - Past chair of the Diversity Council.
    - A committee is currently looking at the compact and how to incorporate it in the classrooms and on campus.
    - We invite your comments and ideas. You’ll be hearing more about it soon.
    - It would be nice, eventually, if we all acknowledge it to our students when we see it on the walls of the classrooms during the first class meetings each semester.
Questions?
- It seems like every semester or every year we come up with a new relationship or initiative. Do we have a problem here? Are we that debauched?
- President McKinney: I think the compact helps with civility in the classroom. Another committee is also working on an honor code which I think we should seriously consider based on recent reports of the prevalence of cheating and plagiarism.
  - William Fleming: The respect compact grew out of the Campus Climate Survey. Then a subcommittee was formed to look into designing something that was an affirmation of trying to respond to some of the issues that came out of the climate survey.
  - Barth: Our climate survey indicated that there were some issues there to address.

Committee reports

1. Handbook Revision—Phased Retirement ([More information in Word](#))
- Floor ceded to William Fleming and Joann McDowell, who summarized the changes in this policy.
  - Joann McDowell:
    - Most of the changes are wordsmithing and formatting. The one change that’s in here regards the workplan – giving the opportunity for the department and/or the faculty member to revisit the workplan. For those not familiar with this, the faculty member on phased retirement is on a three-year contract and designs a workplan with their department chair.
    - One reason for reopening the workplan, if the faculty member wants to teach something else (or the department needs the faculty member to teach something else), change a schedule – basically, if departmental needs change they can revisit the workplan.
    - That was the only substantive change to the policy.
- Questions?
  - How many faculty are on phased retirement?
    - McDowell: This year 1, the year before 3. The most we have ever had at one time is 6 or 7.
- President McKinney: Let me say one thing about revisions to the Faculty Handbook – there are a lot of antiquated things in there. One of my goals this summer is to take a look at the handbook to bring it up to date. If you are around this summer and want to help, please send me an email.

2. Committee on Multi-Year Lecturers
- They have delayed their report to the April meeting.

Old business

1. Learning Goals ([More information in Word](#))
- Floor ceded to Ken Spackman:
  - Nine learning goals were adopted by Faculty Senate in March 2006. And these have been worked on closely by the Basic Studies Committee and the Assessment Committee.
- Questions?
  - If we endorse this here, what will the impact be on any particular faculty member?
    - As Kim Sawrey’s committee points out in one of the sections, one of the common weaknesses of general education programs is a lack of coherence. And this establishes what we want our students to get out of our general education. It articulates what we expect it to do. Another important feature is that without it, assessment is impossible. The procedures for assessment, you will discover, are going to be designed so as to relieve the faculty as much as possible from day-to-day involvement.
  - What is the practical purpose of the document?
    - President McKinney: SACS.
    - Spackman: We shouldn’t do it because of some external body. It’s the right first step to take when designing general education revisions.
  - But we’re kind of late now – it’s already designed.
Spackman: This had its origins three years ago. The wording is a little different but it is the basis of what the Basic Studies committee has used to design their proposal.

I guess I don’t understand what the practical purpose is – does it have one?

Spackman: It certainly does – it states what our expectations are for general education. It’s extraordinarily important.

Would it be used, for instance, by a curriculum committee?

Spackman: Yes, in addition to the learning goals that the Basic Studies Committee proposed. This connects the mission of the University explicitly with the learning goals of Basic Studies. This is designed to be a self-contained stand-alone document to explain why we as a faculty think these are important. Without it we would be in the position of having frequent instances of discussion of Basic Studies on opinions instead of agreements.

Andy Jackson: Could we expand a little on the role of these learning goals for the majors?

Spackman: These categories are so broad that they should cover what we already expect our majors to do. We discovered that more departments are accomplishing critical thinking than we initially thought, for instance.

Mark Spaulding: What would be the process of amending this? We pass this and then need to change it. What would be the process for doing it?

Spackman: There will already need to be a change in the future – it reflects the current Basic Studies objectives. When we change Basic Studies, we will need to change it. It doesn’t necessarily have to come before Senate to change it.

How does it reflect what we do if the Faculty Senate doesn’t need to approve the changes?

Are expected to vote on this today?

Is it going in the handbook, the catalogue?

Spackman: We have never had a document like this before.

Have other campuses done this and put it in their catalogue, for instance?

Spackman: Other campuses have done this – I don’t know that it is in their catalogues. I think it would be a document approved by the faculty through the Senate upon which we have based our general education program.

If ultimately it is something that goes into the Undergraduate Catalogue, then there are steps that need to be followed to get it in there. If it will be outside the catalogue, then we will have to consider what that will mean.

What authority does this document have?

Spackman: It gives guidance and serves as the support. These are the broad categories – these aren’t the 37.

Dan Noland: This started up with an earlier Basic Studies Committee, who discovered that there was no published rationale for Basic Studies. The other part of this is that it feeds into assessment, which might, for instance, justify merit raises. There is that component of assessment. It is hard to predict how this will manifest itself.

Spackman: With respect to assessment, it will have absolutely nothing to do with merit raises or annual evaluation of faculty. We have some evidence that our students are not doing as well in analytical writing, for instance – from 5 years of NSSE. It doesn’t tell us in detail what students are not doing well at and how to fix it, though. This is the foundation of assessment that will get at those questions. The only goal is to discover strengths and weaknesses that students have broadly across classes in Basic Studies – irrespective of faculty and who is teaching these classes. It’s just doing this for our students.

President McKinney: Let me try to summarize what I am hearing. You are really supporting this and don’t have any problems with it – just where it will go and what authority it will have.

From what Ken just said, it will have little impact on faculty workload. But it will have impact on curricular matters. So it would seem that it should live in the Undergraduate Catalogue. So therefore it should go through the proper channels and curriculum review process to get in there and then be brought before Senate.

President McKinney: Couldn’t we approve it here and then figure out where it will go?

I think there should be a mixture of the two. Endorse this as an abbreviated version but that this won’t necessarily be the final catalogue copy.

Can we as a Senate endorse this and then change it?
President McKinney: I think we can endorse this and the content of the document but then decide where it will live and what form it will take.

[Motion 09-07-21] Motion to approve the learning goals as stated in this document with the realization that further discussion is warranted as to where this document will live with respect to the University’s curriculum.

- [Motion 09-07-21] seconded.
- Discussion:
  - Who’s responsibility will it be to take this to the next level?
    - President McKinney: I will take that responsibility.
  - Shouldn’t it say "Characteristics of a UNCW Student" and not "UNCW Graduate"?
    - Spackman: It’s a minor point perhaps. They are still our students upon graduation and will presumably exhibit these characteristics as seniors, etc.
  - Ken, we have data that our students are not doing well in some of these areas on national tests?
    - Spackman: I am hampered by not being able to show you the entire assessment report. This will help us show more than what our national tests can ever tell us.

[Motion 09-07-21] approved.

2. Basic (University) Studies Revisions ([More information in PDF])

Floor ceded to Kim Sawrey:
- I would like to thank the Basic Studies Task Force, and Dr. Tim Ballard, the chair of that committee, for their work. They initiated the discussion of general education review and revision on campus and provided us with a framework for the future form of general education at UNCW. Many thanks to that committee.

- Many thanks also to the members of the current Basic Studies Committee. Each member of the committee has done an enormous amount of work over the past two years. Between weekly meetings that altered many summer vacation plans and countless hours of work done outside of those meetings, the energy invested was truly above and beyond.

- This group brought considerable experience and expertise to our deliberations. But perhaps the most important characteristic of each committee member was that they left departmental affiliations at the door. We all learned very quickly that to have any chance of success we would need to do our best job of viewing each proposed change from the standpoint of all majors, not just those represented on the committee. My thanks to all of you.

- [Members were acknowledged by Senate with applause and "Bravos!"]

- There has been much discussion in recent years about the future of this university. The form of any eventual revision of our general education program will go a long way toward shaping that future. As expectations for scholarly output have increased, some have wondered if UNCW will be able to maintain our tradition of excellent undergraduate teaching. Today, the ball is firmly in the faculty court and I hope that we take this opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to excellence in teaching.

- The administration has been patient with this process. And we can now reaffirm our commitment to excellence at this institution.

[Motion 09-07-16] From Fred Scharf, Biology and Marine Biology:

On page 16, we move that the Capstone requirement (C. Capstone Courses) be listed as 1-3 credits rather than 3 credits.

**Rationale** The addition of the required “Freshman Seminar” and “Senior Capstone” categories to the Basic Studies requirements may impact our current curriculum. Our B.S. degrees are currently at or near the maximum allowable credit hour limit, and there is pressure to increase capstone offerings directed towards assessment (which would not have the same intent as the Basic Studies Senior Capstone). Our current departmental senior capstone (BIO 495) serves to meet communications, assessment and applied learning requirements and cannot be easily converted to meet the intent of the Basic Studies Senior Capstone without losing these major-specific needs. We are not alone in this need to utilize our senior level courses for multiple, worthwhile and necessary purposes. As such, the department supports the overall proposed revision, provided that each department decides on an appropriate class structure (and credit hours)
to meet capstone and freshman seminar category requirements.

- Martin Posey: In the document, they mention that the capstone should be three credits. We just want to clarify 1-3 credits. We believe that it is in the spirit of the document but there were some concerns that it be mandated as 3 credits.
- Dan Noland: Martin, could you speak to the inclusion of the “freshman seminar” in the rationale?
  - That’s not part of the motion – these were just comments made from the department.
- [Motion 09-07-16] approved.
- [Motion 09-07-17] Heath White, Department of Philosophy and Religion, proposes the following changes to the Basic Studies document:

  p. 33, on completion requirements for the Aesthetic, Interpretive, and Literary Perspectives component. Amend the document to read:

  Students are required to take six hours from this component, including at least two courses with two different course prefixes.

  p. 35, on completion requirements for the Historical and Philosophical Approaches component. Amend the document to read:

  Students are required to take six hours from this component, including at least two courses with two different course prefixes.

  p. 39, on completion requirements for the Understanding Human Institutions and Behaviors component. Amend the document to read:

  Students are required to take six hours from this component, including at least two courses with two different course prefixes.

Rationale: these amendments are consistent with the declared intentions of the Basic Studies committee in the February 2009 Faculty Senate meeting and with the requirements stated on p. 12 in the “Core Curriculum” section of the document.

- Representative from Philosophy and Religion: These are just three minor adjustments to the body of the document that make it consistent with the front part of the document and what the Basic Studies Committee intended. I think the amendments speak for themselves.
  - Sawrey: This provides clarification where it really needed clarification.
- [Motion 09-07-17] approved.
- Any other motions?
  - PED 101 is a still a Basic Studies component?
    - Sawrey: Yes – there are two amendments that the Basic Studies Committee is ready to endorse. Where the language requirement reads “201 level” – Foreign Languages and Literatures would like to replace that with a less stringent requirement that I think is a good idea. It will also reduce the hours from 9 to 6.
      - Page 11 of the Basic Studies proposal should now read: “iv. Foreign Language – Students will demonstrate proficiency by completing a course at the 201 level or higher in a language previously studied, or at the 102 level in a language not previously studied (3-6 hours).”
      - I think this is a really good change – so folks won’t be penalized for wanting to take a new language. Would anyone from Foreign Languages and Literatures like to say anything?
- [Motion 09-07-22] That the language on page 11 section iv be changed as indicated.
- [Motion 09-07-22] seconded.
- Discussion:
  - Does this change fit in with the current learning goals of the University – does it achieve the goals for proficiency?
    - Jess Boersma: There’s an increased meta-linguistic awareness. In addition to
that we thought it very important to not penalize someone for taking a less common language. We want to encourage students to have a number of options.

- Those are good goals. I just want to make sure we aren’t approving something that will violate something elsewhere.
- Ken Gurganus: I suggest that the Senate approve this and then enable the Basic Studies Committee to change things on page 29 – essentially, to reflect these changes accordingly throughout the document.

- **[Motion 09-07-22]** approved.
  - Sawrey: On page 25, we propose an amendment to the Lifespan Wellness Component.
  - **[Motion 09-07-23]** To amend the Basic Studies proposal, regarding the Lifespan Wellness Component. Page 25 of the Basic Studies proposal should now read: “W4. Practice the basic components and principles of safe and effective physical activity and other health-related behaviors.”
    - **[Motion 09-07-23]** seconded.
    - Discussion:
      - Cara Sidman: We need the physical activity component in here to combat problems like obesity, etc., on campus.
  - **[Motion 09-07-23]** approved.

- **[Motion 09-07-24]** To approve the Basic Studies proposal as it now stands [provided by Kim Cook].
  - **[Motion 09-07-24]** seconded [provided by Dan Masters].
- **[Motion 09-07-24]** approved to general acclaim.
- [Standing ovation given to the Basic Studies Committee.]

3. Russ Herman from Academic Standards Committee makes the following motions:

- **[Motion 09-07-18]** On page 116 of the Undergraduate Catalogue 2008-2009 under Waiver of Requirement, add the following sentence to the end of the subsection Students with Existing Degrees:

  Students who are transferring to UNCW for a second baccalaureate after having earned a baccalaureate at any UNC institution with a general education requirement will be given a Basic Studies waiver.

  - Floor ceded to Russ Herman: This first motion is on Basic Studies waivers and the idea is that we trust that other schools in the UNC System have Basic Studies programs and that we aren’t going to make these students take a lot of Basic Studies classes after they have already gotten a degree. We looked at these programs in state and don’t have any issues with their Basic Studies programs.
  - Questions?
    - Steve Pullum: What about the language requirement? Are we comfortable giving a UNCW degree to a student who hasn’t fulfilled this at another institution?
  - Herman: We looked at other UNC programs.
    - Pat Lerch: Is this common practice within the UNC System? Could a UNCW student go for another degree at another UNC school and not have to take Basic Studies there?
  - Herman: from my understanding, yes.
  - **[Motion 09-07-18]** approved.

- **[Motion 09-07-19]** Under Faculty Responsibilities – Teaching – Grading in the Faculty Handbook [http://www.uncw.edu/fac_handbook/responsibilities/teaching/grading.htm] make the following insertions/deletions:

  **Grade of Incomplete (I)**

  At the discretion of the instructor, a student may be given a grade of Incomplete when the work in the course has not been completed for reasons beyond the control of the student. In addition to [N.B. Slight editorial change made to text on the recommendation of Russ Herman, following the meeting] reporting the grade on Seaweb for Faculty SeaNet, the instructor must also complete a "Form for
Assigning an Incomplete," available in departmental offices. It is the responsibility of the faculty member 1) to send copies of the form, once approved by the departmental chairperson, to the student and the Registrar when the grades are due, and 2) to specify to the student the exact terms and conditions necessary to satisfy the incomplete including the date by which all work needs to be completed. All incomplete grades must be removed according to a deadline established by the instructor, not to exceed one calendar year from the end of the semester in which the incomplete was given, no later than the end of the next regular semester; otherwise the "I" becomes "F". A student must not register for a class when attempting to remove a grade of Incomplete for that class. When a student with an Incomplete grade has successfully completed all required work, the instructor submits a completed "Report of Conversion of Grade or Incomplete" form, available in the departmental office. (More information about [Motion 09-07-19] in Word)

- Herman: At the last Senate meeting we talked about this. An internal audit revealed we were not in compliance in certain areas. What we approved last month we have to update in the handbook. So when an incomplete is assigned, faculty are supposed to submit a form which has not always occurred in a timely manner. This has to be taken care of before the grades are due. These bullets state when it is appropriate to post an incomplete grade and when to post an F. Generally speaking, this should take care of compliance issues.
- Any discussion?
- [Motion 09-07-19] approved.

4. Steering Committee makes the following motion:

- [Motion 09-07-20] “In the spirit of intellectual and educational freedom, the Faculty Senate admonishes the UNCW administration for not consulting with the Women’s Resource Center, Faculty Senate Steering Committee, and other interested parties before asking photographer Frank Cordelle to remove pictures of minors from his exhibit at UNCW.”
  - This is coming from Steering Committee and the Women's Resource Center.
  - Is someone from the WRC here to speak on this?
  - Floor ceded to Janet Ellerby, Interim Director of the WRC.
    - Ellerby: We worked out a timeline as to the events leading up to whether the exhibit would be censored -- I know that this is a contested word for some. (Timeline in Word)
      - Noland: Who raised the issue in the first place? Did you get a communication from someone who said they didn’t want the images of the minors in the exhibit?
        - Ellerby: On February 16th, Jose Hernandez came to my office with a letter from John Foubert. I asked Hernandez to communicate to the administration that they were positive and strong depictions of women.
      - Was that meeting in the spirit on consultation?
        - Ellerby: I was just simply being told that the communication had come from Foubert in Oklahoma. I was being informed.
      - But you had no sense that the photos would be pulled from the exhibit at that time?
        - Ellerby: I was not involved in the discussions – the decision came midweek that week [of February 16th].
      - David Cordle: I wonder if to date any explanation has come as to why this decision was made?
        - Ellerby: The only consultation that took place was between the Chancellor, the Provost, and the Vice Chancellors.
    - President McKinney: I was contacted by Steve McFarland, who talked of disturbing photos of minors coming to campus. I was told by him that if I were contacted by the media, not to say anything and to refer them to MAC.
      - Were you contacted by the media? That is a horrible thing to say to faculty – we should all be free to speak our mind.
      - President McKinney: I was not contacted by the media.
    - I am really sorry to have to point this out that graphic nudity of people of all ages is
commonplace and has been so throughout history. What am I supposed to tell my students, who have been asked to write poems for the forthcoming WRC event "Women's Bodies/Women's Lives" about women’s nudity, when they ask whether their poems will be censored or not?

- Andy Jackson: Bruce, will you report on the meeting Steering had with the Chancellor over spring break?
- President McKinney: The Chancellor said that Cordelle agreed to the administration's stance and removed the photos then capitalized on the situation by going to the media about the censorship.
- Ellerby: We did receive an ultimatum that if he didn’t pull the photos, the exhibit would be cancelled. He had made all his travel plans, one of his subjects was coming to be photographed. He said he would come if we hosted the Feminist Colloquium. He knew that a lot was being asked of him. I think the administration thinks it wasn’t asking a lot. I know it was because of the enthusiasm of the WRC and the fact that his travel plans were already set that he came.
  - I want to raise the question about academic sovereignty. We are taking one letter from someone at another institution and using it to determine what we do on our campus?
  - I’d like to hear what the administration has to say about this so we all have all sides.
- Provost: You are only the second person to ask the administration about our perspective and I do appreciate that. Our problems with this happened before we got the letter from Foubert. I had been in contact with a provost in Texas and some of my old colleagues – they are just starting to feel the pinch of the recession and wanted to know how we were faring. One of them mentioned that they had had the "The Century Project" on campus to much controversy with complaints about, I quote, the photos of "nekkid women." And he was convinced that they took a budget cut at his campus because one of the officials was offended by it. I looked at the book in the bookstore and online -- I went deep into it and, contrary to what has been said, there has been controversy about this exhibit at other campuses. We are the first campus where Cordelle actually came after being asked to remove the photos. In the past, he would not exhibit, when asked to come without some photos. The issue for us was not about pornography but about informed consent. I want you to know that we asked him to remove the photos and he agreed. When you ask someone to do something and he agrees to do it, it’s not censorship. I don’t think we can use the word censorship. Eileen advised us that this was probably something that we should not have on campus. We have to think beyond academic sovereignty to how this will affect the community – we have a broader audience to consider than just the University.
- Kathleen Berkeley: I am grateful that the Provost has responded to Dean Cordle’s request for an explanation. I want to redirect us back to the motion; a number of people would have liked to have been considered in this process. There is a lack of consultation in the bodies that have investment in sustaining these issues on campus. If this had been such a concern for you so early on, other members for the sake of shared governance and responsibility, should have been consulted. I do want to redirect us at least to that piece.
- Pam Evers: I agree with Berkeley. I spent the last year on sabbatical researching intellectual freedom. You believe it belongs to the institution. We happen to believe that it belongs to the faculty. Consent to censorship is still censorship. I consulted with my colleagues at the Texas Bar: censorship is censorship, plain and simple. We were just talking about our learning goals – critical thinking is one of those goals. To avoid controversy because it might impact our budget or might be shocking – that is not what the University is for.
- President McKinney: I’d like to keep it to the motion.
- Spaulding: That is exactly right. We are not going to solve all the issues here. We cannot run a university if the intellectual and artistic content is decided upon by one or two people in Alderman Hall.
- Michael Seidman: I support the motion. But I think it is insufficient and does not communicate the seriousness of what happened here.
- Scott Nice: I would like to formally applaud the Seahawk newspaper for their brave coverage of this situation.
Lou Buttino: If there wasn’t a process in place, then how can the administration be admonished? I was disturbed by the idea of nude photos of minors being shown on campus.

President McKinney: I have some relatives who are victims of abuse and before I knew what the exhibit was about, I thought "Get those out." But I think the motion addresses how it was done, not what was done.

Berkeley: The first time Janet was notified was on February 16th. There was a WRC Advisory Board meeting on February 18th, at which time posters promoting the exhibit were given to the board. There was a golden opportunity for the Advisory Board to be told about this – but nothing was mentioned to us. That speaks to the problem addressed in the motion.

Who exactly was consulted?

- Provost: It was a meeting that took place in the Chancellor's office. Max Allen, the Chancellor, Eileen Goldgeier were there. I was present, also Pat Leonard and Cindy Lawson. So four women and two men.

- Vibeke Olson: There are several things that I think I would like to address. There was no consultation with the WRC, nor with the experts on campus in terms of art, what constitutes a work of art. We have photographers that deal with issues of the nude body. We also have a modernist on our faculty. This brings up a discussion about guidelines and process. Will there be instances of where there will be things we can discuss and not discuss in the classroom?

- Jackson: There are a couple of things that I recall from the meeting with the Chancellor. The division of Student Affairs did consult with their experts on the impact of images on persons who had been abused sexually. The Chancellor pointed out that there were differences about this idea of censorship from her perspective versus Cordelle’s. She did not perceive herself to be a censor and she wanted to make that clear to us at the meeting.

- Gabriel Lugo: What I find remarkable about this motion is the lack of incentive for the administration to consult with the faculty. And what we get from administration is a defensiveness that confirms the validity of the motion.

- Anita McDaniel: If we approve this motion, what is the next step? Will there be guidelines or a process that will be developed that everyone will be aware of?

  - President McKinney: If there are issues like this again, the administration might realize the value of consulting with faculty.

[Motion 09-07-20] approved.

New business

- No new business.

Announcements

- No announcements.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 3:49pm.
Tuesday, 17 February 2009
2:00 p.m., Lumina Theater, Fisher Center
Meeting 2009-06

***Please note that the February 17, 2009 meeting will be held in Lumina Theater, Fisher Center, starting at 2 p.m.***

Meeting called to order at 2:02pm.

Roll sign-in

- Attendance sheets circulated.
- Absent:
  - Departmental senators: Abrams (Geography and Geology), Brubaker (Communication Studies), Buttino (Film Studies), Cody (Randall Library), Dennis (Foreign Languages & Literatures), Elikai (Accountancy & Business Law), Henry (Geography & Geology), Hritz (Health & Applied Human Sciences), Hurst (Psychology), Kinard (Marketing), Miller (Sociology and Criminology), Moore (Dean, University College), Olson (Art & Art History), Porter (Marketing), Rodriguez (Management), Roer (Dean, Graduate School), Simmons (Anthropology), Wray (Information Systems and Operations Management).
  - Committee chairs: Caropreso (Evaluation), Ellerby (University Advancement), Gill (University Curriculum), Hurdle (Public Service & Continuing Studies), Johnson (Research), Olsen (Faculty Welfare), Wilcox (Buildings and Grounds).

Approval of the January 2009 minutes

- January 2009 minutes were approved.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo

   - The only thing we need to discuss is money.
   - It's a complicated situation.
   - Regarding tuition and fees:
     - The Board of Governors approved all the tuition and fees requests from all the campuses.
     - All the initial requests were lowered by one third.
     - After extensive discussion, that did pass on Friday.
     - Tuition is different – when it was at 6.5%, a large chunk was for salaries (1.5% for faculty and 1% for non-faculty EPA and SPA).
     - President Bowles’ new guidelines and instructions are that 40% of the increase be for financial aid.
       - Originally, it would have been 35%.
       - 60% of the request must be spent on critical needs – all tied to the budget cuts. Bowles has a list – and they must all be approved by him.
     - I have the unwelcome task of telling this group that that salary piece is now off the table as it was presented. I know that it is very unwelcome news as we don’t know what the Legislature is doing if anything – but the Governor made it very clear that in a time when people are being laid off, she can’t approve raises.
     - When I met with the Vice Chancellors yesterday, I made it clear that my expectations are that that money that would have been used for raises go to academic and academic support needs to mitigate the increase in class sizes, etc. Any questions?
     - The tuition piece cannot really be seen separately from the budget cut piece – we are having two open forums next week.
     - Again, we need to separate this year’s reversion which at this point is at 6% (and could still go up). And then there are the cuts for the biennium. Bowles is requesting that these be non-recurring cuts as opposed to permanent cuts – since the economic situation is not permanent, then why should budget cuts be?
Especially, since it takes so long to recover from these.

- I am hoping that Bowles will be successful in his attempts that the cuts be minimal and non-recurring.
- I know this is all awful – but if you really want to see awful, check the websites of colleges in AZ, CA, and TN – we are fortunate to live in a fiscally conservative state.
- Questions?
  - The tuition increase included hiring new faculty to address an increased number of students. If they are not hired, can we use the funds in other ways?
    - In theory, yes.
  - The email that came out this weekend about stimulus packages and how it will affect the states: Do we think this will impact our planning for the fall?
    - I was really surprised that the Governor said she was hoping for more because we got a lot. But we really don’t know what that money will be used for.
    - Mark Lanier: The economic stimulus provides more for tax credits for families in NC, etc.
    - Chancellor: I think the question was asking whether we would be benefiting from this money directly.
    - Yes – and when we would get the money and if it would result in us having to re-plan?
    - Lanier: Right now it all depends on the Legislature.
  - Ideal situation, we get enough to counter the cuts. Or the BOG could decide that those schools that get more than other schools will experience deeper cuts than those that don’t get the stimulus money. There are so many variables at this point – all I can communicate is what we know at this stage.

2. President of the Senate McKinney

- Budget webpage
  - Some of you may have seen the budget webpage – the wiki page is very slow to load.
  - However, if you want to email Liza Palmer (palmerl AT uncw.edu), Secretary, she will load it for you (either signed or unsigned).
  - I was approached last November by someone who said, "I have some donors who will fund a discussion about Faculty Senate issues."
  - This person has asked not to be identified – it's an outside donor. S/he is funding a day-long summit on March 10th about budget issues. There are 30 spots – I have 20 people signed up so far and I am waiting to hear from 6 or 7 more. Whatever we come up with, will be given to the Administration.
  - I figured if someone wants to give us a lot of money so we can discuss something very important over spring break, I don’t have a problem with that.
- Committee on Departments and Schools (More information in Word)
  - Charged by the Provost.
  - If you look all over the country, not many places have concrete rules about this.
  - An ad hoc committee was established, formed from volunteers – we couldn’t have everyone on it who wanted to be.
  - The report was sent to the Provost.
  - Questions?
    - Could you give us a summary of the report?
      - We suggested certain criteria – the existence of a graduate program, a licensing procedure, or whether being identified as a school would enhance the image of the department, and the amount of scholarship that the department produces.
      - Lot of people we contacted about their criteria just said, "We have schools but couldn’t tell you why."
    - Did this get us anywhere?
      - I hope so – it did give us some specific criteria.
      - Can you clarify what will happen after this?
        - Not really – that would be for the Provost to decide.
      - For instance, certain things require BOG approval. Looking at centers and institutes, there are criteria governing the formation of those already.
Special Order of the Day: Discussion of Basic Studies Revisions

- We aren’t going to come to any concrete decision today – that will be for March.
- I can’t say enough about the committee’s work on this process – they spent a heck of a lot of time working on this.
- I know we can’t please everyone all of the time. But lets keep this discussion as constructive as possible.
  - I want to try to limit this to 45 minutes. Please stand and say what department you are from. And try to limit your comments to 5 minutes.
- I want to open the floor now to comments, criticism, changes, whatever:
  - How are we to interpret when these competencies say 0-6 hours?
    - Kim Sawrey, Chair of Basic Studies committee: Usually, those are places where the credits can be double-counted.
    - So students still have to take those?
      - Sawrey: Yes, but they might be able to use existing classes they are taking to fulfill these without having to take additional hours.
  - Ann Pabst (Biology): The addition of required “Freshman Seminar” and “Senior Capstone” categories to Basic Studies requirements may have an effect on our department in terms of teaching effort. For the seminar requirement, several possible course structures were suggested, but it is unknown from which departments these would be offered. Our current BIO495 (1CH) senior seminar presently serves as a capstone course, however, the proposed revision indicates capstone courses will be 3CH, an increase that could also affect our department. The description of capstone courses in the revision is general and a bit vague so it’s difficult to assess what specific courses would fulfill this new requirement. Our department supports the overall proposed revision, provided that each department decides on an appropriate class structure to meet capstone and freshman seminar category requirements.
    - President McKinney: Any other departments in this situation?
      - Yes.
    - Where do you see this in the document?
      - On page 16.
      - Sawrey: This was something where the committee felt that a three-credit capstone would be nice. But this may be an appropriate place for an amendment to help those departments that have tight requirements already.
      - Physics and Chemistry would be in this same situation.
      - Pabst: Could we change this to a range of credit hours from 1 to 3 – then the departments could decide on the structure of this. One other issue was the freshman seminar; that also seemed to be something we were concerned about
      - Tim Black (Physics): This is probably true for many of the science departments – we always have a problem with any additional required courses. This revision includes more courses – so this would be a problem for our students because our classes are hierarchical in nature and have to be taken in a certain order.
    - William White (Philosophy and Religion): Thanks to the Basic Studies committee for all their work. I believe I have discovered two minor and one major inconsistencies. On page 12 – there are two different course prefixes. On page 33 and page 35, it leaves out the two different prefixes. What I am hoping is that this means six hours from two different prefixes. On page 12, Understanding the Human Institutions and Behaviors says 6 and on page 33 it says 3.
      - Sawrey: That is a typo – it should be 6.
  - Andy Jackson (Psychology): One of the things that I think we should think about is our cost factors in terms of the short run. The problems of shifting and developing new courses under strained circumstances, it might be worthy to have these phased in.
    - President McKinney: When I was reading the report, it seemed like certain sections were phased in. I will defer to the Administration on this – are there any changes that would be cost-prohibitive?
    - David Cordle (Dean, CAS): Looking at the active learning component, the resource implications for that might be tough depending upon the flexibility of this definition – fresh seminar also, simply because of its nature of its smaller class size. Also for foreign languages – requiring proficiency
beyond the 201 level will require more seats.

- Mark Cox (Creative Writing): I don’t want the fiscal considerations to outweigh the academic considerations of this. But I do think it is important to hear from the Administration on this before voting so there aren’t any unfunded mandates on this.
- President McKinney: Yes, I would be happy to meet with Brian and anyone else in the Administration to discuss these issues.
- Black: But we really can’t wait on this – we were told months ago that we were really behind on this.
- Dan Noland (English): Even if we moved with alarming speed and voted on this in March, the schedule for 2009-10 would already be set. So this won’t come into effect until the following AY. I am stunned that we are in pretty broad agreement about this unless we have abstainers about this.
  - I am hoping to hear more about the transdisciplinary cluster theme idea – how will this affect students if faculty disappear, etc.?
    - Sawrey: I think it is pretty standard that faculty submitting proposals for these types of courses are usually asked to indicate a certain commitment to insure student access.
    - My concern is whether this is department based or faculty based – will the department be bound by a faculty member who teaches in this cluster and then leaves?
    - Noland: Who is the cluster supervisor?
    - Sawrey: You may have noticed that we did not identify a supervisor of Writing Across the Curriculum or Basic Studies – there would most certainly have to be this. Our hope was to begin that journey for students to approach topics from multiple points of views.
    - I am not against the idea of this but just how this will be effectively managed.
    - Carol Pilgrim (CAS): Looking through the proposal, it seems to imply that these courses would be coming from the core and thus, there would be more stability and more support at the department level.
    - Also, if clusters are significantly large enough, there could be 10 courses included in it but a student would only have to take 3.
  - Regarding transfer students, how they would be integrated into Basic Studies?
    - President McKinney: Wouldn’t it just be dependent on what catalogue they come in on?
    - Sawrey: There aren’t gigantic transfer issues at this point.
    - Kemille Moore (University College): Clearly, transfers are a major part of our campus. We would have to have clear articulation agreements. Some schools grandfather students in. We can also decide which pieces of the Basic Studies will transfer and which won’t. We do need to look for ways to accept transfers – most of the classes will transfer, but we might have to make some exceptions. I think it is a part of the revision that requires more examination but there is no point in examining it closely at this stage.
  - Jess Boersma (Foreign Languages & Literatures): The across-the-board 201 requirements will be detrimental to the less commonly taught languages. Enrollments would be affected in these languages – students would be more likely to take “easier” languages.
    - Black: I think that requiring fluency in a single language is as much as we can hope for. As much as it would be valuable for students to take additional languages, at the Basic Studies level, it is not practical or possible.
    - Boersma: But what is at issue is punishing people for having curiosity about different languages.
    - Back: It is about goals for student education vs. enrollments in classes.
    - Sawrey: We would like to entice students into these less common languages, we would like to encourage that type of diversity. Perhaps a friendly amendment – to encourage enrollment in these less common languages?
  - How will the vote work in March?
    - President McKinney: Any senator or department who wants to make a motion to amend this will make it and we will go through these amendments one by one.
    - So it will be a 60-page motion?
    - President McKinney: Any motions would be a response to what was in the original proposal.
    - Black: Are we voting on it section by section?
    - President McKinney: I think that would tie things up too much. I don’t want to rush this through
but I do want us to be productive.

- Ken Gurganus: Speaking as a member of the committee, it would be helpful if someone wishes to make concrete amendments, as soon as possible it would be great to get them.
- Sawrey: Please send these comments to me sooner rather than later – I know some departments are meeting to discuss this. We would like to get this information as soon as possible for consideration to include in the revision of our document.
  - President McKinney: Send the motions to me and I will make sure they get into the agenda.
  - Pabst: Just a question about process: We should send the motion to Kim Sawrey for incorporation into the document and then to Bruce McKinney as a motion for the agenda?
    - Yes.

Committee reports

1. The Academic Standards Committee makes the following motion, concerning Incomplete Grades:

   **[Motion 09-06-12]** On page 87 of the Undergraduate Catalogue 2008-2009, under Grades and Reports, make the following insertions and deletions:

   All incomplete grades must be removed according to a deadline established by the instructor, but no later than the end of the next regular semester following not to exceed one calendar year from the end of the semester in which the Incomplete was given, otherwise the “I” becomes “F” and cannot be changed.

   - Russ Herman, Chair of Academic Standards: This proposal is based on an internal audit of incompletes. There will be a couple more motions like this coming.
   - Too many incompletes on the books. Usually incompletes that are left for too long get changed to Fs.
   - President McKinney: Any discussion?
     - What happens to students who have tragedies?
       - Herman: There are other avenues they can take.
       - Pilgrim: We would have a mechanism to deal with this. A student could work with the associate dean in the school. I see this as being a tremendous benefit – where we run into difficulties are incompletes that are strung out too long.
     - What is the definition of the end of the semester? Last day of classes? Exams?
       - Herman: There is a standard definition for the end of the semester.
     - Black: We have a real problem with this proposal. We hope there is a real reason for doing this. In Physics, a student can pass the lecture and fail the lab. If this proposal passes, we would either have to fail the student outright or run a separate lab for them because of how our course offerings are structured.
       - Mark Spaulding: That's a wrong use of the grading system – if they fail, they should get an F.
     - Black: Can I ask the rationale for this?
       - Herman: An internal audit suggests we have to do this. Many schools have a cutoff for a semester or less than a semester.
       - Steve Pullum: An incomplete should not be given in attempt to avoid giving an F. An incomplete should be given when a student is on track for most of the course but then suffers a setback like a death in the family and needs more time to complete his/her work. I might also point out that this timeline is consistent with our timeline for grade appeals.
       - Kate Bruce: This proposal also came with the discussion that the forms would be updated to include information about scenarios where incompletes would be appropriate.
     - Kathleen Berkeley: And also a place for the chairs to sign.
   - **[Motion 09-06-12]** approved.
2. The Research Committee makes the following motion:

[Motion 09-06-13] The faculty research committee be charged with reviewing nominees for the Faculty Scholarship Award. This procedural change would avoid schedule conflicts reported by members of previous award review committees, and would facilitate the review of nominees’ credentials. This task is consistent with the committee’s duties (quoted here from the Faculty Senate Bylaws):

"To promote and stimulate scholarly research by faculty and students. To recommend to the Chancellor policy, procedures, and procedural changes in matters relating to research. To sponsor programs fostering or otherwise encouraging research. To act as liaison between researchers and university administration on research-related matters."

Nominees for the Faculty Scholarship Award (due March 31, 2009) be forwarded to the Research Committee chair no later than April 1, 2009, and that nominees’ portfolios be submitted to the Chancellor’s office no later than April 15, 2009 so that the review process can be competed prior to the end of the spring semester.

- President McKinney: Carol Ellis suggested we look at this – we have all these criteria for the teaching awards, but nothing for the research awards. So I gave this to the Research committee. They took it one step forward and suggested that the Research committee be the clearinghouse for the award.
- Who appoints the ad hoc committee now?
  - The Chancellor, in conjunction with the Faculty Senate President.
- The Research committee is a Faculty Senate committee?
  - Yes
  - It’s appointed by the Steering Committee.
- And now we are proposing that the Research committee will assume the duties of the ad hoc committee?
  - Yes.
- Are there any differences between the make-up of the two committees?
  - I would think the Senate committee is more diverse.
  - Spaulding: I am not sure that there are distribution guidelines for this committee. But Steering is generally pretty sensitive to this and appoints people appropriately based on the committee preference forms.
- Does the Senate committee stipulate that a past winner be on it?
  - No – would that be a friendly amendment?
  - Gurganus: What you are proposing is a Bylaws change. It requires twelve faculty. It is a well-taken suggestion but it should be more well thought out.
- Noland: I am suggesting that we go with the motion as written – I am not sure that past winners would add much to the committee.
  - Spaulding: I would agree.
- But right now, distribution is not mandated in the Bylaws?
  - No – but we are sensitive to this when making the appointments to represent all the colleges.
- [Motion 09-06-13] approved.

3. Faculty Senate Steering Committee Faculty Handbook Revisions

- Faculty.Section IV.APT.DOC
- Faculty Section VI Nonreappointment Rev.doc
- Section VII.grievancecommittee.docx
- Faculty.Section IX.termination.doc
- Section VIII cessation of employment.doc
- Section X retirement.doc
Floor ceded to Eileen Goldgeier.

- Goldgeier: A committee was formed to look at Section VI for changes to be made for the BOG.
  - What has happened, the system-wide committee looked at clarifying procedures in these policies.
  - Our policies were outdated with regards to grounds for discrimination, for instance. We added sexual orientation, for instance, as a protected class.
  - We also added some procedures for retaining documents, etc.
  - Fortunately, we don’t have many hearings, but these revised policies will help streamline the process for those people who are involved in them.
  - As we reviewed these, I noticed our sections on retirement and disability were outdated.
  - It was my recommendation to the Steering Committee that we take resignation (everyone knows how to resign), and retirement from disability (there is no retirement from disability) out of Section VIII.
    - Question: Can you clarify what is changed?
      - They are in blue and red – the changes.
      - Question: Can we accept the whole motion?
    - There was one portion of these revisions to these policies that the BOG gave control of to the campuses. What happens in nonreappointment hearings of untenured faculty members. Each institution must decide on whether the faculty member can have an advisor or attorney at the hearing. And if so, can this advisor or attorney participate? The BOG discourages a participating attorney. I had made the suggestion that attorney can be present but not active.
    - President McKinney: The steering perspective is that we didn’t want this to be a legal proceeding.
      - Curt Stiles: We considered this to be a meeting of colleagues – not a place for lawyers.
      - Noland: Is the chair of the committee allowed to determine whether the lawyer can participate because that is how it is written now?
    - President McKinney: We wanted to leave it vague purposely.
      - Black: Admirable to leave it vague as long as everyone plays nicely.
    - Sam Murrell: Are there any recent situations that prompt these changes by the BOG?
      - No.
    - Andy Jackson: [Motion 09-06-14] I move that we reinstate the words “but who is not allowed to participate actively in the hearing.”
      - Stiles: I think we should leave it as is.
    - Gurganus: As Chair of the Hearings Panel, I have been a member of five of these committees. Two people did not have a lawyer present, three did. I thought that the three attorneys represented their clients well. Just because a lawyer is present does not mean that the hearing will be controlled by the attorney. For other termination of employment situations, both parties are allowed to bring legal counsel. I think this limits the possibilities that people have had in the past.
      - [Motion 09-06-14] seconded.
  - Discussion:
    - Black: Well it’s actually unnecessary, because it states that the hearing is under the chairperson’s control.
    - Spaulding: I would think you don’t want to incentivize the person to sue – I would say, let the chair handle it. Let the possibility exist that the person can be as well defended as possible.
    - Provost: However, you have set up the perfect lawsuit – if one committee chair says yes the attorney can participate and another says not.
    - Goldgeier: We have to be clear to our faculty. Previously I was at NC State. Attorneys can be present but non participating – they do participate by preparing scripts for their clients. Regarding Ken's comments, we do have three different hearings for three different types of cessation of employment. Terminations of employment and then nonreappointment of contracts. Your contact ends - it is not being terminated.
      - Which one of those did you suggest, Eileen?
        - Goldgeier: I concurred with the BOG. I have no problem with an advisor accompanying the person. But I do not advise that that person actively participate.
        - Stiles: Can I ask Eileen if you can comment on the Provost’s comment?
          - Goldgeier: It can’t vary between faculty on the same campus.
          - So would the suggestion be that if we include a comma at the end of “attorney”?
That’s not in the amendment.

Call to question.

Call to question seconded.

[Motion 09-06-14] approved.

[Motion 09-06-15] To approve these Faculty Handbook revisions as amended on the floor of Faculty Senate.


Old business

No old business.

New business

“J” Semester

Steve McFarland: We have three basic downtimes: winter break, May, and August.

- As we are struck with this budgetary problem, perhaps we should try to generate revenue.
- “Minimesters” – can we leverage these breaks to generate additional revenue?
- Other campuses have found more study abroad happens at this time, and it results in a better use of facilities, retention, etc.
- We talked to CAS chairs; there is support. WSE would like to explore this.
- So we have a number of questions we will be attempting to answer over the next couple of weeks.
- Whenever we have a time of economic disturbance, there is always that challenge to balance quality against increased productivity (i.e. workload).
- I want to look at this as an opportunity. What has always bothered me is that we use the seat time paradigm. That’s an input rather than a learning outcome. When we look at these minimesters, let's change our paradigm and base them on learning outcomes. So we can ignore seat times when awarding credits.
- You’ll hear over the following weeks as we move forward, our first meeting will be to develop our constituents. As we move forward, we will keep the Faculty Senate informed.
  - In our department, there is a great amount of interest. This is receipt-driven, yes? Like with summer classes?
- There are two models: direct pay or reduced workload in other semesters.
  - What is the anticipated impact on the remainder of the schedule? I have heard a rumor that half of spring break would disappear?
- Not sure where that rumor came from. But we did find out with 2010, where Martin Luther King, Jr. Day is, we wouldn’t have to change the spring graduation date. Ned Martin, Chair of the Calendar committee, was at our first meeting.
  - What about the possibility of shifting the summer sessions?
- We can look at any possibilities in this computer age – maybe that old traditional calendar needs to go by the wayside.
  - It also gives you the ability to do a lot of things departmentally that you aren’t able to do.
  - Is the model that this would be completely voluntary for faculty?
- Yes – for faculty.
  - Totally voluntary? In the sense that we wouldn’t be compelled to teach J Term like we aren’t compelled to teach summer sessions? I don’t want this, in this age of increased productivity, to come at the expense of research.

Announcements

No announcements.

Adjournment

President McKinney: I want to thank you all for a productive meeting.
Meeting adjourned at 3:57pm.
Tuesday, 20 January 2009
2:00 p.m., FSC Wrightsville Beach Room 2017
Meeting 2009-05

***Please note that the January 20, 2009 meeting will be held in FSC Wrightsville Beach Room 2017, starting at 2 p.m.***

Meeting called to order at 2:00pm.

Roll sign-in

- Attendance sheets circulated.
- Absent:
  - Departmental senators: Evers (Accountancy and Business Law), Olson (Art & Art History), Pappamihiel (IT, Foundations, & Secondary Education) Palmer (Randall Library).

Approval of the December 2008 minutes

- Minutes were approved, with correction of spelling of Governor Perdue’s name.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo

   - Chancellor DePaolo commented upon the viewing of the Inauguration in the Lumina Theater. Students will always remember where they were when they saw President Obama’s Inauguration. Highlights from Obama’s address included an indication that science is back in the setting of government policy and the need to retool higher education. She recommended William Massey’s piece in the Chronicle of Higher Education as a thought-provoking reading. We will need to rethink in the face of economic crisis; there is no way to fight it. We need to be at our most creative and innovative, think about what our ultimate goals are and how to achieve them in new and different ways. We cannot “hunker down” and ignore this – it won’t just pass. We will think how to do our jobs as well but differently.
   - About the budget cuts, Chancellor DePaolo noted that across the board cuts are not fair and weaken the fabric of every program. The academic core is the heart of the university and must be protected. However, the heart can’t beat without the other units. We have a multiplicity of aims and goals; this is a complex entity. How can we protect the academic core and survival of the university, becoming stronger through common thinking? Open forums are coming, and we need the best thinking of everyone. More information will be coming soon from Chapel Hill and Raleigh. The amount we must cut will be connected to the Board of Governors’ decision on our requested tuition and fees request. To the question of whether we can increase the number of out-of-state students to generate more revenue, Chancellor Depaolo responded that the restriction is a staunchly held principle. Demand for higher education is expected to increase among North Carolina families, and they are the priority. When asked how we can prepare to respond, the Chancellor urged everyone to look at commonly held values and not just to protect one’s own turf.
   - Chancellor called upon Vice Chancellor for Business Affairs Charles Maimone to provide additional details. Mr. Maimone reported that we are not sure of the target cut, but expect it to be 4-5%. Units have worked out 3%, 5%, and 7% scenarios. The 7% scenario is being revisited. We have the semester to complete the plan. This plan calls for a 7% permanent cut. Governor Perdue could change those terms.
   - Asked how the 6% we reverted this year could be used as a plan for next, Chancellor DePaolo noted that new money was not allocated. Also, 2%, or $2 million of that cut was a one-time cut which was met by deferred hiring, travel reductions, and deferred purchasing of computers. The strategy for a permanent cut would be different. It was noted that state funding is only about 40% of the total university budget. Chancellor DePaolo asked, how can we reduce the state share? How can we create revenue?
   - Senators expressed concern about transparency of the budget process. We thought computer purchases were funded by student technology fees. Besides the memo about suspended searches in the College of Arts and
Sciences, little else is known by the faculty. We need more information. We must also consider the repercussions for junior faculty, such as reduced funding to present scholarship at conferences, book publishers pulling back. Whether to increase or decrease enrollment is another issue. Enrollment targets are mandated across the UNC System. Without enrollment increases, enrollment growth money is not available. Failure to meet enrollment targets can be punished.

- To the question about how the state funding is used, Chancellor DePaolo responded that 80% of the funds are for salaries and benefits.

2. President of the Senate McKinney

- President McKinney noted that he will try to do more to share budget information, perhaps developing a newsletter. The Committee on Departments and Schools should also have a report to present at the February meeting. The SACS Five-Year Report should be ready in March. Implementation plans for UNC Tomorrow recommendations will be discussed over the next few months.

3. Faculty Assembly Kim Cook

- Faculty Assembly Representative Kim Cook reported on the last meeting of that group. In addition to Dr. Cook, President McKinney, and Drs. Kathy Roney and Raymond Burt represented UNCW at the meeting. The first concern raised at the meeting was distance education. With 80,000 new students expected to apply to UNC System institutions by 2017, distance education will be one major way to serve these new students. There are quality concerns. The Faculty Assembly wants more faculty voices on the Quality Committee for Online Education and drafted a resolution about quality. UNC President Erskine Bowles spoke to the Faculty Assembly about the budget. He began his remarks by congratulating institutions receiving recognition as Engaged Campuses by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (including UNCW). He noted that tough times are here, the toughest he has seen. President Bowles predicts the next 9-10 months will be worse. He acknowledged that permanent cuts are harder than one-time cuts, and anything over 5% eats into the core. He discussed horizontal (i.e. across the board) vs. vertical cuts and the need to think strategically to reshape the university for survival and thriving. Dr. Cook also reported that UNC Tomorrow reports are being digested. Duplication of programs is a troubling area being examined.

Committee reports

1. Basic Studies ([Revised Basic Studies Document in PDF](#))

   - President McKinney noted that the Basic Studies Report came out last Friday and urged senators to be familiar with it by next month’s meeting. He called for any general questions. Committee Chair Kim Sawrey asked how senators would like to give feedback. It was recommended that faculty discuss in department meetings and provide feedback within the month. While the budget situation should not impact thinking on this initiative, the bin arrangement and departments may be impacted by the budget.

2. Faculty Senate Steering Committee Faculty Handbook Revisions

   - [Faculty.Section IV.APT.DOC](#)
   - [Faculty Section VI Nonreappointment Rev.doc](#)
   - [Section VII.grievancecommittee.docx](#)
   - [Faculty.Section IX.termination.doc](#)
   - [Section VIII cessation of employment.doc](#)
   - [Section X retirement.doc](#)

   - The documents included in the agenda are being revised to bring the Faculty Handbook in to compliance with the UNC Code. Senators should review so a vote can be taken at the February Senate meeting.

3. The Faculty Senate Steering Committee makes the following motion:

   **[Motion 09-05-10]** To ensure that the quality of the educational experience of UNCW students is not
diminished by the current and anticipated budget cuts:

In order to serve current and future student enrollment and to maintain the lowest student/faculty ratio practicable, the university should not delay hiring faculty to replace retiring/exiting faculty, and should make every effort to recruit faculty needed to meet the increasing academic demands of current and projected student enrollments.

- Following discussion of the motion, including the dilemma of choosing to freeze unfilled positions or releasing people from currently filled positions, the danger of hiring and then laying off faculty, and other choices in the face of severe budget cuts, it was noted the motion was drafted due to a sense of a lack of information about the budget plans. Provost Chapman noted that the process is only beginning, and the timing of most searches being conducted in January and February put us in a difficult situation. Each search costs about $700 in interview expenses. Deans are being prudent to wait. Dean Cordle spoke to the value of the motion as a statement of principle and explained the breakdown of the College’s budget and choices of risking doing searches and then only having the option to dismiss faculty to meet the budget. Several senators noted that transparency and open information exchange will reduce anxiety and loss of morale. It was also noted that the Faculty Senate is an advisory body, and passage of the motion would not be binding on the Chancellor.
  - A friendly amendment was introduced [Motion 09-05-11], revising the motion as follows (insertions are underlined):

    To ensure that the quality of the educational experience of UNCW students is not diminished by the current and anticipated budget cuts:

    To the extent that is fiscally possible, in order to serve current and future student enrollment and to maintain the lowest student/faculty ratio practicable, the university should not delay hiring faculty to replace retiring/exiting faculty, and should make every effort to recruit faculty needed to meet the increasing academic demands of current and projected student enrollments.
  - [Motion 09-05-11] seconded.
  - [Motion 09-05-11] approved (and by show of hands passed with 28 "yes" votes and 13 "no" votes).
  - [Motion 09-05-10] approved (by show of hands, 29 "yes" to 13 "no").

Old business

- No old business.

New business

- No new business.

Announcements

- Provost Chapman encourages everyone to listen to the local media for an announcement about the resumption of classes by 6 a.m. tomorrow.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at approximately 3:50pm.

[Thanks to Sue Cody, for serving as guest secretary.]
Tuesday, 8 December 2009
2:00 p.m., EB 162
Meeting 2010-04

Meeting called to order at 2:01pm.

Roll sign-in

- Attendance sheets were distributed. If you don't sign them, email Liza Palmer (palmerl AT uncw.edu).
- Absent:
  - Departmental senators: Abrams (Geography & Geology), Barlow (Interim Provost), Blundo (Social Work), Bourgeois (Information Systems & Operations Management), Bradley (Computer Science), Brown (Health & Applied Human Sciences), Brubaker (Communication Studies), Clark (Dean, Business), Cordle (Dean, CAS), Dumas (Economics & Finance), Elikai (Accountancy & Business Law), Evers (Accountancy & Business Law), Gessner (Creative Writing), Graham (Economics & Finance), Kinard (Marketing), Lapaire (Foreign Languages & Literatures), McCaffray (History), McMurray (Mathematics & Statistics), Messer (Creative Writing), Moore (Dean, University College), Shynett (Music), Usilton (History), Wray (Information Systems & Operations Management).
  - Committee chairs: Bingham (Student Affairs), Bollinger (University Advancement), Chandler (Bookstore), Murrell (University Curriculum).

Approval of the November 2009 minutes

- November 2009 minutes were approved.

Special order of the day: Election of the Senate President

- President McKinney: I am halfway through my second year – I am happy to run again unless someone else would like to step forward. Anyone?
  - Self-nomination for Bruce McKinney.
  - [Bruce McKinney left the room, leaving Vice President Lugo in charge.]
- Vice President Lugo: Any discussion?

[Motion 10-04-15] To approve Bruce McKinney as president.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo

- Congratulations, Bruce – I look forward to continuing working with you. We have a wealth of talent here on campus. But Bruce is particularly interesting because he brings mediation skills.
- Graduation is Saturday. We have a cold weather report – possibly snow. I take it as a sure guarantee that it will be 75 degrees and sunny. 1400 graduating in two ceremonies. I hope to see as many of you there as possible. I know we have a lot of ceremonies that you have to do – but it is important to be out there to support the students. I have been going around and seeing projects. With seniors, they didn’t come in as smart as they are now. The work that they do is stunning and the way that they do it is equally impressive. And that’s because of you – I want to take this moment to thank you. Your work shows. Next year’s class promises to be even better. Again, thank you for the job you do.
- On Friday we have a special-called meeting of the Board of Trustees that we have annually to discuss tuition and fees. I want to share with you what we plan on presenting on because I am not sure how the paper will report it. We decided to be very modest this year, given the economic issues – tuition to go up 2% (under $60 for most of our students). Half will be used for financial aid (as is required) and the rest for three faculty positions (1.25 are going to the library). $5.60 raise for fees. As modest as we can be with this – let me say this, we are still dealing with the specter of a legislative tuition increase rather than a campus-initiated increase – so
instead of $50 something, if the Legislature proposes an increase, it will be $200 and we won’t see any of it. The news reports coming out in anticipation of Friday, they’re not getting that. They’re also not getting that some of our sister campuses are requesting much higher increases. Any questions?

- James Reeves: I would be remiss in my role as chair. The students are paying a price in other ways for this – their experience will be lacking. I don’t have equipment, for instance.
- You’re absolutely right.
  - Lou Buttino: There are rumors that the state budget is worse than last year. Do you have any read on that?
- No – I wouldn’t be surprised if there are more cuts. But we are not getting the weekly or biweekly cuts that we faced last year. So far, we have been pretty lucky. I wouldn’t be at all surprised if it doesn’t continue.
  - Administrator: According to nclegis.net – the most recent report for November – revenue is 1.5% down from projections. And the governor’s hold back should account for that.
- Any questions? Okay, thank you.

2. President of the Senate McKinney

- My report will be brief – no PowerPoint today.
- The Faculty Handbook Committee is still at work – hopefully they will be done with updates by January.
- Another committee is still at work on the gifts with strings issue.
- I had some frustration last month, when trying to get parking passes for our guests. I went to the Parking Office and was given a business card for a person to contact about this. The person never responded to my attempts to communicate. I went to the person’s supervisor and was told that department chairs are supposed to contact the Parking Office to arrange for guest passes. But the spaces guests can use will still be far off from the buildings.
- Floor ceded to Sue Cody, Interim University Librarian, Regarding Learning Commons.
  - I wanted to make you aware of some changes coming to the library.
  - When you walk in the front building on the right side – we are about ready to put that under construction to continue our progress toward establishing a learning commons, which will combine computing and research assistance in one space. The Reference Collection will be moved. Regarding the Undergraduate Lab, we will be moving those computers out, which will be relocated until the construction is completed. The Reference Desk will be relocated. There will be a lot of dust – but the noisy part will be done during the holiday.
  - Any questions?

3. Kim Cook, Faculty Assembly

- Hi, everyone.
- We all met on November 20th in Chapel Hill.
- I want to focus on two GA folks, Alan Mabe and Rob Nelson, and what they shared with us. I am not going to talk about the health plan owing to our guest.
  - Mabe handles academic programming for the system. About 60 programs are being considered by the Board of Governors. They’re moving more slowly than they originally thought. Nine of these are from UNCW. UNC Tomorrow had a sky’s the limit mentality. But now the budget problems are causing this to be a more deliberate process. The main consideration, according to Nelson, is budget feasibility.
  - A task force has been formed to discuss issues related to non-tenure track faculty.
  - Nelson deals with financial resources for the system. He works closely with legislators in Raleigh.
  - Erskine Bowles hopes to put forward an alternative to the state-approved legislative increase, hoping that the alternative would see some of the money being brought back to the university system.
  - Please don’t shoot the messenger – we are unlikely to get a raise this year. That's probably not a surprise.
  - Nelson mentioned that we may see a hard freeze in the budget again in March or April, which might be difficult to manage but we did it last year.
  - Regarding raises for promotion, you can count on those happening.
  - Faculty travel might be restricted or frozen again – he didn’t say it was a certain thing but there is the possibility.
  - Nelson is the one who is reading the crystal ball – he thinks the state can make its budget without these
dire tactics. So we need to be cautious with our state resources.

- Several committees are working at the moment in Faculty Assembly – one on distance education, specifically looking at quality of delivery and content; one on benefits and academic freedom; I am on one trying to determine the academic core.

- Any questions?
  - President McKinney: Didn’t Nelson say there may be raises the year after next?
  - He dodged that one.
  - Michael Seidman: Is the committee you mentioned on benefits AND academic freedom?
  - There is a lot of Faculty Assembly committees – those are two operating at the moment.
    - Seidman: I just wanted to make sure that academic freedom wasn’t being considered as a benefit?
  - No, point taken.
  - It’s a pleasure to represent you. Hope you have a happy holiday season.

4. Ms. Lacey Barnes, Guest Speaker from State Health Plan

- Thank you for letting me come today.
- This visit resulted from a communication to Tony Rand’s office. He referred McKinney’s email to the plan and here we are. There are a number of questions and issues that were shared with me. I am going to cover the basics of the plan and then answer some questions that have come up. I hope to do this in 20 minutes or less.
- As you know, North Carolina is governed by the legislative assembly. The State Health Plan (SHP) is a creature of statutes. Everything we do is governed by the statutes. The SHP is about 36 people who oversee the SHP, including its vendors – I know you all know one of vendors – Blue Cross Blue Shield of North Carolina (BCBSNC). We call them our claims processing vendor. But they are so much more than that. They are actually our administrative vendor. When you call the SHP, your call is being answered by BCBSNC. We have an executive administrator, who is my boss. He is appointed by the General Assembly and we are overseen by the General Assembly. There is also a Board of Trustees – three are appointed by the House, three by the Senate, and three by the Governor. Also the make-up of the board, there has to be one active and one retired state employee, and one active and retired public school teacher. The executive administrator will consult with the board – and not necessarily do what they say. We generally do.
- The Legislature and the oversight committee is really the group of people who determine what the SHP will look at. Today our co-chairs are the House and Senate majority leaders. Has everyone heard that Rand is stepping down? That will be a really interesting situation for the SHP because Rand has been very involved and very active. With his departure, we don’t know who will be appointed.
- Just so you know, there are four other groups supposed to be overseeing the SHP – an oversight team, made up of fiscal research folks. There’s also someone from the Office of Budget – they work with the oversight committee to make sure we won’t break the bank. There’s an administrative commission – they have the dubious honor of hiring and firing the executive administrator – this committee hasn’t been formed yet. There is also a committee of retired persons.
- The Blue Ribbon Task Force had its first meeting recently. They are looking at a number of things regarding the SHP, one of which is governance.
- There was a mandate to procure a vendor to audit BCBSNC and Medco to determine whether or not BCBSNC is performing efficiently. We have done that.
- The SHP's responsibility for the biennium is to put forth an array of benefit options to offer to the General Assembly. We just budget to break even in the SHP.
- I know a lot of people are not very happy. I can’t say that anyone who works at the SHP is particularly excited about the current benefit levels we have and the cost of premiums.
- Moving on to the questions previously submitted to me:
  - Would it be possible to get the SHP out from under the General Assembly?
  - The Blue Ribbon Task Force will be looking at that.
  - Would it be possible to get it to the Governor’s Office?
  - It’s a possibility.
  - Would the plan be better served with an independent board?
  - The state auditor has come out in favor of this. This decision rests with the Legislature today. There is no one that has a set-up like ours. We’ll serve where the governing body puts us.
Why would the SHP sign a protected confidential contract with BCBSNC?
- The statutes allow us to negotiate the best price with vendors.
- Isn’t Tony Rand supported by BCBSNC?
- That’s outside the SHP’s purview. We have a costs-plus contract.
- President McKinney: Why do we have a costs-plus plan with a nonprofit organization?
- The issue with a costs-plus contract – how many of you have built a house with a costs-plus contract? The key to making these work for you is knowing what kind of materials your builder is buying. BCBSNC has been a willing partner with us – we have been consistently bringing the administrative costs down. The first thing we did was poll other states about costs. We found that NC was right in the middle of what other people are spending.
- Why is it that the BCBSNC contract was no bid?
- It was a competitive bid but BCBSNC was the only bidder. The previous administration honestly believed that the PPO would realize better prices and costs and coverage. We needed to have an option that would serve all 190 counties.
- Since we know that not all employees pay premiums, maybe it would be better if all employees paid premiums?
- Politically, there are groups that are adamantly opposed to this. So simple math, these numbers could be off. Assuming we had 455,000 employees, if each one paid $20 a month each, that would generate $109,000,000. $50 a month, $273,000,000 – that could be used to subsidize dependent premiums. Right now, it is in statute that there be no employee-only premiums. About 80% are employee-only right now – and we know that is because dependent premiums are so high.
- Why are we doing the wellness initiatives?
- There is no research that these will cut costs. There is research that the top two causes of preventable death in NC are smoking and diet and lack of exercise. It’s hard to say how long it takes to see decreases in medical costs over time, once these initiatives come into effect. A 40 BMI is what is called morbid obesity. Did the SHP make the decision to create a comprehensive wellness initiative? No, we didn’t. But did we provide it to the Legislature in the menu of options? Yes, we did. There is no one entity that gets all the blame or credit.
- Questions?
  - Timothy Black: This notion that the insurance police are coming to our workplace got us fired up. You’re saying that is passed by the statue, the Legislature, and then signed by the Governor but conceptually, the SHP doesn’t think this is necessarily a bad idea?
  - Correct. You need to talk to your state legislator – you need to exercise your rights as a taxpayer and voter.
  - Buttino: If memory serves, when Erskine Bowles was selected he made the comment that we can do a whole lot better. Has he followed through on this?
  - It’s safe to say that Erskine Bowles has had a lot on his plate right now. The university has been more focused on university issues, including student health insurance than they have been on the SHP and benefits available to university employees, at least since my tenure (July 2008).
  - Reeves: When you do the costs research, do you factor in people who are not in the SHP? Why not tax the offending items like tobacco and junk food to cover these costs? Second question, regarding the $500 a year for the student health plan – why aren’t they included in the SHP? Isn’t this against the point of the plan to get everyone involved in the SHP to distribute the costs?
  - The SHP would benefit from this, of course. But the students would not benefit from this. It would be far more expensive than what a student could buy for themselves. If a 19-year-old man goes on the web and searches for a plan, a lot of these plans have a maximum of $500,000. The cost out of pocket is so much less (higher deductibles, etc.). We won’t be competitive. It is something that we are looking at.
  - Craig Galbraith: You mentioned the SHP is costs-plus and that BCBSNC has been transparent.
  - They have become more so.
  - Galbraith: I don’t see how anything can be transparent in a confidential agreement. If they have been doing this, though, then why the need to hire an auditor?
  - Because the Legislature told us to. The Legislature was operating under the impression that the SHP have never been audited when, in fact, we are constantly monitoring that. But, no, we have never done a performance audit. When you spoke about transparency, it’s confidential in terms of not being a public record. If the media or taxpayer asks for it, we have an obligation to provide that information as a public record. But the statute obligates us to redact that information that is confidential to protect our ability to get competitive bids. The
current contract ends in 2013.

- When will the audit be complete?
  - By April 30th, according to the auditors. I am sure a lot of that information will be made public.
  - Can you please clarify the obesity and tobacco initiatives? Because that is an oversimplification of health.
- You’re right.
  - You only used the one risk factor to make the determination of an increased premium – just the one risk factor?
- I know it is a trick question and I don’t want to answer wrong.
  - Not a trick question.
- In 2010, employees and dependents will be asked if they use a tobacco product to determine eligibility for the 80/20 plan. In 2011, tobacco and BMI will be the factors.
  - Chancellor: Are retirees included in that?
- No they are not – not if Medicare is primary.
  - President McKinney: Let’s thank our guest.
  - Seidman: Can you send us that state-by-state comparisons by email?
  - President McKinney: Send it to me and I will forward it.
- Please feel free to contact me with other questions. Thank you.
- President McKinney: This is obviously a legislative issue. I will not be using university resources to work on this as it is a political issue.
- Chancellor: This is not university policy – it's state policy.

**Committee reports**

1. Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Misconduct ([more information in Word](#))

- One of your faculty members was accused of faculty misconduct which Steering did not really think was so. But if accused, it starts a process that can’t be stopped. Imagine yourself going through a lengthy process whereby no one on campus can advise you, you need to hire your own lawyer, etc. Robert Smith and a committee took a look at this to make suggestions. Please just put yourself in the other person’s shoes. Obviously, it’s generally an egregious offense. This is something that would give more faculty more power to be involved in this process. The best recommendation would be an ombudsman – we don’t really have a faculty advocate on campus.
  - Robert Smith: This is really a research document. And faculty are involved in lots of other tasks like teaching and service – we need a policy that should cover academic conduct. How many faculty have used an assignment found online and included it in your syllabus without proper credit? If we want these things covered, then the document needs to explicitly state this.
- President McKinney: Read this and send your thoughts to me. I am going to meet with Smith’s committee and in January we will bring this for a motion.
  - Cook: Can I ask that this be moved to February, given the holiday, etc.?
- I agree – that makes a lot more sense.
  - Robert Roer: This is designed to be compliant with specific agencies. We might need to create an additional pipeline for teaching and service issues.
  - Ken Gurganus: Following up on Bob, a guy at Chapel Hill, who lost his NIH funding and standing, one of the reasons that this requires a supervising dean to look at this, we need to comply with federal agencies.
- The committee was looking at teaching and service.
  - Patricia Turrisi: Does the committee feel there is a need to address teaching misconduct?
- Yes.
  - Turrisi: And there wasn’t any other process?
  - Not that I am aware of.
  - Turrisi: It sounds like a witch hunt – I don’t understand how we can devise something like this without giving paradigmatic examples.
  - Cook: This is one of the reasons I advise going slow on this. I would like to see what the source of authority that Bob spoke of is. It’s a complicated issue and with enough time and information, we can make informed decisions.
You make good points. I think it is something that needs to be addressed – and I feel strongly about that.
  - Cook: I feel you are speaking in code.
- I have to because of confidentiality.
  - Cook: But this is something that needs to be clear.
- Yes, I appreciate that. So we will retool it and bring it back in February.
  - Cook: With ongoing discussions before that, yes?
- Yes.

2. UNC Tomorrow RPT Report (more information in Word)

- This is an initiative based on UNC Tomorrow. This is not a choice we had – there had to be some modification of RPT based on service.
- I have gotten several emails about this. If you have concerns about this, bring them to the meeting.
  - Black: Let me just clarify that this inclusion of service and engagement learning only provides an additional pathway – it does not serve as a means for denying tenure for someone who does not engage in this unless there is a specific agreement with the department at the time of hire? This is not a rationale for denying tenure?
- That is my read.
  - Reeves: It has to go both ways. If I hire someone to do this engagement, I need to have the authority to fire that person if they don’t do it.
  - Black: That’s what this says.
  - Galbraith: As chair of the RPT Committee, I was one of the people who sent a long email to Bruce about this. My concern with this, I think engagement is great, but for the RPT process, we need to be careful about the language. It may become a bar that has to be hurdled in order to get tenure or rank. We are much more aware of the legal obligations. I would strongly suggest that this go back to Steering or another Senate committee to look at this as well as some other issues that have come up related to RPT. This also raises the issue of a contractual path to tenure which takes it out of the Faculty Handbook. I think this needs to be looked at more comprehensively.
  - L. Andy Jackson: The continual need to look at RPT issues is important – they are complicated. Part of this, though, is a specific response to a requirement from UNC Tomorrow. We can parse words but this report deals with a specific requirement of GA. The issue of faculty scholarship involving engagement with the community – I don’t know the solution but that is one of the factors.
  - Aaron Wilcox: When we vote on this, how will it affect the people in the pipeline?
- New people, Steve?
  - Vice Provost McFarland: New. Oh, you mean new hires or new to the RPT process? That is up to us.
  - Black: The way I read it, it doesn’t impose any new requirements just new opportunities.
- This needs to be done by February.
  - Vice Provost McFarland: That was set up by the committee – GA just stipulates by fall.
- I read it as more different opportunities.
  - That is one of the issues – it is connected to research in some areas, service in other.
- It seems to me, that Craig is one of the people who will know better about making the language more palatable.
  - Galbraith: Some of the language can be fixed by changing commas. But the issues are more broad than this. It is making something explicit that isn’t so explicit in the handbook.
  - Cook: Given your role on the committee, what would you recommend?
  - Galbraith: Do you want to require engagement or something as a positive encouragement. Those requirements we are obligated to look at.
  - Reeves: The key thing that you said, Craig, is that there is a common set of requirements. I would be very uncomfortable to have this as part of that list. I don’t want this to be one of the general things I can point to. When I can make it a contractual obligation, then it can be considered. But I don’t want it to be a substitute for what they should have been doing.
  - Can you shed some light on the process?
- I think each campus was charged to set this up on their own. I think the spirit of what they are trying to do, I think we all agree, is a good idea.
  - Black: Again, maybe my language skills aren’t so good – I don’t see anything that imposes a
requirement. Now I haven’t vacuumed through the language word by word. But if there is language that does impose a new requirement – I would want it removed.

- Galbraith: If this is put under the scholarship section, where it is now, it will be required. We just need to sit back and look at the bigger picture. Some can be taken care of by a word or two.
- Jackson: I think that this is quite important – I think that the purpose of the original call for policies on each campus is to make certain that individuals that engage in research that engage the community be given due consideration. The reason that there is one clause, in some departments and programs, scholarship involves regional engagement. Their efforts in their faculty work involves this type of work. As I understand, the purpose of UNC Tomorrow is to insure that faculty involved in this type of knowledge generation were not penalized.
- Is there anything in place that would send this out to the tenured faculty? In my area, there would be a knee-jerk reaction against this.
- Gurganus: It will become part of the Faculty Handbook.
- I just wanted to touch on whether this would apply to newly hired people. My concern is that there are always misunderstandings regarding RPT as it is, so I think if it is applied it needs to be applied to people newly hired.
- Smith: Just to follow up on a point you have raised, we have had no discussion about this yet in my department. I understood recommendation one as saying that departments would have more freedom in determining specific criteria – this would be an opportunity for those departments that need that type of engagement. So I am interested to hear Craig’s point that this would apply to all faculty.
- Galbraith: There is a couple of issues going on here. There is reference to a contract, which would indicate a path to tenure. We would have classes of people – some on a contractual path, others from a more broad system of being tenured. Research is defined as peer reviewed. Scholarship is more board. The role of department policies in tenure versus university wide. Some departments have very detailed policies regarding tenure; others don’t have anything. Some departments have higher bars, others have low ones. So maybe engagement needs to be defined at the departmental level and not the university level.
- Lugo: As the person who put in this wording on scholarship, there is no hidden agenda. The interpretation that we want faculty to get is what Black said. The wording is coming from UNC Tomorrow – I had to figure out what section to put it under. Chapel Hill created a whole new category. I put it under scholarship. Any other assumptions about that or wording are not done on purpose.
- Cook: Three points. The language is very clear that this still needs to go under peer review. Second point, as chair, I am obliged to discuss with job candidates the RPT process. I have to document that conversation and it goes into their file. Then it is perfectly appropriate to me to communicate to the candidate that this contribution is valued as long as it satisfies the criteria for peer review in the discipline. If you would like to see how Sociology defines the engagement piece, you are welcome to look at our website. It’s important to flesh out these conversations early on – but I think as well-educated, responsible people, we can do this well.
- Lugo: Regarding this going back to the committee, I don’t think that will do any good. The committee has worked very hard on this already – it needs to go to the departments. The committee doesn’t have the larger campus perspective.
- Reeves: Craig’s call for a discussion on this is key. This has to be both a contract and a general set of expectations for the person and department to thrive. That needs to be part of the process.
- Nice: In Theatre, if I go to direct a play locally, it is considered service. This may create a slippery slope if it is put under the research section.
- Would a logical next step be to see if the RPT Committee would like to clear up any language to make this more acceptable?
  - Galbraith: I am only one person – and it’s not like we won’t have a lot to do in the spring. But we may be able to look at this at our first meeting in 2010.
  - Should it go to departments first?
- Since there is not the timeline I thought, why don’t we discuss it at the department level and then bring it to the RPT Committee?
  - Galbraith: Can I just encourage departments to consider, too, whether this should be inputted at the department level – in dept policy – and not university-wide policy.
3. The Academic Standards Committee submits the following motion:

- [Motion 10-04-14]

Academic Standards Committee moves to insert the italicized bullet into the section concerning RETENTION, DISMISSAL AND READMISSION (Motion 09-08-25 approved April 21, 2009 by the Faculty Senate). [The old language of this section appears on p. 81 of the 2009-2010 UNCW Undergraduate catalogue. The following wording is that of the Senate-approved text with the italicized addition of this motion.]

The University of North Carolina Wilmington both encourages and requires scholarship. In order to remain at the university, all students enrolling fall 2010 and later must meet the grade point requirements outlined below.

**RETFENTION CHART**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Quality (GPA) and Transfer Hours</th>
<th>Good Academic Standing</th>
<th>Academic Probation</th>
<th>Required Grade Point Average for Eligibility to Continue in the University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 45</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.75 – 1.99</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 – more</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transfer students are placed in the above retention chart based on total hours transferred from all institutions attended. Transfer students’ grade point averages are computed only on quality hours attempted through the University of North Carolina Wilmington.

**ACADEMIC PROBATION**

An undergraduate is automatically placed on academic probation when the cumulative GPA drops below 2.0.

- Students who fall within the academic probation category at the end of any semester will be limited to enrolling in no more than 14 hours in the following semester.
- A student on academic probation is expected to show satisfactory academic progress by the end of the next semester, regardless of the number of hours attempted. Satisfactory academic progress is generally defined as improvement in the GPA earned at the end of each semester during the probationary period. A student is expected be in good academic standing within 30 credit hours after being placed on academic probation.
- When a student is placed on academic probation, it is the responsibility of the student to arrange regular meetings with his or her academic advisor to consider specific academic intervention strategies.

**ACADEMIC DISMISSAL**

Students who do not meet the minimum grade point requirement for retention at the conclusion of the spring semester will be academically ineligible. The student will be allowed to make up deficiencies during this university’s summer sessions immediately following the spring semester in which the ineligibility was declared.

- If a student is not in good academic standing at the conclusion of the summer sessions, the student will be dismissed from the university and will not be permitted to enroll for two consecutive regular semesters (fall and spring).
• Full-time (at least 12 hours) students who earn a 0.0 GPA in any semester will be dismissed from the university and will not be permitted to enroll for two consecutive regular semesters.
• **Full-time students (at least 12 hours) who do not earn at least a 1.00 semester GPA and pass at least nine academic hours in any semester will be reviewed by the appropriate dean to determine academic eligibility.**
• Readmission in both cases above is contingent upon the results of the Re-enrollment Review.
• If a student is allowed to re-enroll, he/she must see an academic advisor before registering for classes. See also ADMISSIONS-FORMER STUDENTS (Re-enrolling).
• Academically dismissed students may enroll in any summer session.

Students who have been academically dismissed for the first time may seek administrative review of mitigating circumstances for authorization to enroll in the following semester under an academic contract.

Students seeking a review must submit the required appeal form and a written statement outlining their circumstance to the appropriate dean. The appeal must be submitted to the appropriate dean within 10 days after the end of the last semester (spring or summer) in which a student is registered. Students must understand that the submission of an appeal does not guarantee the student will be allowed to enroll. The appeal process may take several days to be completed.

After a second declaration of academic dismissal, eligibility for continued residence can be restored only by completion of sufficient work during the summer sessions at the University of North Carolina Wilmington.

• **[Motion 10-04-14]** approved.

Old business

• No old business.

New business

• No new business.

Announcements

• No announcements.

Adjournment

*Meeting adjourned at 3:58pm.*
Tuesday, 10 November 2009
2:00 p.m., EB 162
Meeting 2010-03

Meeting called to order at 2:03pm.

Roll sign-in

- Attendance sheets were distributed.
- Absent:
  - Departmental senators: Almeida (Chemistry & Biochemistry), Black (Physics & Physical Oceanography), Blundo (Social Work), Bourgeois (Information Systems & Operations Management), Buttino (Film Studies), Clark (Dean, Business), Elikai (Accountancy & Business Law), Evers (Accountancy & Business Law), Hall (Social Work), Hungerford (Psychology), Hurst (Psychology), Kim (Sociology & Criminology), Lapaire (Foreign Languages & Literatures), McCaffray (History), Miller (Sociology & Criminology), Moore (Dean, University College), Shynett (Music), Silva (Film Studies), Turrisi (Philosophy & Religion), White (Philosophy & Religion).
  - Committee chairs: Bingham (Student Affairs), Bollinger (University Advancement), Chandler (Bookstore).

Approval of the October 2009 minutes

- October 2009 minutes were approved.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo

- Good afternoon. Just a few things.
- There is a Board of Governors' meeting on Thursday and Friday – a few things on that agenda that affect us.
  - First, mission statement approval – we have been without an approved statement for many years. I have every expectation that it will sail through.
  - Second, moratorium on degree approval – that is opening up and we are in the queue. Some degree programs will start the approval process on Thursday and Friday and that is good news for us as well.
- The President’s Action Plan is online and available for review. There is a link to a version of it on the UNC Tomorrow website; it is also linked to the BOG agenda for this upcoming meeting.
- Some of you may have noticed that in any university environment rumors take on a life of their own. I am here to dispel one – that ITSD gave raises this year when no one else gave raises. It’s not true – the raises that are quoted are ones that were given the previous year when other people got raises. The only people who got raises this year were faculty who were promoted and a handful of other people who did not get raises but who took other jobs that they applied for on campus. Anything you can do to help spread this correct information is good because it is ruining morale. And I think the worst thing the Star News ever did was make that salary information available because it just makes people upset.

2. President of the Senate McKinney

- PPT presentation.
- Setting record straight on BCBSNC
  - I have never managed a plan like this so I asked some people in accounting about this [the audit process for BCBSNC] – is it strange? And they said yes.
  - Regarding the October 29th meeting – I took the ideas that came out and brought them to the Senate Presidents at the other campuses and have been nominated to draft motions to be brought forth to Faculty Assembly.
  - Senate will be visited at a future meeting by a BCBSNC representative.
- Faculty Handbook update
Anne Pemberton from the Library is doing an excellent job as chair of the Handbook Committee.

- **Special University Advancement Committee**

- **Good news from Library**

  - Sue Cody, Interim University Librarian: We are soliciting faculty input about what that was cancelled during the serials reduction project should be added back in. It’s been an interesting process, canceling what has not been used to free up some money for new things. Faculty, please let us know some focused topics we need to develop the collection on – we want to do some targeted development with this money.

- **Visitor parking**

- **Special Guest Speakers: Adam Linker and Adam Searing of the North Carolina Justice Center**

  - They came in on their own time to speak with us today. They are out there looking out for the little guy in NC. Adam Searing has been researching NC health policy for about 12 years. We should give them a big hand for driving down and sharing their information with us. [Applause.]

  - Floor ceded to Adam Linker and Adam Searing:
    - Pretty short presentation on what we have been working on.
    - You can Google the North Carolina Justice Center if you are not familiar with us.
    - We are both from academic families – our fathers have been at UNC and NC State. We have up-close-and-personal experience with the State Health Plan.
    - We want to show you how in our view how the discussions last year about the health plan, we felt that everybody got heard and did not have to suffer as long as you are a wealthy special interest.
    - You should call BCBSNC back and retract your retraction because you were basically right – they were instrumental in all of this.
    - You will get a lot of answers about why the health plan is the way it is: state workers are sicker, for instance. The average annual cost for one employee in the South for a PPO plan is $4490, in NC it’s $4156 – so state employees in NC are cheaper to insure than the average employee in the South but no one has yet to explain why the costs are the way they are.
    - The short-term problem was a cash problem – the shortfall as a result of mismanagement of the plan. The burden was placed on the state employees. So George Stokes was fired because he saw problems and didn’t let the Legislature know. There was also this issue of the contract – BCBSNC was able to take over the plan with a no-contract bid. So this immediate problem was because we couldn’t see the administrative costs for BCBSNC. All the costs were put on the state employees because they had the weakest voice in the Legislature.
    - Regarding the wellness provisions – actuaries don’t predict it will save any money. It’s just a feel-good measure that was rushed through. The only way it will save money is to push more people into the worst plan. Everybody will be put in the 70/30 plan until you provide a note that you are not a smoker. They will be doing random checks at your workplace. BCBSNC did not give up anything in this – the state asked BCBSNC if they could help us with this and they said, No, we have a contract (this is in the News & Observer).
    - This is what I propose: federal reform will change the state plan very likely. I would recommend that state employees agitate that the state plan be removed out of the General Assembly. We are one of the few states where this is the set up. Get it to the executive branch or an independent board. Second, repeal the wellness provisions or change them so they are not punitive. Third recommendation: stay engaged. Help us make sure that this is fair (see: http://pulse.ncpolicywatch.org; http://www.youtube.com/adamsearing).
    - I would like to show, if it is okay with Bruce, a few short videos. [Technical issues delayed the screening of the videos.]

  - Questions while we wait?
    - You mentioned the contract between the state plan and BCBSNC – how long does it last?
    - Another two years. They put in that they will re-bid next time.
      - But the bid process starts in 2013, yes?
    - Right.
      - Do we have any allies other than the two of you?
    - Yes – we have allies, which the faculty should start reaching out to. SEANC (State Employees Association of NC). The teachers' association of NC. Those are the main ones that constitute the
state employees.

- Any legislators?
- Legislator allies will be more effective than before. Legislators who are in districts where there are universities will be more effective.
  - Have you checked the campaign contributions to Rand?
  - Yes – that didn’t get us very far. It only embarrass them so much. BCBSNC is Rand’s largest contributor.
    - Is it true that BCBSNC is exempt from Federal HIPAA guidelines and if so, how did that happen?
    - Yes – the state plan is. So if it is self-insured, they can get a HIPAA waiver. There is a mailer that you should have gotten about the wellness initiatives, which states the HIPAA exemption.
      - Will the confidential records be made available under the new federal regulations about public records?
      - No – we are sort of stuck with this really big contract.
        - Will these random tests for the wellness initiatives apply to the workers or the dependents, too?
        - No – it should be in the workplace only.
          - Who is responsible for this contract being confidential – Jack Walker?
          - No, George Stokes. There was no lawyer in the room to represent the State Health Plan – there was an attorney in the room but she stated she wasn’t in the room in her lawyer capacity and she now works for BCBSNC.
      - Why is Jack Walker so hard on state employees and health care? It’s part of our package when we are hired.
        - Yes, and NC struggles to be competitive in this area – some NC universities have said to me they have to offer more money to offset the health plan, it is so bad.
      - Since we are doing comparisons, do you know something about the profits of BCBS in other states?
        - We don’t know that – all we do know is that they got paid $100m each year to process the claims. We divided that figure by the number of claims they processed and got about $10 per claim. Medicare gets paid about 60 cents a claim. BCBS was fired from the Children’s Health Insurance Program at $4 per claim.
        - We have to go back to our faculty and report on this – what can we do as state employees. Should we write our legislators?
  - Call your legislator and do these things – one, move the administration from out of the State Legislature – put it under the executive branch or an independent board. With the oversight of the Legislature, when the problems arose with the shortfall, it came out that the committee in charge wasn’t meeting – the plan can’t run itself. Two, take a new look at these wellness provisions – they are punitive and not what any other state is doing. And, three, follow along with us to make sure that what we are doing is fair for every employee in the state. Calling or personal visits to your state legislator will make a big impact. If you go with those specific questions – these are not radical, they are just what other states are doing.
    - Where do the Board of Trustees for BCBS fit in in all this? I look at the board and see two state employees on it. I look at the duties of the board as described in their corporate governance, I would be embarrassed – there are people on that board that I respect. Is the board active? I know they get paid well for their efforts. I see close ties to 8 different institutions of the UNC System. Do they have any effect?
    - The nonprofit board of BCBS, as far as I can tell, is not doing the job they should do as a nonprofit board. They should be overseeing the company more strictly. When you are getting paid $40,000 a year to serve on this board, maybe that impacts how they act but I don’t think so. They are also not doing what they should do to support federal health care reform. We have circulated their email addresses and asked people to respectfully contact them about this.
      - Does BCBS listen to their own board?
      - In my 12 years of experience, the board has had little effect on the company. I think they have stayed from their mission and I wish the Attorney General would investigate this. [After extensive
technical issues screening a video] We need to get you more money for AV equipment here!

- Video files:
  - State Auditor - $100 million no-big “cost-plus” contract State Health Plan signed with NC Blue Cross: [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1fzlflvzlyo](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1fzlflvzlyo)
  - Jack Walker on smokerlyzer and possibly drawing state employee blood: [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8JbS7kGfkjo](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8JbS7kGfkjo)
  - “Dr.” Jack Walker: [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n6_5KDHgJ9M](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n6_5KDHgJ9M)
  - Senator Rand on costs to state employees of health plan changes: [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aYZGVOhoudI](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aYZGVOhoudI)

- President McKinney: An issue as controversial as this, my Steering Committee reined me in on this as it is not balanced. So I contacted Tony Rand’s office to ask if someone would speak – they bumped me over to the State Health Plan office. So someone should come to a future meeting – I will say this about the two Adams. They contacted me within 15 minutes of my contacting them and they are not the ones I am paying a lot of money to for my health care. I don’t know if it is going to be Dr. Walker. If anyone else in this room had a PhD like Dr. Walker's, we would be out of here. Any other questions?

**Committee reports**

1. Ed Graham, Chair Faculty Senate Budget Committee

   - Ed Graham, Cameron school. I spoke at the last Senate meeting and was curious as to why I was included on this agenda. I should have a report for you in January. I shared my comments at the last meeting.

2. Emily Bliss, Director of Financial Aid, Financial Aid Committee

   - **PPT presentation.**
   - I have worked here for almost 14 years and this is the first time I have been asked to speak here. The reason is that I am on the Financial Aid Committee this year and we thought this would be a good idea.
   - **Questions?**
     - If the Legislature allows us to have a campus-based tuition increase, half will go to Emily’s office, yes?
     - And we love it, we take it. So that money is going directly to the students. So I appreciate it.
     - I have had students in the past, particularly in the fall, tell me that they can’t buy their textbooks because their financial aid hasn’t come through.
     - We release the money on the first day of class only to those students who have done all their financial aid, which is unusual. We do have a book voucher program if they come to our office and are getting aid; we can put it on their card and then take it back when their aid comes through. Never hesitate to refer students to us, though.

3. The University Curriculum Committee submits the following motion:

   - **[Motion 10-03-11]** That the Senate approve the following recommendations:
     - **Environmental Studies**
       - Creation of a new option within the B.S. in Environmental Studies: The Environmental Conservation Option
       - (related documents for above: UCC cover form for proposed program change | Memo from Department Chair, describing the change | Catalogue text for the B.S. degree, including the proposed change)
     - **Geography and Geology**
       - Change name of B.A. in Geology to B.A. in Geosciences
       - Creation of two options within the B.S. in Geology: The Academic and the Professional Options
       - Designate the existing Senior Seminar GLY 495 as Computer Competency course
       - Designate the existing GLY 431 Stratigraphy as Oral Communication Intensive
       - (related documents for above: UCC form for program changes | A description of all changes, all with proposed catalogue text | UCC form for designating GLY 431 as satisfying the oral competency
requirement | UCC form for designating GLY 495 as satisfying computer competency requirements)

- Health and Applied Human Sciences (HAHS)
  - Reduction of the number of hours required for the major in Parks and Recreation Management from 67 to 61 (necessary to bring the program in line with the policy in the UNCW Faculty Handbook)
  - Establishment of a new option within the Parks and Recreation Management major: The Recreation Sport Leadership Option
  - Designate the existing course REC 359 as a computer competency course for the REC major
  - Designate the existing course REC 380 as an oral intensive course for the REC major
  - Designate the existing course RTH 480 as an oral intensive course for the RTH major
  - (related documents for below: UCC Form | Overview of Changes | Catalogue Copy | Course Action Form Degree Core | Course Action Form TCR Option | Course Action Form PNP Option | Course Action Form RSL Option | E512 UCC and Course Action Forms Computer | E513 UCC Form Oral | REC 380 Course Action Form Oral | E520 UCC Form Oral)

- International Studies Courses
  - Change 294 and 494: Departmental Study Abroad from 3-6 hours to 1-6 hours (to allow for greater flexibility in assigning credits appropriately for study abroad opportunities)
  - Add 394: Departmental Study Abroad for 1-6 hours (to allow for greater flexibility in assigning the appropriate level for a study abroad course)
  - (related documents for above: INT 294 | INT 494 | INT 394)

- Music
  - Change the options in the Bachelor of Music in Music Education degree, such that the current “Instrument majors” option becomes “Wind and percussion majors,” “String majors,” and “Piano and guitar majors” options
  - Change the number of hours required for the Bachelor of Music in Music Education degree, from 93 to 91-93
  - (related documents for above: UCC Form | Catalogue Copy | Course Action Form Strings | Course Action Form Singing | Course Action Form Piano and Guitar)

- Physics and Physical Oceanography
  - Creation of two Options within the B.S degree in Physics and Physical Oceanography: The General Physics Option and the Physical Oceanography Option.
  - Creation of a Minor in Physical Oceanography
  - Designate new course, PHY 315, as computer competency requirement
  - (related documents for above: UCC form for program change | Overview of proposed option and minor | UCC form for considering a course as satisfying the computer competency requirement | Course action form for PHY 315, to be considered as satisfying the computer competency requirement | Syllabus for PHY 315)

- Watson School of Education
  - Approval of New course offerings
    - EDN 420: Instructional Seminar – Foreign Language
    - EDN 312: English Grammar for Teachers
    - EDN 326: Applied Linguistics for ESL
    - EDNL 330: Education Lab
    - EDN 287: Spanish for Educators
    - EDN 421: Seminar in Education (6-9)
    - EDN 353: Thematic Unit Lab
  - Middle Grades Education Program (EMG) changes to more closely align with the NC Standard Course of Study for students 6-9
  - (related documents for above: EDN 420 Syllabus | EDN 420 Instructional Seminar | EDN 326 Course Action Form | EDN 312 | EDN 312 Course Action Form | EMG Academic Concentrations | EDN 326 | EDNL 330 Course Action Form | EDN 287 Course Action Form | EDN 287 Syllabus | EDN 421 Course Action Form | EDN 421 Syllabus | EDN 353 Course Action Form | EDN 353 Syllabus | Middle Grades Concentration Course Action Form)

- Discussion:
  - All of these have been approved in their departmental committees and we are rubber stamping?
Of course.

- Some of these are addressing computer competency requirements – are these addressing those requirements in the catalogue or the new ones?
- Reeves: These are for SACS. The whole issue of competencies is up in the air at the moment and needs to be addressed for SACS before 2012.

- **[Motion 10-03-11]** approved.

4. The Academic Standards Committee submits the following motions, the first item consisting of a revision and update to the mission statement of the Honors Scholars Program and the second raising the minimum G.P.A. from a 2.50 to a 2.70 for admission into the Bachelor of Science Programs in the School of Nursing and progression towards the degree.

- **[Motion 10-03-12]**

Honors Program Mission Statement

This new statement better reflects the Program and aligns it with overarching University goals and outcomes. Revisions are indicated in **red**. Omissions are indicated by **strikethrough**.

_The mission of the Honors Scholars Program at the University of North Carolina Wilmington is to attract and retain_ academically talented students _with innovative and unique educational experiences_. _The Honors Program offers a powerful learning experience by encouraging curiosity, critical thinking, and independent work skills, and by developing a community of honors scholars on campus_. _The Program is committed to offering opportunities to students as they pursue their academic passions in college_. _The vision of the program is to encourage and support life-long learning, including a global perspective_. _by offering exciting academic and cultural activities as well as the opportunity for close working and social relationships with the faculty._

The following is a “clean” copy of the completely revised mission statement that should replace the that currently appears on page 105 of the 2009-2010 on-line undergraduate catalogue.

The mission of the Honors Scholars Program at the University of North Carolina Wilmington is to attract and retain academically talented students. The Honors Program offers a powerful learning experience by encouraging curiosity, critical thinking, and independent work skills, and by developing a community of honors scholars on campus. The Program is committed to offering opportunities to students as they pursue their academic passions in college. The vision of the program is to encourage and support life-long learning, including a global perspective.

- Discussion?

- **[Motion 10-03-12]** approved.

- **[Motion 10-03-13]**

Motion from School of Nursing

The curriculum committee and the faculty council from the School of Nursing unanimously approved and forwarded a request to Academic Standards Committee that changes both the minimum admission and graduation G.P.A. from 2.50 to 2.70. Their pool of students accepted into the School of Nursing typically has G.P.A. values above 2.8. Raising the admission G.P.A. to 2.70 brings Nursing into alignment with the admission G.P.A. in the other professional schools. Raising the standard will not significantly affect the application pool. But, publishing the higher standard should help to advise students whose G.P.A. is less than 2.70 to search out alternative career paths earlier and not proceed with the false hope of gaining admission into Nursing. Academic Standards Committee unanimously approved this change.
The following is the revised catalogue copy. Revisions are indicated in red. Omissions are indicated by strikethrough.

For page 113:

III. **Requirements for Admission to the Bachelor of Science Programs in the School of Nursing**

**Bachelor of Science in Professional Nursing**

**Prelicensure Option:**

- Admission to the University of North Carolina Wilmington.
- A **2.70** total GPA is required for evaluation of a student's transcript by the School of Nursing. Each student's total GPA, including the fall semester/quarter grades of application year, is calculated on all transferable college courses attempted at all accredited institutions of higher education according to the guidelines in use by the UNCW Admissions Office.
- Completion of all basic studies and required nursing prerequisites prior to admission to the professional component of the program.
- Minimum grade of "C" in all required prerequisite and corequisites courses and their accompanying labs: BIO 201, 240, 241, 246; CHM 101; MAT 111 or 151; either PAR 101, 110, 115, 205, 211, or 215; PSY 105, 223; either SOC 105, ECN 125 or 221; STT 210 or 215; and NSG 251.
- Certification as a nursing assistant (CNA1) is required before application deadline. Applicants must have taken a course with a clinical component.
- Application deadline for fall admission is January 10; application deadline for spring admission is August 10. Satisfactory score on standardized nurse admission examination is required. Contact the UNCW National Testing Office (910) 962-7444.
- Physical, mental, and emotional health that enables a student to participate in and complete the program.
- Criminal background check.

In addition to the minimum criteria the following will also be considered:

- Students with a prior baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited institution.
- Students with backgrounds in keeping with the university's commitment to a diverse student body.
- Students' GPA on courses prerequisite to nursing. (See Admission Criterion #3 and 4)

For page 177:

**B.S. Degree with a Major in Professional Nursing, Prelicensure Option**

**Requirements for the B.S. Degree with a Major in Professional Nursing, Prelicensure Option:** 99 hours.

**Collateral Courses:** BIO 201, 240, 241, 246; CHM 101; MAT 111 or 151; either PAR 101, 110, 115, 205, 211 or 215; PSY 105, 223; either SOC 105 or ECN 125 or 221; STT 210 or 215. (Note: Completion of these courses will satisfy university basic studies requirements in the social and behavioral sciences and the natural and mathematical sciences.)

**Core Courses:** NSG 250, 251, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 334, 401, 403, 404, 405, 406, 415.

A minimum grade of "C" (2.00) is required in each nursing course. A cumulative grade point average of **2.70** or better is required for graduation.

- Discussion?
- **[Motion 10-03-13]** approved.

**Old business**
• No old business.

New business

• Any new business?
  • From the floor: Question for Steering? Do they think this is the appropriate venue for a health care discussion?
• President McKinney: I regret not involving the Faculty Welfare Committee in this. I have never had one issue that faculty have commented to me more about than this health care one. Is there any reason why we shouldn’t?
  • Is there not another venue to discuss this with your other meeting? Does this fall within the purview of the Senate?
• I guess because it affects faculty welfare, then yes.
  • Then why not bring it to Faculty Welfare?
• Because of the issue of expediency – the committee has to meet and research the issue.
  • I guess I would ask Steering Committee to keep this in mind for future agendas.
  • Steve Pullum: Let's ask the Senate – what do they think? Are they tired hearing about this?
  • I have to say I am grateful to you – I am in shock. I had no idea the corruption that goes on.
• McKinney: I would like to thank Sam Murrell for his excellent work on the UCC, and thank Steering and in particular Liza Palmer, whom you may not know, as Senate Secretary – I don’t know what I would do without her and Ken Gurganus. And the counsel of Steve Pullum. Gabriel Lugo, Andy Jackson, Patty Turrisi, and Jennifer Horan.
  • Sarah Messer: I think it is great what you are doing – I think we should tell everyone to get involved in this issue because we don’t often read those mailers they send out.
  • Sam Murrell: I would like to share my thanks with Carol Pilgrim.

Announcements

• No announcements.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 3:38pm.
Tuesday, 13 October 2009
2:00 p.m., EB 162
Meeting 2010-02

Meeting called to order at 2:04pm.

Roll sign-in

- Attendance sheets were distributed.
- Absent:
  - Departmental senators: Barlow (Interim Provost), Buttino (Film Studies), Clark (Dean, Business), Cordle (Dean, CAS), Elikai (Accountancy & Business Law), Evers (Accountancy & Business Law), Henry (Geography & Geology), Lerch (Anthropology), McCaffray (History), McCann (Dean, Nursing), Moore (Dean, University College), Reeves (Chemistry & Biochemistry), Shynett (Music), Usilton (History), Wray (Information Systems & Operations Management).
  - Committee chairs: Bingham (Student Affairs), Chandler (Bookstore), Murrell (University Curriculum), Willis (Library).

Approval of the September 2009 minutes

- If you were incorrectly noted as absent in the September 2009 minutes, please contact Bruce McKinney or Liza Palmer to fix it.
- September 2009 minutes were approved.
  - [N.B. The remainder of the meeting was conducted out of the original order as presented in the agenda.]

Special order of the day

1. Election of Faculty Assembly Alternate Delegate

- This was deemed unnecessary by President McKinney and the Steering Committee.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo

  - [N.B. This presentation occurred fifth.]
  - I thought we would start by handing out swabs and scales [laughter].
  - I wanted to go last so that I could clarify any questions you might have.
  - Budget. I can see your point of view, whether the Administration deserves applause or not, UNCW handled layoffs differently from any other UNC school, and in a way we should be proud of. People are just grateful that they weren’t laid off. We did not fill vacancies. Every person on this campus is working more than they ever have before. And that’s real. Everyone is feeling that in really real ways. Charlie or William, anything to add?
    - Maimone: It was really a matter of planning that allowed us to do this. But it was the planning that allowed us to maneuver through those reductions.
  - Tuition and fees. Ed mentioned this was a 4-year plan from Erskine Bowles. The total package would be 6.5% over four years. In fact, the 4-year plan was only in effect for 2 years. Erskine came to us because of the economy and told us that he didn’t want us to go anywhere near that. This year, the Legislature has preempted us and said we will not have our normal campus-initiated raise. But there will be a Legislature-initiated raise and we won’t see any of that. We use campus-initiated raises for faculty salaries. We have used it for financial aid and for other great needs on campus. So far, we won’t be able to do this for next year. That should be viewed as an additional cut because that is what it is. They have not said anything about fees. I guess, if I have a view on it at all, we might not come out with any fees. But we should go through the process so we can at least identify our needs.
I like Erskine’s action plan. Most of it suits us extremely well. He has probably taken some heat for putting K-12 first.

The other major point that I think is a real policy shift is that we look at these other schools who are focusing on quantity, growing their enrollments. I and many others always doubted whether enrollment growth was the right incentive. I understand why they do it. But what happened is that they were continually taking in more students to get enrollment growth money and those students were not prepared and they were not retained and graduated. Erskine will go to a system that will recognize instead retention and graduation rates. Some penalty will follow – not sure what it is yet. But if you are taking in students and not graduating them, there will be a penalty. 87% retention this year at UNCW – our goal was 90%. That is extraordinary. I think philosophically, this is absolutely the right thing the System should be doing.

We are already administratively lean. It says that UNCW has no academic cuts, that was looking not at our total cut of 10%, that was looking at the last 3% that Erskine instituted. I know it is confusing. For that additional 3%, they wanted it over the summer. They were upset with us, we could not give them those statistics over the summer because of faculty being away.

Distance education – our numbers have doubled in the last two years. Our numbers look great. Our reporting improved. That’s not one of the things high on my worry list.

Finally, we have been without a mission statement for several years. Our BOT approved several over the years but because of UNC Tomorrow, the BOG have not been approving them recently. I am hoping they will approve this in the November meeting.

Questions?
- Seidman: I imagine there is a relationship between not raising our enrollment and our retention numbers?
  - Absolutely.
  - Will there be money that comes from good retention and graduations rates?
- I am hoping that will happen.
  - Turrisi: I am concerned about the effect of the losses (that aren’t losses) on the students. There are positions that weren’t filled that might impact programs. Has anyone looked at that?
- You’re right. These losses have been devastating to us.
  - Turrisi: But it doesn’t look that way, if the message comes out that we didn’t suffer any layoffs. Do we have some obligation to set the record straight?
- I set the record straight every day.
  - Maimone: We went through a 7% budget reduction plan – we implemented that plan. What was presented to the BOG was only a portion of that. The annual allocation requests are going through right now – the Planning Council and the Cabinet has made a strategic aim to focus our money back into the academic experience for the students. We are very careful not to make any changes that we can’t sustain over time. It’s a strategy to focus in on whatever monies are available – those dollars will be infused back into the system.
- I think you will see on the academic side some relief soon. They asked us to hold back 10%. At this point, they are not taking that entire 10%. So we will have some money to put back to things. My instructions are that that will go primarily to the academic experience for the students. It is for the Provost and deans to makes these decisions.
  - Lugo: I think the problem as it is perceived is that the way it is presented is that we lost no faculty and that is wrong. We lost faculty – last year, we were told we lost 11 faculty in CAS. That I think is the perception we are complaining about.
- I understand that. We were putting out very directly last year how many sections we would lose, etc. What the press picked up was the latest set of numbers and that got out there. It was at that point that Erskine said we’re only taking administrative cuts. So we gave him more administrative cuts. Again, I know there have been faculty losses. I can’t control what is picked up by the media at a BOG event or how GA presents it to the BOG. Does that make sense? I understand completely what you say. You talk to your neighbors, they think this is all good.
- Thanks.

2. President of the Senate McKinney

- O. Max Gardner Award
An email went out from Sharon Lindgren.
We have no nominations!
It’s important that we nominate someone from this campus.

- Messer: Are we going to do anything about the health care?
- My action is that I am going to try to get together with all the staff council and faculty senate presidents.
  And then try to determine the audience to address these issues.
  - Graham: Olympia Snow is supporting the Senate Health Bill – maybe someone can address the tax consequences for us? Mark – if you could run the numbers and bring it back to us, I would really appreciate it.
- If any of you want to work with me on this, please send me an email.

- Health Insurance
  - My father lost his job when he was 62, which required drastic family changes. So I am not an unbiased speaker on this topic but the information I will be presenting is true.
  - PPT presentation.
  - BCBS sent out this information a while ago.
  - Faculty Assembly discussed this at length at the last meeting.
  - In front of you, there is a printout of SC health insurance options (see page 19 of this PDF).
  - This was on the NBC Today show, talking about NC specifically.
  - Can anybody with more knowledge about BMI talk about it?
    - If you are extremely muscular, you will have a BMI in the negative.
    - Messer: The CDC does not use BMI as a valid tool.
    - Does the tobacco ban allow for chewing tobacco?
  - I think it is on tobacco products so chewing tobacco would be included in this ban.
    - Turrisi: BMI measures proportions of fat in your body. That’s a reasonable number.
    - Messer: The CDC does not recognize this measure.
    - Black: I don’t think the insurance company should be coming in and randomly testing you.
    - Gessner: This is being done elsewhere as a reward, here it is a punishment.
    - Lugo: What is wrong is the assumption is that we are all guilty until proven innocent.
    - Brubaker: How much are our rates going to go up to pay for all these people to go around and police us?
    - Jackson: Blue Cross has one of the highest administrative rates. Bob Greczyn makes 3.99m a year.
  - So children will be punished for the actions of their parents. As I understand this all, all of our records are no longer private because BCBS has opted out of HIPAA.
    - Graham: One of the reasons NC premiums are so high is because of the lobbyists. There are a lot of stupid things that NC is required to cover (chiropractics, etc.). That’s an opinion. Please keep this in mind.
  - I’d like to thank the fellow faculty members who helped me prepare this presentation. I could not find data on how much BCBS spent on PSAs against health care reform. I will be extremely extroverted on this issue – I don’t think we should sit back on this one. SC gets choices – why don’t we get choices? I am going to do my best to make sure the status quo will not stay the same. I think it is despicable – we need answers from BCBS or the Legislature.
    - Graham: We appreciate what you have done [applause]. The solution is buying insurance across state lines. To pursue this outcome, you will have to climb into bed with some unsavory people, who advocate competition. I do have to respect a free-market system. Let’s buy that SC insurance.
    - Messer: I am wondering what we are going to do as a group? It would be great to know how much weight we have as a UNC System. It is illegal to organize in NC. Could we ask the chancellors to write letters to the governor?
    - Chancellor: Bruce sent this to me and I sent it to Erskine Bowles. I know Erskine already expressed concern about the benefits issue. He is making a presentation to the Joint Education Committee this afternoon. Hopefully we will know of it more. Let me also add, Brad Wilson is a member of the BOG and was in fact the head of the BOG for a number of years. He has often been very supportive of UNCW. I think, from my knowledge of Brad, he is a very savvy guy and I think that because we

have contacts with him and because Erskine has an obvious relationship with him that there are ways to discuss this with Brad.

- Gessner: I think the fact that this is getting media coverage – I think by drawing attention to it, we make progress. Already there is backlash and this is just today.
- Gurganus: I share your concern but I would like clarification on whom we should be made at. We don’t have a BCBS policy now – it clearly said on the back of my card that BCBS is an administrator only. While I agree with all the statistics, it’s not altogether that we have a similar plan to those in the other states. I see this as a logical consequence of the State Legislature cutting off revenue streams. When Molly Broad first came, she said, much more eloquently, that the benefits suck. So let’s not, when we are looking at our dismay at this, it is not necessarily the private sector.
- It’s not going to do us any good to go after BCBS – we have to find the appropriate people in the Legislature and let them know that they let us down. Some people in other states are demanding rebates – I don’t think that will happen here.
- Chancellor: I think we need a better action plan. I can’t believe that this is really going to continue. I think Staff Senate and Faculty Assembly would be appropriate. I would look at all those groups and be as methodical and calm about is as as possible.
- I am not talking about unionizing here.
- Fleming: Before you spend a lot of time collecting a lot of data. The UNC System has been collecting a lot of data about this over the years. So that data is there, if you would like to get it from GA. As the chancellor said, this is a changing landscape. It is complicated, though. That’s why I would encourage you to look at the comparative data.
- I was just looking at the basics, the deductibles, the co-pays, etc.
- In regard to the State Health Plan, it does have its own Board of Trustees. There is a wealth of information between the trustees and the Legislature. The state put in over 300m to fill the hole after the mismanagement of the plan. Before you do go through too much research time, a lot of that is out there and I would be glad to assist you with that.
- I am concerned that we don’t have a choice. BCBS covers 96% of people who live in NC.
- Jackson: One of the reasons we don’t have a choice: we tried that before but because of our varying terrain, the companies pulled out.
- I just want to find out how SC can offer these different plans to their residents. One of my frustrations is that these are people we give a lot of money to each month and they can’t even return a phone call. To me, that speaks that they don’t care about the complaints we have.
- Gessner: I am listening to the complexity of it, which some of us don’t understand. For me the most important goal is creating awareness and not in an angry way. So just putting those facts out there, it’s going to make people aware that there is a problem.

3. Faculty Assembly Report: Raymond Burt

- [N.B. This presentation occurred third.]
- I will begin with a description of Faculty Assembly. It represents all 17 institutions. We are allowed to send a certain number of members, depending upon our institution size (four plus Faculty Senate President, who serves as ex officio, for UNCW). There are a president and executive council. They also set up task forces as necessary. Every member of the executive council chairs those task forces. Meetings are divided into two parts; during the first half, GA reports to us (same report that they make to the chief academic officers in many respects). I want to remind us to go back to the special order of the day – we are missing one representative.
- PDF presentation.
- Faculty Assembly's action plan this year. Erskine Bowles presented and said he was very proud of faculty during these budget cuts.
  - K-12 Education: Erskine says there will be no recovery if there aren’t improvements to K-12 education.
  - Online Education: The Sloan Foundation found that in terms of credit-hour education, the online courses that the system offers, if added up, would make it the 7th largest (in the system). We are better organized than the Phoenix system.
  - Retention: If you don’t retain students, you won’t grow.
Faculty Workload: They had been talking about faculty workload – discussions are about that would require a 4/4 workload. I don’t know if this will be an immediate issue.

Hate Crime Policies: There are some hate crime guidelines coming down, in response to an incident at NC State.

Bob Nelson’s report – A number of institutions (like us, for instance) reported no losses on the faculty side. The FA President said we need to gather a response to this report.

FA Would like to question the mission of online learning.

I encourage you to apply for the FA position we have open.

President McKinney: According to the Bylaws, I have to pick one from an existing nomination.

4. Budget Committee Chair Ed Graham

- [N.B. This presentation occurred fourth.]
- I will keep my remarks brief.
- My email address is edgraham AT uncw.edu.
- First, UNCW and the UNC System are currently under a BOG 4-year plan, capping raises of tuition and fees at 6.5%.
- A number of faculty incur expenses ourselves. It would be great if UNCW tracked these expenses so administration could take this data to stakeholders. A lot of faculty have already paid for conferences themselves.
- We are operating under Senate Bill 202. No raises for last year or this year – not sure how that impacts raises as a result of tenure and promotions.
  - President McKinney: I think those have gone through.
  - Cook: There is a way around that; you can access the retention pot if you get an offer in writing that is more than what you currently make.
- Tuition changes. We are authorized to increase tuition for 2010-11 for out-of-state students and graduate students. GA and BOG actions in the next month or two, they are largely unknown. In May 2010, there will be a short meeting that could change these tuition rules. So if we are assertive, we can make changes before the start of the 2010-2011 AY.
- Faculty concerns are with mandated fee increases. Dumas works with me on this. Fee increases might displace tuition increases. This is not the time to be proposing not easily defended new programs or enhancements.
- UNCW should keep track of additional expenses faculty have taken on in response to the modest salary reductions (i.e. furloughs).
- There was a lecturer in CAS that was let go. UNCW otherwise has been able to retain everyone else through reassignments. People really are important.
  - Turrisi: You’re talking about positions currently held?
- There were lots of recurring positions that were not renewed. But they were not permanent positions. We have fewer employees then we did last year.
- Keep in mind, additional budget cuts are possible, but the gravest portion of this particular budget and funding “correction” seems to have passed.
- I do return my phone calls and emails – and thanks for listening.

Committee reports

1. The University Curriculum Committee submits the following motion:

- [Motion 10-02-08] That the Senate approve the following recommendations:
  - Biology
    - Approve the establishment of a new option within the B.S. in Biology: The Biology Terrestrial and Freshwater Conservation Option (see UCC Form for BS in Conservation | Requirements for BS in Conservation)
  - Geography and Geology
    - Approve the establishment of a Geospatial Technology Minor (see UCC Form for Geospatial Technology Minor | Catalog Copy | Minor Description | Email)
Sociology & Criminology

- Approve the establishment of a “Minor in Criminology” (see CRM Minor | Letter to CAS | UCC Form for Minor | UCC Form for Name Change)
- [N.B. The remainder of the meeting adhered to the original agenda.]
- Any objections to considering this as one motion?
- Any discussion?
- [Motion 10-02-08] approved.

Old business

- No old business.

New business

- [Motion 10-02-09] Motion from Faculty Senate President McKinney: The UNCW rescind the fee for visitor parking on campus and allow visitor to park for free anywhere with the appropriate permit.
  - You probably got my email about the warning citations that went out – totally unnecessary. We have email. I don’t like the way that was handled, particularly with budget cuts; and we are told not to give out paper in classes.
  - I don’t think this sends a very positive message, having guest lecturers have to pay for parking.
    - Pullum: We need a second for this.
    - Cook: [Motion 10-02-09] seconded.
- Discussion?
  - Seidman: What do you mean by visitor?
- Any visitor.
  - Black: Chancellor, if we pass this, will anyone lose their job?
  - Jackson: [Motion 10-02-10] I move that this motion is moved to committee.
  - [Motion 10-02-10] seconded.
  - Discussion?
    - We should send it to the Parking and Transportation Committee.
    - Noland: That is not a Senate committee.
    - Black: Do we have the authority to do this?
    - Gurganus: We have the authority to recommend.
    - Posey: I suggest that the committee be the Steering Committee.
    - Gurganus: The motion on the floor is to refer.
  - [Motion 10-02-10] approved.

Announcements

- No announcements.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 3:37pm.
Tuesday, 8 September 2009
2:00 p.m., EB 162
Meeting 2010-01

Meeting called to order at 2:04pm.

Roll sign-in

- Attendance sheets were distributed.
- Absent:
  - Departmental senators: Ashe (English), Black (Physics & Physical Oceanography), Bourgeois (Information Systems & Operations Management), Clark (Dean, Business), Cordle (Dean, CAS), Fritzler (Randall Library), Hurst (Psychology), Jarosinski (School of Nursing), Lanier (Sociology & Criminology), McCann (Dean, Nursing), Moore (Dean, University College).

Approval of the May 2009 minutes

- May 2009 minutes were approved.

Special order of the day

1. Election of the Vice President, the Secretary, and the Steering Committee of the Senate (More information from Bylaws)

- Nominations open for Vice President.
  - Nomination for Steve Pullum.
    - Declined.
  - Nomination for Gabriel Lugo.
  - Andy Jackson, Motion from the floor [Motion 10-01-03]: Move that the nominations are closed and the secretary cast the ballot for Gabriel Lugo.
    - Motion [Motion 10-01-03] seconded and carried.
- Nominations open for Secretary.
  - Nomination for Liza Palmer.
  - Motion from the floor [Motion 10-01-04]: Move that the nominations are closed and the secretary cast the ballot for Liza Palmer.
    - Motion [Motion 10-01-04] seconded and carried.
- Nominations open for Steering Committee.
  - Nomination for Andy Jackson.
  - Nomination for Steve Pullum.
  - Nomination for Jennifer Horan.
  - Nomination for Kim Cook.
    - Declined.
  - Nomination for Patty Turrisi.
  - Motion from the floor [Motion 10-01-05]: Move that the nominations are closed and the secretary cast the ballot for Andy Jackson, Steve Pullum, Jennifer Horan, and Patty Turrisi.
    - Motion [Motion 10-01-05] seconded and carried.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo

- Welcome to the start of a new academic year.
- Right now, we have not had hurricanes but we have had several hundred cases of H1N1.
  - Mostly, pretty mild from what I am hearing. Students are just not very aware of these things – they are
still around campus coughing. So please keep encouraging them about healthy habits in enclosed spaces.

We’re doing the best we can with that. Washington State has thousands of cases. We have more than other reports from the other UNC campuses, maybe because we started earlier. My next worry is when rush starts, which is next week.

- **Budget.**
  - It looks like the next two years we’ll be seeing more of the same.
  - The budget forums were last week; if you couldn't attend, you can access the slide presentations on the Budget Office site ([http://www.uncw.edu/ba/finance/Budget/index.html](http://www.uncw.edu/ba/finance/Budget/index.html)).
  - The faculty meeting last week was celebratory so not the appropriate time to discuss the budget.
  - We are continuing to stress basic principles. Last year, when we lost $12 million from our budget, we came up with the principles that guide us. You’ll recall that we decided to protect the academic experience for our students. Increasingly we have little left – it’s getting harder to protect that core. We are going to try to maintain that as much as possible.
  - The *News & Observer* is covering the cuts more than the *Star News*.
    - If you read those articles and read the editorial after Erskine Bowles visited the Editorial Department last week, if you read all that, what you will see is in response to all of our understandable wailing that this is causing larger classes, fewer sections, the response is, "So what?"
      - Kim Cook: It’s worse than so what, it’s vicious.
  - Erskine Bowles has taken the tack that part of the way to save money is to cut administrative costs and administrators. We all might go hurrah, but that is a pretty slippery term. If we just had people in classrooms and we didn’t have IT people, or library people, or counseling people, your jobs would be a lot harder. This is particularly hard for UNCW to negotiate – we are already the 2nd or 3rd most administratively efficient campus:
    - Systemwide, 28% administration versus 24% faculty.
    - UNCW: 16% administration versus 32% faculty.
  - We were on the right track already but it doesn’t give us a lot of flexibility that the other campuses have, as far as cuts.
  - Questions? We’ll get through this – we always do, and I thank you for your patience.

1. President of the Senate McKinney

- **Candidate’s letter in RTP Document.**
  - PPT Presentation.
  - There is confusion surrounding the RTP letter.
  - What we all really what to do is insure that the applicant has the best chance in the RTP process; if a letter from the candidate and/or the department chair will facilitate that, then we should consider it.
    - Ken Gurganus: Whatever changes we make today will not be in effect this year – I defer to the administration on the actual process for change.
  - Let’s try to have a constructive discussion about this.
  - Floor ceded to Craig Galbraith, Chair of RTP Committee.
    - This came up as an important issue last year with the previous Provost.
    - We talked about this in the RTP Committee at length. It was our feeling that the narrative was embodied in the application.
    - It was our recommendation to Steering that everyone has a narrative in the context of the list of accomplishments. Our general feeling is again that this [a separate letter] created an additional burden on the faculty.
    - Our recommendation last year was not to change but that the Faculty Senate address some of the language that addresses this.
  - Maybe we need to define “narrative.”
    - Steve Pullum: In the last five years, has anyone supplied a separate document?
    - Galbraith: If there were, less than 5%.
    - Meghan Sweeney: I didn’t do a [separate] narrative but at the last minute, I was told to include one -- but it did not take the letter form.
    - Those of us going up this year have been told to write a three-page narrative – it seems very
important to say whether we do it at this point and we haven’t done it, or don’t do it and we have.

- Galbraith: In the Faculty Handbook, it certainly does not say what the form of this narrative is – and certainly not three pages long. We can change the definition without changing the process -- nothing specifies that it be a separate document, three pages in length, etc.
- I think we need to make this optional at this point, given the timing.
- Martin Posey: Faculty have been advised to put this in. I think this is a definitional component – it’s not only a matter of getting ready for it, in our department, they are already in because we ask for them two weeks in advance for review – I think we should talk about this and decide what we want for next year.
- Lou Buttino: When I view a narrative from my faculty, I see it as a story – I would like an opportunity for the faculty to speak for themselves. To me, they are enjoyable to read.
- Gurganus [subbing for Freeze]: I agree with everything that has been said, but eventually, we do need to change the language. The Handbook does give a prescribed format – Academic Affairs needs to make sure that all the candidates adhere to the format. So if we truly want faculty to have more room to express themselves, we need to include that in the prescribed format.
- Dan Noland: I don’t understand what the candidate writing a separate letter is going to do? Doesn’t the chair already do that? Why should we ask the poor candidate to do it in addition to everything else?
- Russ Herman: Ken, if we change the prescribed format, do we need to send those changes up the chain?
- We are already reviewing credentials in our dept, I would hate to go back and say to the candidates you didn’t need to do it. So we have to be careful this year so that this isn’t an unusual year.
- The candidate does not have an opportunity to synthesize all of his/her work in the application. If the department chair is the person responsible for this and the chair doesn’t understand what the candidate is doing or there are conflicts between the chair and the faculty member, then they may not be portraying the candidates as they should. This is more a list of accomplishments.
- Galbraith: I probably have reviewed 400 applications in five years. We had this discussion for hours last year. If you take this as a list of accomplishments, it would be a vita. The vast majority of these applications, there is a narrative that comes through in the different sections – the narrative embodied in the list of accomplishments is far more illuminating. I think it will be looked at far more seriously than a separate document of three pages and a list of accomplishments.
- James Reeves: If after a chair writes a recommendation, and the senior faculty, the option of writing the narrative should be there if the candidate feels that their story has not been told. So we might want to say there is an opportunity for the candidate to do that if they feel they are not well represented.
- Can I suggest that we refer this to committee? And allow people to submit their narratives this year, if they have done so?
- Buttino: I think it is too late to submit a narrative after the letters have been written and sent off. I think we should change the prescribed format to allow for more flexibility.
- Noland: Where did this come from?
- President McKinney: There have been a number of inconsistencies that have brought this about.
- Galbraith: A little more serious than that – because some candidates have been told that Academic Affairs would not accept their applications without the narrative.
- Posey: I move that we refer this to committee to review on the basis of these discussions whether we should have a separate letter and then bring it back to Senate -- maybe the RTP Committee?
- Didn’t we already do that?
- Galbraith: I would recommend that this be a separate committee as RTP is autonomous and doesn’t make policy – we review the packets. I’m not sure this is the right place to make policy decisions.
- Kathleen Berkeley: This came about from a joint committee under Provost Cavenaugh and the Steering Committee. If this is a clean up, perhaps we should follow the previous process to make sure that we are following established procedure.
- Posey, Motion from the floor [Motion 10-01-06]: I move that we refer this to the Steering Committee to decide the right course of action.
- [Motion 10-01-06] seconded and approved.
President McKinney: The second issue is about what to do this year for people going up.

- Pullum: Provost, is it true that Academic Affairs would not take applications without a separate letter?
- Provost Barlow: We will take our action from you all. And in answer to Herman's question, if it is interpretation and clarification, it would not have to go to the Board of Governors.
- Jackson: My recollection is that this is part of the format document and not the document. The Board of Governors does not have to approve the format document. It’s an internal working document, approved by the Provost and the Chancellor after Faculty Senate.
- Reeves, Motion from the floor [Motion 10-01-07]: I move that the RTP Committee be instructed to accept applications in both forms for this academic year.
  - [Motion 10-01-07] seconded.
  - Discussion:
    - Would that bring up any challenges from a candidate who either did the letter or didn’t do the letter and didn’t get the result they wanted?
    - Gurganus: I might suggest that there be another committee that be instructed and that would be the Hearings Committee. One of the bases a candidate can appeal is materials procedure irregularity. I am not saying what the issue is to be, but if we are going to instruct the RTP Committee, include the Hearings Committee because they are also responsible for this.
    - Noland: Somehow from last year to this, we have changed who we are. I wish people would quit sending out directives unless it goes through the bodies that have the purview to do that.
    - Provost Barlow: Did you have irregularities last year?
    - Galbraith: No, this only happened after all the decisions had already been made last year.
    - I’m concerned that this didn’t get to your committee last year because we were instructed to do this then, too.
    - Provost Barlow: So you did have this last year but it wasn’t a factor?
    - Gabriel Lugo: Why did the Center for Teaching Excellence give these workshops? Where did the "three pages" comes from?
    - All the guidelines and formatting came from the Center for Teaching Excellence.
    - Christopher Gould: That is incorrect; this came about from a memo sent out by Provost Chapman. The guidelines came from the School of Education. They came out not as prescribed but as a guideline. It is not true that the Center for Faculty Leadership or the Center for Teaching Excellence imposed these guidelines.
    - Are we talking about this semester or academic year?
  - [Motion 10-01-07] approved.

- Digital RPT document.
  - Galbraith: Digital Measures -- one of the advantages of being Chair of the RTP Committee is that we hear things somewhat authoritatively -- RTP documents, we have heard, starting next year, must come through Digital Measures.
  - Vice Provost McFarland: Absolutely not true. The request was could we create a custom form in Digital Measures that would spit out in a Word document all the necessary data for RTP?.
  - President McKinney: I just heard about this from other campuses so was bringing it as something for us to consider.
- Policy on donors who want “strings” attached to donations.
  - We will have a report on this later in the year.
- Send new senators names to Liza Palmer.
  - Department chairs, please send your new senators' names to Liza Palmer (palmerl AT uncw.edu).

3. Associate Vice Chancellor for Advancement Marla Rice Evans

- PPT Presentation.
  - Regarding the strings-attached donations, we are with you as far as having less strings as they make it hard to
make the donor’s wishes accommodated.
- 35% of the faculty support UNCW; typically it is 28% at other public campuses.
- We want to reach approximately 75% of our goal before we go public.
- Questions?
  - You skipped over the public phase – what will that look like?
  - That’s when we know what our final goal is and we will hit the road with the Chancellor and the Provost – it’s when we try to get the remainder of our gifts. Marketing and Communications will have a website that rolls out.
  - Buttino: Can you explain what the Faculty Excellence funds mean?
    - They’re not really funds – ours is not very different from other campuses. So the schools and the different departments decide what scholarships they need. It’s just categories so we know how to decide what we need to raise money for – it’s like buckets. Now we all know, at the end of the campaign, not everything that we wanted will be funded. This is a guide through this very complex process – in the end, you can’t talk a donor into funding what you want. You try to guide them to support what resonates with them.
  - Shannon Silva: Before you get to the public phase, what percentage would we be at?
  - 75% would be the best for us. 72% or 73% would work, too.
    - Cook: I want to tell you how much we appreciate what you guys in your office do. A lot of it is invisible – the telethons, working with donors – I just wanted to let you know that we appreciate it.
  - You are so nice – thank you. We are working on communicating better – this is your campaign, so if you have any ideas please share them with us.

Committee reports

1. The Faculty Senate Steering Committee makes the following motions, amending the Bylaws (insertions and deletions):

   - **[Motion 10-01-01] Basic Studies Committee**
     
     **Duties:** To review existing and proposed content of Basic Studies curriculum and catalog copy. To coordinate efforts to refine Basic Studies offerings to promote the academic mission of the university. To work with academic units to ensure that Basic Studies courses are offered on a reasonable and regular basis.

     **Membership:** Nine faculty members, including at least four from the College of Arts and Sciences and at least one from each of the professional schools, and two other from the faculty at large. Term of membership shall be three years with staggered term so that one-third of the committee terms expire in a given year. A member may serve a second consecutive term. At the initial Fall meeting the Committee shall elect a vice-chair who will normally assume the role of chair in the following year. The chief academic officer, the Dean of the University College, and a representative from the library faculty, and the Early College Liaison shall be ex-officio non-voting members.

     - Any questions?
     - **[Motion 10-01-01] approved.**

   - **[Motion 10-01-02] University Curriculum Committee**
     
     **Duties.** To review all proposals for the following: the establishment, dissolution, division, or consolidation of academic departments or other degree-granting entities; the establishment or dissolution of academic degrees, including majors, minors, and certificate programs; the revision of academic degrees when these revisions directly affect any academic unit outside of the revising department's school or college; policies for maximum and minimum hours required for majors, minors, and certificates; total number of hours required for graduation; basic studies requirements; university-wide competency requirements; course prefixes; any curricular conflicts between schools and/or colleges; and other general curricular policies which have total university impact. The committee shall submit all such proposals, along with the committee's recommendations, to the Senate for consideration. [Revised January 2001; January 2005. See
[A description of the process of curricular change is found in the Faculty Handbook.]

**Membership.** Nine faculty members, including at least four from the College of Arts and Sciences and at least one from each of the professional schools, and two others from the faculty at large. Term of membership shall be three years with staggered terms so that one-third of the committee terms expire in a given year. A member may serve a second consecutive term. At the initial Fall meeting the Committee shall elect a vice-chair who will normally assume the role of chair in the following year. The chief academic officer, the Director Dean of the University College, and a representative from the library faculty, and the deans of the professional schools and college (or their delegates) shall be ex-officio non-voting members. [revised April, 2001. See previous membership.]

- Any discussion?
- [Motion 10-01-02] approved.

**Old business**

- No old business.

**New business**

- Budget and Convention Travel for Assistant Professors.
  - I received several emails from assistant professors, worried about not being able to travel to conventions and how this will affect their progress to tenure.
  - It is my understanding that funds have been released to the departments.
    - Charles Maimone: There is still an approval process – the chair and dean must approve.
  - What we are informally doing in our department is privileging travel for junior faculty – senior faculty are taking a break from travel in favor of our junior colleagues.
    - Cook: Academic Affairs put out a call for requests for help with travel for assistant professors. The deadline was September 1st and we were told we would hear back in mid-September. Is that still the case?
    - Provost Barlow: Yes – we received them all and are working through them right now.

**Announcements**

- No announcements.

**Adjournment**

*Meeting adjourned at 3:28pm.*
Tuesday, 20 April 2010
2:00 p.m., EB 162
Meeting 2010-08

Meeting called to order at 2:04pm.

Roll sign-in

- Attendance sheets were distributed. If you don't sign them, email Liza Palmer (palmerl AT uncw.edu).
- Absent:
  - Departmental senators: Barlow (Interim Provost), Black (Physics), Blundo (Social Work), Bourgeois (Information Systems & Operations Management), Brown (Health & Applied Human Sciences), Burgh (Philosophy & Religion), Clark (Dean, Business), Cordle (Dean, CAS), Dumas (Economics & Finance), Evers (Accountancy & Business Law), Glew (Management), Graham (Economics & Finance), Hall (Social Work), Hungerford (Psychology), Hurst (Psychology), Lapaire (Foreign Languages & Literatures), McCann (Dean, Nursing), Meyer (Marketing), Miller (Sociology & Criminology), Moore (Dean, University College), Roberts (School of Nursing), Roer (Dean, Graduate School), Shynett (Music), Stapleton (Biology & Marine Biology), Swafford (Elementary, Middle, & Literacy Education), Turrisi (Philosophy & Religion), Usilton (History), Wetherill (Interim Dean, Education), Wray (Information Systems & Operations Management).
  - Committee chairs: Bingham (Student Affairs), Chandler (Bookstore), Kemppainen (Research), Murrell (University Curriculum), Pemberton (Faculty Handbook).

|Special Addendum:| Subsequent to the April meeting, Gabriel Lugo, Elections Officer, reported the results of the election on May 10, 2010 to Steering Committee:|

**Autonomous Committee Membership Results 2010**

In order to determine the memberships of the three autonomous faculty committees for the 2010-2011 academic year, an election was recently conducted. The results of the election were reviewed by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee in its regular meeting 10 May 2010 and are as listed below, where recently (re-)elected committee members are indicated using blue font and continuing committee members are indicated using black font:

**Hearings Panel (HP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division I</th>
<th>Division II</th>
<th>Division III</th>
<th>Division IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spaulding, Mark</td>
<td>Stapleton, Ann</td>
<td>Combs, Sue</td>
<td>Dumas, Christopher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waxman, Barbara</td>
<td>Vetter, Ron</td>
<td>MacKain, Sally</td>
<td>Hargrove, Tracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweeney, Meghan</td>
<td>Simmons, Susan</td>
<td>Willis, Cecil</td>
<td>Steele, Marcee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berliner, Todd</td>
<td>Frierson, Dargan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kemppainen, Jeanne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Professional Relations Committee (FPRC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuing</th>
<th>Continuing</th>
<th>Continuing</th>
<th>Continuing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noland, Dan</td>
<td>Pabst, Ann</td>
<td>McNamee, Steve</td>
<td>Thomas, Carol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgerton, Clyde</td>
<td>Lugo, Gabriel</td>
<td>Sawrey, Kim</td>
<td>Badarinathi, Ravija</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furia, Philip</td>
<td>Ballard, Tim</td>
<td>Sheridan, Earl</td>
<td>Evers, Pamela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mollenoer Lynn</td>
<td>Willey, Joan</td>
<td>Albert, Midori</td>
<td>Smith, Robert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Barth, Tom

† The FPRC is required to include all professorial ranks among its members. No associate professor was slated to continue on the FPRC. Following the rotation prescribed in the bylaws, Division III should have the responsibility of electing an associate professor. However, both FPRC members from Division III were continuing; hence, there was no FPRC election in Division III this year. Accordingly, as prescribed in the bylaws, Division IV was assigned the responsibility of electing an associate professor to the FPRC.

Committee on Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (CRTP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuing</th>
<th>Continuing</th>
<th>Continuing</th>
<th>Continuing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fonvielle, Chris</td>
<td>Gurganus, Kenneth</td>
<td>Keith, Julian</td>
<td>Moallem, Mahnaz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brunson, Deborah

‡ The FPRC is required to include all professorial ranks among its members. No associate professor was slated to continue on the FPRC. Following the rotation prescribed in the bylaws, Division III should have the responsibility of electing an associate professor. However, both FPRC members from Division III were continuing; hence, there was no FPRC election in Division III this year. Accordingly, as prescribed in the bylaws, Division IV was assigned the responsibility of electing an associate professor to the FPRC.
‡ As given in the CRTP Table above, the term of Dr. Waxman concludes in 2009. Inadvertently, the CRTP ballot for Division I indicated that there were two open positions, when there was only one. Dr. Lisa Pollard, the highest “vote-getter,” was elected to the position.

Faculty Assembly

Approval of the March 2010 minutes

- March 2010 minutes were approved.

Executive Session

- In accordance with the provisions in the Faculty Handbook, we will go into Executive Session for the purpose of considering a candidate for an honorary degree.
  - Faculty Senate considered and voted on one nomination for an honorary degree.
  - The candidate received the requisite 2/3 favorable vote.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo

- Good afternoon. I had an email from Madeleine Bombeld in the library – it's that time of year, the library starts its 24/7 schedule this weekend. Numbers from midnight until 6am are increasing. Hang in there – only a couple of more weeks to go.
- Our basketball coach search has ended. It was hard for many of you to read criticisms in the paper and news media and probably to listen to your neighbors. The athletic director was always clear that we weren’t starting the search until the end of the basketball season. We ended up with a great coach. I imagine you were surprised by the salary. So I want to talk about that. Let me start off with an idiom – what I discovered in this search, this
is the market. It is what it is. Before this, we were in the CAA – we were next to last in salaries. This puts us in the middle. Hofstra hired someone in the range of $600,000. We could not have gotten anyone with head coaching experience for less than that. And that was simply a decision that had to be made. Whether we agree with that is another issue. There are different planetary perspectives on all of this. But I do what to assure you this is not state money – you might disagree with this. But it is not coming from the same coffers for the academic side of things.

Questions?
- Steve Pullum: Was that salary set by you?
- The athletic director suggested it, and I approved it.
- Lou Buttino: Given all the budget cuts and no salary increases, don’t you think that we should take a stand and set a good example and put our money behind academics?
- I finally viewed this as an investment. It is a market-driven process and that market has changed dramatically over the last few years.
- James Reeves: If we ever do achieve national notoriety again, I hope it focuses on how we do athletics right. That we value athletes for their mental skills as well. There is a real opportunity for us to blow our whistle.
- Absolutely.
- Michael Seidman: You said it was an investment – but what kind is it? When people invest, they usually think there will be some kind of return so I wonder how you see this in the future?
- I think this will overturn all the emails I received from alums saying they would never give money to our university again. You would not believe the vitriolic passion.
- If the funds are not state, where are they coming from?
- Student fees, auxiliary funds, trust funds.
- Aaron Wilcox: Are we going to have to increase our subsidization of athletics to support this salary? We have taken serious cuts and cost-saving measures over the last few years. So I would just like some assurance that we aren’t going to take from what is already so minimal.
- Aaron, I have received such positive response from donors over the last couple of days that I am pretty much assured it will be a separate entity. Kelly has depleted – has gone deep into her trust funds for this.
- Wilcox: I am looking at the larger issue – are we going to have to increase subsidies and student fees to cover this?
- I don’t think so.
- Peter Fritzler: The coach has a reputation that he is flighty – are you sure he will stay?
- We have built penalties into his contract in increments. If he brings us to the Final Four, we won’t be complaining.
- But what if he is 0 for 0 and we want to fire him? We have to pay him still, plus the salary for the reassigned coach.
- He has a reputation for turning teams around.
- Kim Cook: I hope that works out for us.
- So do I.
- Regarding the budget – the Governor came our with her budget this afternoon. She is recommending a 3.9% cut to universities. We just got Erskine Bowles' response. Should I read it? It will be on the website soon (Link to PDF of Bowles' response).
- I think the key there is how often he mentioned “academic core” – I don’t think he has done this before.
- Mark Lanier: The net impact for the second year will be about 2% up on what was projected. But the university will have to absorb the 3.9% cut.
- This is a process and you all know that. The Governor’s budget comes first. Then the legislative ones.
- Lanier: The calendar suggests that in the middle of May, the Senate will pass a budget, and the House in June, in time for June 30th (in place by the end of the fiscal year). They are trying to rush the process in part because they know they don’t have the money and they can make those tough decisions and in part because it is an election year.
- I have been having a series of wonderful discussions on the Provost’s situation, which will segue into Bruce's presentation.

2. President of the Senate McKinney
This isn’t on the agenda because it came up yesterday. There were some strong opinions on either side [of the issue to make Cathy Barlow Provost permanently] – I know from talking to a large number of faculty, I know the Chancellor has done this, too -- this is what we decided we would like to do. One thing about Cathy, she does not want to be appointed – she wants to know the faculty is behind her. Some faculty yesterday said she doesn’t really have a vision. We are going to ask Cathy if she were selected as provost, what would her vision be for the university. She is going to prepare a response in the next few days, which we will circulate. We will then host some open forums so Cathy can discuss her vision with attendees. Personally, I have worked with Cathy and Chapman, it’s day and night. I have a lot of admiration for Cathy.

Chancellor: Can I expand on that? People didn’t say Cathy had no vision – they asked what her vision was? When I asked her to be interim, I did not charge her to do this. Cathy is such a modest person, I think she would have thought it presumptuous to go out and set a vision for the university. I would modify the process just a bit – I think vision is a grandiose, overused term. I have asked her to prepare a statement, what her priorities are to work on with the faculty for the next several years. And she was the one who offered to be open to questions from the faculty. I know it is a busy time of year but I hope you will take the time to participate.

Seidman: I think this is a wonderful idea – what is the post-forum procedure, though?

Chancellor: Good question. I will ask for feedback – you can email me or if you prefer we can set up an anonymous form.

Seidman: Will there be a committee or will you be talking with Bruce only about this?

I do think we need some direct communication with faculty. There will be faculty input. There will be some accounting on what the university feels about that.

Seidman: It seems like the procedure is not clear on how we are going to do this. How will the positive and negative forms be considered?

Messer: She is going to be giving her presentation in the next few weeks while everyone is still here and then we send you emails?

Yes.

Messer: My concern is that no one is going to participate because it is the end of the year. I think senators need to communicate back to their departments about how important it is to participate.

I know we are all busy but I think we can all find time for something as important as this.

Seidman: And there will be a statement, if for some reason we couldn’t go?

Chancellor: Yes. And to speak to the procedure, if we went through a search process, you would communicate your thoughts to me but it wouldn’t be a vote. It would be my decision. I went into this in every discussion solely for the purpose of finding out at Cathy’s request whether the faculty wants this. Because the last thing that would be good for the provost, chancellor, and university would be to impose a provost that the faculty doesn’t want. That would compromise her effectiveness. I know on any issue there is a variety of opinions. I will take the faculty response into the highest possible consideration.

William Fleming: Many times in searches, the committee frames the feedback as strengths and weaknesses. And be advised about being careful what you put in email – we can only protect it so far.

Reeves: I also know that the Provost wouldn’t take the position if she didn’t feel like she had the strong support of the faculty. She has said, I will not take this position if the faculty aren’t four square behind me. So this process will be important not just to the Chancellor but to the Provost herself. I think Sarah’s point about senators communicating back to their departments is important. Now is the time to make the decision about a national search.

Mark Spaulding: Why isn’t this a process that couldn’t wait until the fall?

Reeves: I think the process for a national search needs to be set up now, if we want to proceed with it.

Spaulding: If we decide that we don’t want Cathy, then a search process will be decided over the summer when we are not here?

Reeves: I don’t think we can do it properly if we don’t start now.

Spaulding: I think that’s right – especially based on the last search.

Buttino: I am concerned about voting electronically. Emails are not nuanced or too nuanced. Why can’t we have a committee made up of junior faculty, students, etc., and then have them interview Cathy and then have them make a recommendation to the Chancellor?

I think that is an excellent idea – we can move forward with that.
Seidman: How are we going to choose a committee?
Patricia Lerch: Can we do this without advertising?
Chancellor: Yes.
Fleming: Yes, you can – because the Board of Trustees would approve an exception. As the Chancellor mentioned earlier, a tier 1 level position, only the Chancellor has the authority to make a recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

- I can get back to you on the selection process for the committee.
- **PPT presentation.**

  a. Faculty Handbook Update

  - The Faculty Handbook should be done in early May – we will send it out then and in August, and then we can vote on it in the first fall meeting.

  b. RTP Survey

  - Regarding the RTP survey – we got a lot of good input from faculty. We don’t want to rush this through. We’ll send it out in August and then put together a committee.

  c. Parliamentary Training and Senator Handbook Training/Lunch

  - If you know someone who is probably going to be a senator, please encourage them to attend this training. Right now we have about 20 and I would like to have about 40 attendees. I need a count by Friday for the lunches.

  d. Faculty Committee Preference Survey

  - The response to this survey is typically bad – make sure people who need service experience respond to it.

3. Denise DiPuccio, International Programs

- **PPT presentation.**
- Faculty will receive summer salary to develop courses with an international focus.
- Two priorities this year – the new University Studies curriculum and preferred geographic areas.
- The bonus is that this dovetails with faculty research areas.
- Two grantees (senators) spoke about their research – Donyell Roseboro and Sangmoon Kim.
- Seven new classes will offered next year, as a result of these grants, that have a global context.
- Questions?
  - Gabriel Lugo: As Elections Officer, can we move the last agenda item up now?
- President McKinney: Any objections?

4. Marla Rice-Evans, Associate Vice Chancellor University Advancement

- [This portion of the meeting occurred after the Special Election business.]
- **PPT presentation.**
- Questions?
  - Jess Boersma: Will you be revisiting those athletic donors now we have a new coach?
  - Cook: Our students are better off for this so thank you for all you do.

**Committee reports**

1. Kim Cook, Faculty Assembly Report

- [This portion of the meeting occurred after Bollinger's presentation.]
- I’ll be short. I prepared a short document. ([Link to Cook's document in Word](#)).
Faculty Assembly helps to interact with General Administration. One of the topics we have been talking about is the State Health Plan (SHP).

- Faculty Assembly resolved to endorse the Academic Core white paper. ([Link to Academic Core white paper in Word](#)).

Questions?
- Buttino: When does the SHP expire?
- I believe it is 2012 – maybe the same year as the SACS review.
- Buttino: Shouldn’t we have conversations before it expires?
- We as a faculty at one institution won’t have a lot of input in the conversations between the state and the vendors.
- President McKinney: I am still waiting to hear from the SHP about who and how they will do the testing.
- Cook: If you are interested in becoming a Faculty Assembly delegate, I encourage you to do so. Thank you!
- President McKinney: You have to be creative when dealing with the SHP. All students have to have health insurance now. It is actually cheaper to send your spouse to school and get insurance that way – I looked into it.

2. David Bollinger, University Advancement Committee

- [This portion of the meeting occurred after Rice-Evans' presentation.]
- Basic charge we were given was how to deal with gifts with strings.
- What we have so far is a list of criteria generated by faculty – still a work in progress. The challenge is that we don’t want to scare away potential donors either.
- Questions?

Old business

- No old business.

New business

1. Special Election for Faculty Assembly Delegate

- [This portion of the meeting occurred after DiPuccio's presentation.]
- President McKinney: Burt’s term is ending and Reilly is going to be on reassignment in the spring so we need to replace her. We get nominations from the floor.
- Parliamentarian: The Senate nominates, the faculty elect.
- President McKinney: Any nominations?
- Pullum: We moved this up then?
- President McKinney: Do I have unanimous consent to move it up?
  - Faculty: Yes.
- President McKinney: Nominations for the three-year term.
  - Nominations: Raymond burt (seconded).
- President McKinney: Nominations for a sub for Reilly for spring 2011?
  - Noland: If I recall, we can pull a sub from prior delegates.
- President McKinney: Exactly right – I can look through that information.

Announcements

1. Randall Library's Seahawk Study Moonlight Breakfast: Call for Faculty, Staff, and Administrative Volunteers

- Liza Palmer: Randall Library will be hosting its first ever midnight breakfast for students during finals week. We are actively seeking administrative, faculty, and staff volunteers to help serve at the breakfast, which will be 9pm-11pm on Wednesday, April 28. Please consider volunteering; interested volunteers should contact Rachel Radom (radomr AT uncw.edu).
- President McKinney: This will be the last meeting of the academic year.
2. [Announcement via email after the April 20th meeting:
   - Test Drive the New Randall Library Website:

   Before classes start in the fall we will be launching a brand-new version of our website. **Take a look at our beta version of our redesigned homepage & give us your feedback.**

   Note: Many of the secondary pages are still under construction & will be finalized before fall. Some of the links in our new navigation don’t work because we haven’t created those pages yet. So, check back during the summer for progress!

   We have redesigned our site and our navigation with the intention of making the things you do on our site, such as searching for articles, searching our catalog, finding our hours, course reserves, specific resources, and learning about research easier. We are also aligning our site visually with the new UNCW look, such as the **Cameron School of Business’** site.

   It's still a work in progress & so we would appreciate **your thoughts** so far about the new site.]

**Adjournment**

*Meeting adjourned at 3:45pm.*

Minutes respectfully submitted by Liza Palmer (palmer AT uncw.edu).
Tuesday, 16 March 2010
2:00 p.m., EB 162
Meeting 2010-07

Meeting called to order at 2:03pm.

Roll sign-in

- Attendance sheets were distributed. If you don't sign them, email Liza Palmer (palmerl AT uncw.edu).
- Absent:
  - Departmental senators: Black (Physics), Blundo (Social Work), Bourgeois (Information Systems & Operations Management), Brown (Health & Applied Human Sciences), Clark (Dean, Business), Cordle (Dean, CAS), DePaolo (Chancellor), Dumas (Economics & Finance), Fritzler (Randall Library), Hall (Social Work), Hines (Geography & Geology), Hungerford (Psychology), Hurst (Psychology), Jarosinski (School on Nursing), Lanier (Sociology & Criminology), McCann (Dean, Nursing), Moore (Dean, University College), Nice (Theatre), Shynett (Music), Spaulding (History), Swafford (Elementary, Middle, & Literacy Education), Turrisi (Philosophy & Religion), Wray (Information Systems & Operations Management).
  - Committee chairs: Bingham (Student Affairs), Bollinger (University Advancement), Chandler (Bookstore), Murrell (University Curriculum), Pemberton (Faculty Handbook).

Approval of the February 2010 minutes

- February 2010 minutes were approved.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo

- Floor ceded to Cathy Barlow, Interim Provost.
- Thank you to everybody – and please pass this on to colleagues. You made this real easy on someone like me.
- What went on on campus last week – we had an emergency exercise that involved three academic buildings. In this exercise, we had an active shooter, three hostages, a bomb. I think it was really good for us to go through that type of exercise. We had EMS teams here – the campus was full – firefighters, bomb squads, federal agencies. I wanted you to know that that went on – it was amazing, if there were hostages in Wagoner, how do you find out about it? Chief, do you have anything to add?
- Chief of Police: We walked away learning some things but ultimately with our confidence reinforced.
- Raymond Burt is in involved in our search for a new president.
- Raymond Burt: The Leadership Committee (about 25 people) is going to be reaching out to all the various constituents to see what qualities we would like to see in the next president.
- One of our Board of Trustees is on the search committee – Terry Coffey. So that is excellent for us. We also had a fair last week. We had a national columnist on campus. We had Photographic America; that display continues until March 31st. The science olympiad was this past Saturday. We also had the joint economic summit conference. I want to say the news coverage on at least four of these events was excellent. It’s nice to have positive news coverage.
- Science faculty had in the basic studies proposal lab course fees – we didn’t get the fee increase but we are going to have $50,000 increase in the permanent budget for labs.
- Legislative coverage – GA is going to send forth on tuition. They are proposing alternative legislation to the $200 increase. These will come back to the units. They have a good campaign going on – the universities have done enough, for the cuts. They list all the programs that were cut and that if we are cut more, this will result in an increase in class size and a decrease in section offerings.
- Last thing, Vision 20/20. You have heard this rumbling around. It is not a new strategic plan – it is a look at our current plan and how we can stretch it to accommodate new goals. I want to mention four committees: a mission committee will operationalize our mission; most powerful undergraduate experience committee;
graduation education committee; and our public relations committee.

- Questions?:
  - James Reeves: I think it is great they are doing this, regarding the cuts. But that means if we do get cut, we have to cut meat. Now is the time. We have to do that, if they say it.

2. President of the Senate McKinney

- **PPT presentation.**

  a. RPT Revisions, Narrative, etc.

  - Questions?
    - Lou Buttino: I disagree with your description of the narrative. It goes beyond what they already will be reporting on research, teaching, and service.
    - Sarah Messer: It also is the only place where they can write it in their own words and I think that is important.
    - Patricia Lerch: I think you are on the right track – how are you going to phrase the questions if you don’t know what to ask about?
  
  - The survey will be based on the input I get from faculty. It’s not going to be all forced choice – there will be room for elaboration in all the areas.
    - Buttino: The narrative is optional for the candidate but it is not optional for the RTP Committee to read them.
    - As I see it, it’s optional.
    - Jess Boersma: I thought there was an implication that to be consistent was to not read any of them. Optional is very problematic here.
  
  - Jimmy, didn’t you make a motion on this?
    - Reeves: Yes, optional that they be written, not that they be read.
    - Tiffany Gilbert: It would be nice to come to some sort of consensus decision about this, as someone who recently went up for reappointment.
    - David Gessner: I think at the chairs meeting, they supported the idea of the narrative.
      - Question: What chairs meeting was that?
  
  b. Healthcare update

  - They still have not selected a vendor to do the testing.
    - William Fleming: The online enrollment was designed without campus input so if you have comments or suggestions, I can’t help you with that. We do have: HR, on campus, is offering 11 face-to-face sessions. It’s not difficult to complete but it’s not totally intuitive either. The first session was last night – and we have ten more scheduled.

  c. Faculty handbook

  - Anne Pemberton has done an excellent job chairing this committee.

  d. Parliamentary Training and Senator Handbook

  - Excellent work from Lisa Theriault on this.
  - Questions?

**Committee reports**

1. Academic Standards Committee makes the following motion:

  - **[Motion 10-07-22]**
Current policy regarding reenrolling students and catalogue year for graduation requirements (page 81 of the 2009-2010 Undergraduate catalogue):

A student who enrolls at the University of North Carolina Wilmington during any academic year and who earns credit for work done during the year may graduate under the provisions of the entering catalogue or under any subsequent catalogue, provided all graduation requirements are completed within six years of the expiration date of the catalogue chosen. Catalogues are effective for one academic year, beginning with the fall term and expiring at the end of the summer term.

DRAFT OF REVISION—to be implemented fall 2011

A continuing student or a student returning from “on-leave” status who enrolls at the University of North Carolina Wilmington during any academic year and who earns credit for work done during the year may graduate under the provisions of the entering catalogue or under any subsequent catalogue, provided all graduation requirements are completed within six years of the expiration date of the catalogue chosen.

- Re-enrolling students who were academically eligible when they left UNCW may choose to enroll under the catalogue in place when they return, or they may enroll under a previous catalogue from a year in which they earned credit, provided all graduation requirements are completed within six years of the expiration date of the catalogue chosen.
- Re-enrolling students who have been academically dismissed or were academically ineligible when they left UNCW must enroll under the catalogue in effect when they re-enroll at UNCW.
- Catalogues are effective for one academic year, beginning with the fall term and expiring at the end of the summer term.

Anyone from Academic Standards want to say something?

- Academic Standards representative: Any questions?
  - Andy Jackson: Amendment [Motion 10-07-23]: “eligible or had earned at least 89 credit hours when... ” in first bullet and then next bullet “ineligible and had earned 88 or fewer credit hours when...”
    - [Motion 10-07-23] seconded.
    - Discussion:
      - Kemille Moore: I am just not sure why it is necessary in the first bullet because they have the option of choosing an earlier catalogue anyway.
      - Jackson: People who are seniors who are academically ineligible could also choose a new catalogue. In my view, the result would be if we leave as is, a senior would return and have potentially a large number of other hours because they would have to use another catalogue. I feel it is an unnecessary burden on the seniors. I often encounter students who are seniors who have dropped below the retention level in their senior year. I am not hugely invested in this but I just feel we should consider seniors.
      - Moore: I can understand that with the second bulleted item but not with the first bullet. So seniors can come back under another catalogue.
      - Carol Pilgrim: Another comment about the second bullet, we have students reenrolling down the line, by allowing these students to choose their catalogue, it may obligate departments to teach courses that are no longer on offer.
      - Reeves: I thought the caveat was that no catalogue older than six years is usable.
      - Pilgrim: We have some departments that change radically within the six-year window.
    - [Motion 10-07-23] approved.
  - [Motion 10-07-22] approved.

Old business

- No old business.

New business
1. Dean Robert Roer: The Five-Year Master’s option (more information in Word)

- Floor ceded to Dean Robert Roer.
- An issue was raised by the SACS compliance audit committee, were we devaluing the program with this option? The answer is no, because the students are doing the same coursework in an accelerated timeframe. In tandem, this is being brought to Senate and the Graduate Council. So it is informational at this point.
  - Dan Noland: SACS is frowning on these programs, in general?
  - No, there are thousands in operation right now.
  - Noland: You weren’t surprised by the question then?
- No, the question was really how do we maintain the standards? The only difference is that we admit the students into the Graduate School in their senior year.
  - Reeves: My faculty refuses to call this a five-year program because you are done when your faculty advisor says so. So we call it an accelerated program.
  - Question: Does a student going through these programs have the same number of total credit hours?
  - Yes.
  - Boersma: Has this taken into account the new University Studies requirements for the capstone, etc.? Yes, it shouldn’t be a problem for majors, who would already be satisfying those requirements.

2. Lt. James Watkins: Campus Security in light of University of Alabama Huntsville

- Floor ceded to Lt. James Watkins.
- PPT presentation.
- See the NC Department of Health and Human Services website for workplace violence warning signs.
  - Lerch: Do we have to know the address of our building when calling for emergency assistance?
- No, pretty much all the dispatchers are aware of the buildings now. It does help, though, if you know it. When you get back to your spaces, think about your emergency plans. Then call me – we want to help.
- Questions?
  - Boersma: I think there is some discrepancy between sheriffs and the city regarding dynamic entry procedures – what is that?
- We are the first responders on campus and we will get in the building as effectively as possible.
  - President McKinney: What do police think about arming students on campus?
- Think about it from my perspective: if I see a student on campus with a gun, I won’t have time to ask who the bad guy is.

3. Marla Rice Evans: University Advancement

- Not present.

4. Tom Rakes: Career Center
• **PPT presentation.**
• Choices is a free resource and the other two do cost.
• Email rakest AT uncw.edu if you would like an account in Seawork
• Questions?:
  - Jackson: How long can alumni participate?
• Indefinitely.
  - Michael Seidman: Do you have funding to support internships?
• That would be great if we could but no.
  - Seidman: Because it is my understanding that a lot of internships don’t pay.
  - Buttino: Well done, Tom – very impressive.
• Thank you. Email me at rakest AT uncw.edu if you have any questions.

**Announcements**

• President McKinney: Regarding Faculty Assembly, we haven’t met yet this year due to budget and weather. The next one is April 16th.
• [Announcement via email after the March 16th meeting:
  - Randall Library will be hosting the first-ever Seahawk Study Moonlight Breakfast and we’d like your support. We are looking for faculty and staff volunteers to serve food to students who are studying in the library during one night of final exams. Please read more below.

A great number of students take advantage of the 24-hour services offered at Randall Library during finals. During finals week at many institutions, it is common to find a "finals feast" or "moonlight breakfast." As students need a break from studying, and the university community wants to show support and engagement with students during a stressful time just prior to graduation, these events often include faculty, staff, and administration cooking or serving food to students for 1-2 hours during the late hours at a popular study spot. Running this search in Google will give you some idea of the number of institutions offering such events: *library finals breakfast site:.edu*

The Seahawk Study Moonlight Breakfast will be a great opportunity to talk to students about their concerns and academic experiences one-on-one. From 9pm-11pm on Wednesday, April 28, I would like to invite you to take part in showing support for our students during exams week.

Would you consider serving as a volunteer to help serve breakfast food to students? We will be serving foods such as pancakes, eggs, sausage, etc. to students who are in the library. It will be a very casual event – feel free to bring an apron! There will be two shifts of volunteers: 9pm-10pm and 10pm-11pm. If you are a night owl, as many of our students are, please consider volunteering! If you are interested in serving in this way, please email me, radomr AT uncw.edu, preferably before 6pm Friday, 4/16, with the shift you would like to volunteer. I am hoping to have at least 3 members from each area for each shift (3 administrators, 3 faculty, 3 staff for each hour).]

**Adjournment**

*Meeting adjourned at 3:48pm.*
Tuesday, 16 February 2010
2:00 p.m., EB 162
Meeting 2010-06

Meeting called to order at 2:05pm.

Roll sign-in

- Attendance sheets were distributed. If you don't sign them, email Liza Palmer (palmerl AT uncw.edu).
- Absent:
  - Departmental senators: Ashe (English), Bourgeois (Information Systems & Operations Management), Burgh (Philosophy & Religion), Buttino (Film Studies), Dennison (Health & Applied Human Sciences), Dumas (Economics & Finance), Evers (Accountancy & Business Law), Gilbert (English), Graham (Economics & Finance), Hines (Geography & Geology), Hurst (Psychology), Lapaire (Foreign Languages & Literatures), McMurray (Mathematics & Statistics), Messer (Creative Writing), Mount (Foreign Languages & Literatures), Pavill (School of Nursing), Silva (Film Studies), Turrisi (Philosophy & Religion), Wray (Information Systems & Operations Management).
  - Committee chairs: Bingham (Student Affairs), Bollinger (University Advancement), Chandler (Bookstore), Huntsman (Academic Standards), Kemppainen (Research), Murrell (University Curriculum).

Approval of the January 2010 minutes

- January 2010 minutes were approved.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo

   - Good afternoon, everyone.
   - Sorry I couldn’t come to the last meeting – I was out of town. I regretted that because I wanted to share with you the results of Erskine Bowles’ visit. It was the first time since he had started as president that he had had the time to visit the campus. I had been concerned that he hadn’t visited the campus in four years. What he had was a very clear and stark contrast with what it looked like four years ago. Four years ago he asked me, “Why does it look so scruffy?” In the interim, we had built or renovated 20 buildings on this campus. We walked everywhere on campus, during his visit this time. We started in the Fisher Center because he hadn’t seen that. We took a tour of the new Nursing building, at his request. We all put on our hard hats. Anywhere we went, particularly down Chancellor’s Walk, we bumped into faculty, the vice president of SGA, all the right people. He got a sense of what the campus was like. In fact, he said the fall Board of Governors meeting is supposed to be somewhere else "but I am moving it to here – I want to showcase UNCW. You can serve the same role as William & Mary in Virginia – I see what you are working towards. And – you need money to do that, don’t you?" He went back to his folks and said we need to work with them. Of course, fast forward a month, he announces he is leaving the presidency. So our conversation was in the context of what he could possibly do before he leaves his post. Obviously, he can’t make any promises beyond his stated interest to do that. And I know he wants to leave a continuing legacy so I think it is our job to help him figure out how UNCW can be a part of that.
   - One of our Board of Trustees is on the search committee. This will be tremendously important to UNCW. Erskine said he will stay on until the end of the calendar year (or leave sooner if someone is identified). It’s our job to position ourselves while he is in office and then, later this year, for the new person in office. We need to communicate our value to the state.
   - We have had close to a decade of work together. It’s 2010 and, like you, I am looking forward to where this university needs to go. I think 2020 is an important date. I want us to start envisioning where this university will be in 2020 and what kind of 20/20 vision we need to get us there. We set ourselves very bold goals seven years ago and, despite the economy, we have achieved our goals. With the provost, I have appointed a series of committees to help us think through the key issues to move us forward. You will be hearing more about that as
these committees do their work. It will be the same inclusive process as it was seven years ago. By the end of it, we will come out with a plan and we will live by that plan because that has been what helped us achieve our success.

- **Questions?**
  - James Reeves: One of those things that will affect the plan is who the new provost will be? Is there an update on that process?
  - I hope that at least most of us are in agreement – I don’t want to even think about it. Cathy has done an amazing job. We should all try to convince Cathy to stay in this post. I asked her to serve for two years initially, though.
    - Reeves: This has got to be a national search. This is a fabulous place and really unique so it is going to take a while to find the person that will fit well.
    - Jess Boersma: What is happening with UNC Tomorrow?
  - Thanks for that question. Erskine made his announcement on Saturday – he laid out his strategic action plan. We are going to execute, execute, execute on this. He plans on going ahead with it. That’s all I know.
    - Boersma: One of the things that you said is important is positioning ourselves – do you have a sense of how that relates to UNC Tomorrow?
  - As I have always said about UNC Tomorrow, unlike many of the campuses, we didn’t have to reinvent ourselves to respond to it – we were already doing most of it. Let me modify my answer to your question – he is talking about UNC Tomorrow still. But he is also talking about its corollary for him, the strategic action plan. Steve, do we have that on the web?
    - Vice Provost McFarland: No.
    - We’ll put it on the web. He puts K-12 first in this action plan. But the basic principles are the same and he said all during the Board of Governors meeting that this is going to be the continuing direction of his tenure. He is getting such good press about how he is viewed as responding to the demands of the state that I think the next person would have to abandon it as his or her peril.
  - Thank you.

2. President of the Senate McKinney

- **PPT presentation.**
- **Questions?**

### Old business

1. **Preamble rewrite from Ad Hoc Preamble Committee**

   A public university has a responsibility to extend knowledge, and its application, beyond the traditional classroom and usual boundaries of the campus and “engage” aspects of the public and private sectors to enhance cultural, economic, and social development. Engagement describes the “collaboration between higher education institutions and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.” However, engagement of whatever form must be knowledge based, meet the standards established at department levels, and be consistent with the represented academic disciplines at UNCW. The expectation for the level of involvement of engagement activities may vary across departments or hiring units depending on the subject matter and mission of departments and academic disciplines represented therein. Therefore, faculty whose work does not include engaged activities should not be penalized or denied tenure or promotion on those grounds unless such activities are part of the clearly articulated mission of the hiring unit or clearly stipulated as part of the terms of appointment. Although engagement as part of a comprehensive evaluation of faculty should be acknowledged and rewarded, such activity does not diminish, in any way, the importance and value of the university’s teaching and research missions. Therefore, engagement is not to be considered a substitute for faculty expectations in these other areas.

- **Any discussion?**
  - Timothy Black: I like it – the only problem is the last sentence. My understanding was, we are talking
about engagement because administrators way up and some divisions on campus would like engagement to be a replacement for research for certain faculty. Can someone address whether this is in accordance with their understanding of engagement?

- To me, the key part of the doc is “The expectation for the level of involvement of engagement activities may vary across departments or hiring units depending on the subject matter and mission of departments and academic disciplines represented therein. Therefore, faculty whose work does not include engaged activities should not be penalized or denied tenure or promotion on those grounds unless such activities are part of the clearly articulated mission of the hiring unit or clearly stipulated as part of the terms of appointment.”
  - Black: And I totally love that.
  - Dan Noland: The original intent was not to consider it a substitute but a worthy addition to the standard measures of activities.
  - Martin Posey: I think the question is, can it be considered a substitute if the department states it at the time of the hire and it is mutually agreed upon?
  - I was on the committee – we want to make it very clear that our responsibilities are still the same but that this is an added activity.
  - Alison Taylor: I think this is a minor point – I think a colleague suggested “will not be penalized” instead of “should not be penalized” because it could be interpreted differently over the years.
  - Nelson Reid: Just in regard to the last sentence, I think the sense of the ad hoc committee, a, we wanted to respond to the faculty concerned about lowering standards or creating a new category for a second tier of faculty and, b, we wanted a statement that engagement is not a separate thing from teaching, research, and service – it’s a qualifier. That’s why we decided to end as we did to keep the knowledge focus in tact; and that engagement is not a substitute for these things but interacts with them.
  - Mark Spaulding: Where is this going, if we approve this?
    - Reid: We didn’t really talk about where it would go in the committee.
    - Nelson Reid: If it is all part of the RPT document, shouldn’t it go at the beginning?
    - We agreed on the committee that it shouldn’t go at the beginning.
    - There are two issues, currently, changing the words “will not” and what this should be called.
      - I move that we call this a description of engagement at UNCW?
      - Noland: I don’t understand why we have to call it anything if we don’t know where it goes?
      - It should go at either the beginning or the end, to me.
        - Black: I think the whole point of this is to make clear for people going through RPT is how they should treat engagement when filling out their stuff. So it should come before they start filling out that stuff.
        - There are a couple of places it could go – with research, teaching, service. The other place would be with the RPT document – it has teaching, research and artistic activities. But if we want it to go with all those categories, if we put it under the other two areas as optional, then it can be put wherever it is appropriate for a particular faculty member.
    - Since it is part of the RPT document, shouldn’t it go there?
      - It could go both places.
      - Well, if you want new people to know about it, it should go somewhere where they will read about it before applying for RPT.
      - Paulo Almeida: Is this supposed to be in the RPT guidelines?
      - We didn’t want this to go in the RPT document because it is such a mess. However, for people going up in the fall, and if we are expecting them to do engagement, right now it is only under scholarship and professional development. If we want it to be broad enough to apply for everyone, right now we should put it in all the categories.
      - Is that a motion?
        - Motion: I move that we put it under all the areas in the RPT document as an optional category.
          - Motion seconded.
          - Discussion.
          - Vote, followed by a vote by division.
        - Motion defeated.
    - Black: Can we agree on the text?
      - Taylor: Given that it is a statement, it is rather like the statements in the introductory portion of the document. [Motion 10-06-20]: That we approve this text and put it in the introductory portion of the
RPT document.
  - [Motion 10-06-20] seconded.
  - Discussion:
    - Question: In the application, where is this going? It makes sense that it be put under all the categories.
    - President McKinney: We just voted not to put it in all those three areas.
      - Gabriel Lugo: Can we show where it will go in the document?
      - Question: It seems to me we haven’t resolved the issue of whether a simple statement can be listed under each category? If we just put it at the beginning, it may not communicate that you could do engagement in all the categories.
      - Noland: If we voted on this, wouldn’t this render what we voted on during the last meeting moot?
      - Black: This optionality refers to it being optional to do it period. What we voted on last time refers to being optional to report on it.
    - President McKinney: I can’t find it in the actual document but I think we are all familiar with it?
      - Taylor: It seems to me, this addresses all aspects of engagement so it should go at the beginning. It should be ahead of the entire document. It was just the scholarly part that was a new aspect to it last time.
      - Is the motion to put it in the beginning of the criteria of RPT?
      - Taylor: Before Section II. Under I – a second paragraph.
    - [Motion 10-06-20] approved.
  - [Motion 10-06-21]: Change “should not be penalized” to “will not be penalized.”
    - [Motion 10-06-21] seconded.
  - [Motion 10-06-21] approved.

New business

1. Revised Supplemental Pay Policy ([Current Policy in Word] | [Proposed Policy Changes in Word])
   - Provost: We were not in compliance with the policy for supplemental pay. We developed a committee to come up with what would be “in compliance.” Jessie Sova chaired that committee and she is here to answer any questions. This has gone through many different iterations. It will go through William Fleming for the staff part.
     - Black: With summer school teaching, the way it reads in the new document, if I teach summer school for one month, I can only earn the maximum of 1/9 of my gross pay. But teaching full time in summer school is a lot more work. If I teach three classes in the summer, it is brutally deadly.
   - Provost: There are supposed to be caps on summer school payment.
     - Black: I don’t think I have exceeded the caps because the dean always signs them.
   - Jessie Sova: There are limits to supplemental pay – the cap for the summer period for 9-month faculty, that would be 33.3 percent of your salary.
     - Black: The way the document is written now, if I work a summer school, I can only get 1/9 of one month of my gross salary.
   - Sova: You can not earn more that 33.3 in one month.
     - Black: The only problem is the document doesn’t say that.
   - Sova: Yes, it does say that – you could earn that in one month.
   - Provost: If you do have additional questions, you can send them to me or Jessie Sova.
   - President McKinney: Yes, this is for information – we don’t get to vote on that.

Announcements

- No announcements.

Adjournment
Meeting adjourned at 3:02pm.
Tuesday, 19 January 2010
2:00 p.m., Lumina Theater
Meeting 2010-05

***Please note that the January 19, 2010 meeting will be held in Lumina Theater, Fisher Center, starting at 2 p.m.***

Meeting called to order at 2:04 pm.

Roll sign-in

- Attendance sheets were distributed. If you don't sign them, email Liza Palmer (palmer AT uncw.edu).
- Absent:
  - Departmental senators: Barlow (Interim Provost), Blundo (Social Work), Bourgeois (Information Systems & Operations Management), Clark (Dean, Business), DePaolo (Chancellor), Fritzler (Randall Library), Hall (Social Work), Huber (Elementary, Middle, & Literacy Education), Hurst (Psychology), Moore (Dean, University College), Shynett (Music), Wray (Information Systems & Operations Management).
  - Committee chairs: Bingham (Student Affairs), Bollinger (University Advancement), Chandler (Bookstore), Murrell (University Curriculum), Pemberton (Faculty Handbook).

Approval of the December 2009 minutes

- December 2009 minutes were approved.

Individual reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo

   - The Chancellor is out of town; the Provost is ill. So we will skip to my report.

2. President of the Senate McKinney

   - **PPT presentation.**
     a. Food drive with Staff Senate
     b. Healthcare update
     - I am still going to see if there are other alternatives but it feels like the deck is stacked against us.
       - Patricia Turrisi: Can you clarify who would be breaking the law [if you invited vendors to come to campus to offer a competitive health insurance plan for employee dependents]?
       - According to the General Assembly, there is a state insurance board I would have to go through.
         - Turrisi: So individuals who do this are not breaking the law?
         - No.
         - It’s also illegal to unionize in North Carolina.
     - Yes, it does suggest a union.
       - William Fleming: A couple quick comments. Bruce is correct that an individual can’t go out and invite someone to campus to sell to a group of people – it's a conflict of interest – it has to go through an RFP. I have shared this with Madeleine Bombeld, Chair of the Benefits Committee, that’s a piece of the process. We do invite vendors to campus but it goes through the bid process. Another complication, this coverage would not be for university employees – it would be for spouses and families.
       - I would like to see an a la carte program – for instance, if you are married and you will not have children, it would be nice to have different options.
         - Ed Graham: For a family of three children, our health plan is competitive and very generous. It may even be competitive for families with two children. Those who are at a disadvantage, plans for spouses only.
         - Can we summarize this?: Basically, if you are married with no children, it’s a bad plan.
• Graham: It’s a fair plan if you have two-three children – I’ve done the numbers.

Committee reports

• No committee reports.

RTP Changes

• Floor ceded to Craig Galbraith, Chair of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Committee.
  o UNCW RPT's recommendations regarding engagement language.doc
  o We were asked to go through the changes to the RPT document related to faculty engagement.
  o Current committee members.
  o We consulted with those members who could not be present at the meeting. As a result, we had a quorum who voted on these recommendations.
• President McKinney: Let’s take a look at the motions we have and see if they dovetail into what Craig was saying.

Old business

1. [Motion 10-05-16] The Departments of Biology and Marine Biology and History move that the proposed revision in the RTP Guidelines in which Faculty Engagement is listed under required subcategories under (Part V, Subcategory A) be moved to optional subcategory (Part V, Subcategory B).

   • Biology and Marine Biology, did Craig answer your concerns?
     o Alison Taylor: My Biology colleagues, please feel free to chime in. Personally, I am not sure I feel satisfied in terms of the recommendations from the RTP Committee. And I don’t want to speak for my department.
     o Tim Black: If something is required, that means you have to do it.
   • That’s true but "grants" is listed as required and not everyone does it.
     o Galbraith: Where it says required, that’s in the document that you have to produce. That doesn’t mean you have to do all those things. It simply means in the document you put together, you have to include those things.
     o Gabriel Lugo: It seems like we are discussing the motion before we move the motion. I did want to say I am in full support of the RTP recommendations. I would move that if we have to move engagement to the optional category, then we will have to do that for grants as well. If we move it out of the required category, it will diminish the spirit of UNC Tomorrow.
     o Black: In a way, we can’t consider this first motion until we take up this idea of moving the preamble. If we make all these other changes or don’t make them, but don’t move that preamble, we are still in a murky situation. So I don’t know if there is a possibility of moving on that now.
     o Andy Jackson: Since we are looking at amendments, we can add another. I move that we insert the preamble into this document.

2. [Motion 10-05-17] The Department of Biology and Marine Biology moves that clearer distinctions definitions be made between the terms scholarly engagement (i.e., activities that lead to scholarly outputs such as patents, STEM awards, grants for community projects, reports and peer-reviewed publications based on these activities, etc. to be reported in optional section V-B of the RTP document) and [Faculty] engagement (encompassing a wider range of outreach activities - reported in teaching IV and service VI).

   • Taylor: We felt that "faculty engagement" and "scholarly engagement" were used interchangeably. Although there is explicit use of them in different parts of the document.

3. [Motion 10-05-18] The Department of History moves that the words “research and” be removed from Part III, Subcategory B under “Policies of Academic Freedom and Tenure, and the words “when appropriate” emphasized.
III.B. The tenure policies and regulations herein contained set forth the considerations upon which appointment, reappointment, promotion, and permanent tenure are to be recommended. These considerations shall include an assessment of at least the following: the faculty member's demonstrated professional competence, continued academic and professional growth, potential for future contribution, teaching effectiveness, research and outreach when appropriate, and the institution's needs and resources.

- Mark, did Craig cover what your concerns are?
  - Mark Spaulding: We didn’t understand why the committee conflated research and outreach and that made us uneasy. As much as we have things that say they are not required, the knitty gritty details imply that they are.
    - Sarah Messer: Do you feel like research is important to professional growth?
    - Spaulding: Research, curiously, is not in the document.
    - Messer: Because I understand that research is but not necessarily outreach.
  - James Reeves: I agree with Mark. My concern is for the junior faculty who read this and get hopelessly confused. Junior faculty should have a clear mandate for what they do, provided by their chair. So there should somewhere say to junior faculty, focus on what your chair has told you to focus on. There is a discussion between the chair and junior faculty and it should be in writing.
  - I will wholeheartedly agree, having just gone through the tenure process. I want to know what the difference between outreach and engagement is? In Education, we have very different definitions and I don’t know what the definitions are that our group is talking about.
  - Nelson Reid: I do think the preamble states that it is up to the department to determine what engagement means to the discipline. We tried to utilize the language that is commonly utilized in our documents. The substance of these has got to happen at the department level.
  - Lugo: It is not often that I disagree with my esteemed colleagues. The document of RTP is not clear. It is clear in some departments that they are expected to do research. However, there is nothing in the Math Department that says junior faculty must engage in grants and, in fact, it would distract them from publishing papers.

- This whole RTP document has not been revised since the late 1970s?
  - Piecemeal revisions since then but not as a whole.
  - Paulo Almeida: I want to make two comments. First, with regard to the preamble, I think the language should say right in the first line “cannot be penalized” and not “should not be penalized.”
    - Galbraith: This is not the whole preamble – it’s about two pages long.
  - Almeida: The second, I am little perplexed, if I read the definition that’s in the document from the committee, it’s quite clear that engagement can be part of any of those three. I think part of the problem is that we are trying to disentangle it into its own fourth category.
  - Turrisi: I support those comments and want to return to the overall RTP document. The format, it’s not clear that it reflects anything previous to it. My department had a concern that this constitution of the RTP Committee would understand that a "none" would not be a problem but with a future committee, there is no guarantee. So that needs some improvement if we are going to say that something is required in the format but no big deal otherwise.
  - Black: The way I interpret this, it’s not required that you do it but it is required that you answer it. How we deal with these three motions is dependent upon moving the preamble. So if we do that, I might have a different answer to number one. Can we move that the preamble be included?
  - Secretary: Andy Jackson moved already so we need a second.
  - Black: I second.
  - Galbraith: We suggest that it be referenced and not inserted.
    - Spaulding: What does that mean, that it be referenced? Will it be part of the Faculty Handbook? What will the relationship be between that portion of the handbook and the document for tenure?
    - Galbraith: If it is linked, it is our understanding that it is part of the handbook. I am not sure what the legal definition is. When you are in the section for engagement, link to the preamble.
    - Pam Evers: So basically, the preamble is a footnote? Unless it is a preamble, it’s a footnote.

- Aren’t we talking about changing that preamble into guidelines?
  - Messer: Over time, it becomes a subcategory that’s optional. It should be a preamble.
  - Galbraith: If you want to call it a footnote or a link?
Spaulding: I just don’t see how that’s going to work out logically. Either you put it in a place where it does not have equal status of the RTP document itself and does not afford protection. Or it will be in the document somewhere and now you are going to have a preamble that says it is not required but a format that says it is. I just don’t see how it is going to work out as a solution.

Black: I think there are two definitions of “required.” Either you must do this or you must answer this. We can have another link that gives the meaning of "required".

Jackson: Part of this is the legislative history of the work required in the format document. If I recall, what happened was (I was on the committee that helped with the word "required"), people were leaving out important pieces of their academic history. And departments didn’t know to include that for them. But if you follow this logic, then we need to get rid of "required" in the format document and find some better way to describe this. If this is confusing to people, we need to have some alterations in that part of the document?

- Are you withdrawing your motion?
  - Jackson: My motion has nothing to do with the word "required."
  - Spaulding: The solution is to put it in the optional category. If, in fact, it is optional, then put it in the optional category. No one who is engaged in engagement will not have the opportunity to report that.
  - For those areas of the arts, I wonder if in the preamble, is it explicitly clear regarding the communication between chair and candidate; it is a very delicate gray area when junior faculty are looking at their activities. Does the preamble have specific language, allowing the candidate to know that the department should make that explicitly clear?

- Required categories clearly imply some entry. We would have avoided 25 minutes of discussion: this is referring to preamble, not the preamble itself.

Black: What is called the preamble now will not be called preamble in future life. It will now be placed either as a reference or as a full text in the Faculty Handbook. I think that is the motion that is on the floor right now that can be discussed.

Turrisi: It does make a difference. What I have been hearing are references to an oral culture of interpretation. If we mean something to be in there for a period of time, it needs to say what we mean. I want to argue that we try to take up these issues on the basis of what these documents say and not what they mean to us. I don’t know what proposal to make to amend Andy’s motion. I am a little afraid to adopt that entire thing known as the preamble when it’s not really acceptable.

Brian Kinard: Having just filled out this document, I didn’t find this language too burdensome. I haven’t done any grants – if it is something that you do and it is important to your department, then creating a whole new section doesn’t really solve the problem.

I have a question about what you said, are we talking about engagement as a new category or as a subcategory under service or research?

Lugo: Point of order. The motion we are discussing is: should the preamble be referenced in the Faculty Handbook?

Raymond Burt: How can we vote this in, if it doesn’t exist in this way in the handbook?

Galbraith: The current category in the Faculty Handbook says "scholarship" – you are absolutely right.

- We are discussing a motion to an original document that was brought before the Senate. This is probably something that we need to vote on.
  - We have been focusing on three lines of text here.
  - Spaulding: Could we see what we are going to vote on? Is that possible?
  - Reid: Can I point out, there is no section of UNC Tomorrow labeled "preamble." Section V is the application of the concept of engagement within the context of the mission of the UNCW.
  - Reeves: Let’s excerpt from this statement, what we really mean, by sending this back to the committee instead of trying to adapt this preamble into our document. In general, all of the categories we have under required are things we should respond to – what you should be paying attention to is what is defined by your department and chair. So I want that explicit that it’s in the document – it’s got to be in the document. You want to reference the rest of it for contextual explanation.
  - We still have the three motions regarding the report. Right now, this part, there is a lot of concern that the language be reworked and inserted in the appropriate place. What we need to do is act on the motion that’s before us right now and the others before us and then send it back to the UNC Tomorrow Committee.

Lugo: Going back to our committee is not the right choice – we were not charged to fix an inherent flaw.
It needs to go to some other committee.

- Maybe that should be Craig’s committee.
  - Lugo: Craig’s committee is not right either – it doesn’t set policy.
  - Black: I will volunteer to create this motion for the next meeting.
  - Vice Provost McFarland: If we go beyond today, our schedule will not work – bringing it before the Board of Trustees for the next year of new faculty. If we don’t adopt this today, it will be delayed by a year. As far as UNC Tomorrow, it’s not a problem. But we already have a number of people wondering whether they can use this.
  - Jackson: I withdraw my motion if my seconder will.
  - Black: I will.

And you, Tim, will prepare the motion for the next meeting?

- Black: I will.

Craig: There are inconsistencies throughout the document. We recommended that another committee be put together to look at the big picture. Because of the piecemeal process of revising RTP, there are potential problems in the document. So I would recommend overall that another committee be put together to clean up this whole thing separately from the pressures of UNC Tomorrow.

- It does seem to me that this document needs a good rewrite for consistency. Andy withdrew his motion. Let’s look at the other motions that have been put before the senate.

Any more discussion of [Motion 10-05-16]?

- [Motion 10-05-16] approved.

Any discussion of [Motion 10-05-17]?

- [Motion 10-05-17] approved.

Any discussion of [Motion 10-05-18]?

- Spaulding: The motion we submitted is there. If, in fact, the document that we have been amending, as Gabriel indicated, says, “research, and outreach” – then just the “when appropriate” would need adding. I hear though from my colleagues in English that the following is better, though: “research, and when appropriate outreach.”

- [Motion 10-05-18] as amended on the floor approved.

Galbraith: The RTP Committee now refers us to the recommendation for the language changes in brown. So what’s just been passed is the language in the optional category and not the required as we recommended. But we now advocate some minor language changes in brown.

- Turrisi: A and B works but I question letter C. It doesn’t have a reference that seems real.

President McKinney: Funding that you would get that would help out public schools.

- Karen Wetherill: In the Watson School of Education, we might bring in external funding from multiple sources to do research with public schools but we also might collaborate with public schools who received funding and are bringing in the expertise of WSE faculty. I don’t know if that helps.

- Turrisi: Yes, I think it could be worded more clearly.

- Black: I agree with you, Patty. One of my questions, does it make any difference if this person does the work and that work is funded through an external agency or not?

- Kim Cook: Where are we in this process? Have we voted to endorse this UNC Tomorrow RTP document?

- Cook: Are some of these questions better to be included in the implementation phase and not the endorsement phase?

- Parliamentarian: This is totally in order – you are discussing an amendment to the document.

- Black: I actually didn’t get an answer to my question: does it matter whether it was funded by an external agency or not if the person didn’t get the grant to begin with?
  - Wetherill: No. But in terms of the faculty for WSE, in terms of RTP, it’s basically looking at the fact that externally funded grants or contracts have gone through a review process that warrants the merit that generates the funding.
  - Black: Since the person under consideration didn’t get the funding, it doesn’t matter who funded it?
  - Wetherill: We put it under service.

- Messer: If you were asked to be a part of a project that was externally funded, that’s an honor. I guess it just falls under this whole area of engagement – what Erskine Bowles wants.
I think that’s the point, when in WSE we are asked many times to work in schools, the way this is written now we can’t count it under scholarly engagement. That’s why the question of why engagement isn’t part of service and just scholarship here.

Hopefully that has been cleared up with the motions that we have passed. Do I have a motion to approve the changes in brown?

[Motion 10-05-19] To approve the changes in brown to “RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING UNCW POLICY ON TENURE, PROMOTION, AND INCENTIVE STRUCTURE” as recommended by the RTP Committee.

- [Motion 10-05-19] seconded.
- [Motion 10-05-19] approved.

Galbraith: Mark’s motion dealt with III B. Go down – UNC Tomorrow had a change there. Now you may want to put the same language that you had there in the formal document. But that was not part of your motion as I understand it.

- Spaulding: To me, it doesn’t seem to me to be quite the same thing. But I could be missing something. I don’t feel compelled to make the same change here.
- Evers: Can we form a committee to do the clean up?

President McKinney: We need a committee – an ad hoc committee.
- Parliamentarian: Last time, Steering did it. This is so big.
- Pat Lerch: In this introduction, it refers to criteria guidelines.
  - Galbraith: This isn’t the format. What is being inserted is the word “faculty engagement.”
  - Lerch: So if this is the guidelines, maybe “when appropriate” doesn’t matter?
- Kathleen Berkeley: It seems timely to me, rather than do piecemeal here and there, it might be better to call for a joint Faculty Senate/Provost Committee to do exactly what the current chair of RTP suggested and make sure the language and criteria are clear and bring it before the Senate.

I think that is an excellent idea. The whole RTP document needs to be looked at to find out any problematic language and I would be more than happy to form a committee to look at that. It’s a Frankensteins RTP document. So why don’t we do this – and certainly input from anyone is valued – Steering will start and then we will form a joint Faculty Senate/Provost Committee.

- Jackson: Have we passed the entire document or just the amendments?
- Just the amendments. The Senate wants the language in the preamble to be revised and then inserted in the appropriate place in the RTP document. That’s where we are.
  - Black: There is not really a motion but there should be – that a committee be formed to revise this whole document in a thorough way and bring these proposed changes to us.
- First, we have the UNC Tomorrow document, then the RTP document.
  - Parliamentarian: I thought we have a relatively short time on the UNC Tomorrow document portion? The Senate has not yet approved the whole set of amendments. The entire RTP review was a six-month to one-year process.

Vice Provost McFarland wants this as soon as possible. It looks like the amendments have to be added to the language of the document and then the preamble. Once that is done, we can vote on the UNC Tomorrow revisions. I don’t think that will take more than a month. Kathleen, this is something that the RTP document desperately needs and we will work on it as a sidebar.

- Jackson: We need to lay before the house that we have three basic documents governing RTP – we have a document that has been passed by the Board of Governors and the Board of Trustees, RTP procedure, we have a second on criteria, and a third on format. All of this needs to be done as a total entity.
- The changes in brown are changes to RTP and not UNC Tomorrow. They need to be put aside. We have the three amendments that have been approved, clear up the preamble, and then approve the UNC Tomorrow document. Then we can move on to the RTP document. We can now move forward and get the UNC Tomorrow RTP document in order and hopefully pass it at the next meeting.

- Have we done anything at all to scholarly engagement?
- We have added it to the optional category.
- Cook: But we haven’t embraced the UNC Tomorrow report?
- No.
  - Cook: So just the amendments from the Biology and History departments.
- Right.
Turrisi: What we are doing is important here and the last two hours have been time well spent.
Do these changes automatically take place when we approve it?
As I understand, they will take effect – Steve, can you help?
Vice Provost McFarland: Not right away. They will have to go to the Board of Trustees and then back to the departments.
Reid: So engagement is not optional for a public institution. Engagement will be an ordinary aspect of life for some faculty members. The distinction between optional and required will be different for different departments. The faculty themselves will have to make certain distinctions.
Mark Galizio: One comment on the optional vs. required, when the group returns to look at the document, that wording needs to be addressed. I am wondering if faculty will be required to do both research grants and grants to fund travel. So that confusion needs to be addressed. But having said that, nothing in the UNC Tomorrow reports are designed to suggest that engagement is required of all faculty or in exchange for research.

New business

- No new business.

Announcements

- No announcements.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:02pm.
Tuesday, 14 September, 2010
2:00 p.m., EB 162
Meeting 2010-01

Meeting called to order at 2:04 p.m.

Roll sign-in

- Attendance sheets were not distributed. On September 15, 2010 Lisa Theriault sent an e-mail to all faculty senators asking them to verify their attendance at the meeting. Based on those responses, the following senators were absent:
  - Barlow (Provost), Moore (University College), Szmant and Stapleton (Biology and Marine Biology), Lee and Messer (Creative Writing), Brown (HAHS), Turrisi (Philosophy and Religion), Blundo (Social Work), Mahar (ISO), Fritzler and Palmer (Randall Library)

Approval of the April 2010 minutes

- April 2010 minutes were approved.

Special Order of the Day

1. Election of the Vice President, the Secretary, and the Steering Committee of the Senate

   - Nominations open for Secretary.
     - Nomination for Liza Palmer.
   - Motion from the floor to close nominations and the secretary cast the ballot for Liza Palmer.

     **Motion approved.**

   - Nominations open for Vice President.
     - Nomination for Gabriel Lugo.
     - Motion from the floor to close nominations and the secretary cast the ballot for Gabriel Lugo.

     **Motion approved.**

   - Nominations open for Steering Committee.
     - Nomination for Andy Jackson.
     - Nomination for Jennifer Horan.
     - Nomination for Steve Pullum.
     - Nomination for Patti Turrisi.
     - Motion from the floor to close nominations and the secretary cast the ballot for Andy Jackson, Jennifer Horan, Steve Pullum and Patty Turrisi.

     **Motion approved.**

Individual reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo

   - It’s been a sensational beginning to the new academic year. UNCW has received many kudos and it’s due to everyone’s work that we’re recognized in a huge way nationally and internationally. Please note the Wikipedia entry for UNCW. It’s very positive and I was very pleased by the posting.
   - Emergency closure decisions: Bruce and I received a lot of e-mails, as did the Provost, regarding the
cancellation of classes due to the threat of Hurricane Earl. We have a variety of experts in parking and emergency management who weigh-in on these decisions. Plans must be made in advance. One of the guiding principles in our decision is that it doesn’t matter what the beaches are doing. UNCW has different concerns that aren’t monetary. We must always look at worse-case scenarios so students have at least 6 daylight hours to evacuate campus. We had to make decision about Hurricane Earl at 9 a.m. on that day. We were forced to cancel classes at 4 p.m. In the end, cancellation wasn’t necessary, but at 9 am it was the most prudent decision. Sorry about the inconvenience this caused. We cancel classes with great hesitation. Next time we’ll included faculty senate representatives in our decision-making process.

- Cape Fear Community College has announced it’s going to give significant faculty raises this year. They’re also looking at other ways to reward staff. I’ve asked Erskine Bowles if I can use one-time bonus money for raises. He said no. He felt it would run counter to our request to the legislature to REDUCE cuts to the budget. I sent the CFCC newspaper article to Bowles and asked that someone from his office contact the community college system about the raises and their funding source. Of course, the community college system is completely separate from the state university system. I will continue to push this issue with Erskine Bowles. My top priority is salary increases and all the chancellors feel the university system cannot go on with the current salary limitations. I’ve also spoken with Sen. Mark Basnight and I believe it would be helpful if people started calling their legislators about the budget constraints on the university system.

- Last week was the first time in 5 years that UNCW hosted the Board of Governors meeting. Erskine Bowles insisted we host the meeting after seeing UNCW last year. He wanted to showcase the campus to other NC universities. They were so ‘blown away’ that someone said they wanted to come back monthly for their meetings. It was a lot of hard work but, it was UNCW as normal. Hardworking faculty, bright students, and a beautiful campus. The Board of Governors saw first-hand what an important role we play in the state.

- In a meeting during the Board of Governors’ visit a Star-News reporter took my remarks out of context and included them in a news article. I apologize if the article offended. This campus is extraordinary and we haven’t succeeded because of money, we’ve succeeded over the last 65 years because of people.

2. President of the Senate McKinney

- This job has been enjoyable for me. This is my final year and I’ve thought carefully about some constructive changes I can make in my final year. I’ve always heard people complain about the RTP process. People think the process is inconsistent so, we developed a faculty survey in an effort to evaluate the process and develop improvements. Please take the time to complete the survey. It’s your chance to give your input on what you’d like to see changed in the process. As of our October 2009 meeting, the narrative in the RTP process is optional. Results for the RTP survey may change that. Any proposed changes that result from this survey will have to be approved by the full senate.

- The Faculty Handbook is almost updated.

- SPOT surveys can marginalize us as teachers. We need to look at more comprehensive ways to evaluate our teaching skills. Many studies conclude that student evaluations of teachers are not really viable ways to measure teaching. I would like to form a standing committee – a SPOT Committee - to evaluate these surveys.

  - A professor asked about SPOT evaluations of online instruction and expressed particular concern about the limitations of the survey to assess online instruction.

Bruce: The SPOT instrument isn’t designed to evaluate online instruction. Dr. Johnson Akinleye, will you speak to this issue?

Akinleye: The SACS committee met last semester and made a number of recommendations which will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate. Vance Durrington will chair a faculty committee…

- Reorganizing Faculty Senate representation: I will appoint a committee to determine the best way to reorganize the structure for faculty senate representation.
Committee Reports

1. The Academic Standards Committee submits the following motion:

[11-01-01] To increase the minimum GPA for participation in and completion of the University Honors designation at UNCW from the current 3.2 to 3.5. We also propose increasing the current GPA criterion for graduation with “University Honors and Honors in the Major” from the current 3.2 to 3.5 (with a 3.3 requirement for underclassmen in honors; currently this requirement is 3.0). (More information in Word)

- Kate Bruce of Honors College said the proposal has the full support of the Faculty Honors committee.
- Any questions?
- [Motion 11-01-01] approved.
- Kate Bruce noted that any student may still graduate with departmental honors with a 3.2 GPA. University honors must have a 3.5 or higher.

2. The University Curriculum Committee submits the following motion:

[11-01-02] To add an option for Honors Global Citizen Recognition to acknowledge honors students who have made global studies an integrated and capstone experience in their academic curriculum. (More information in Word: Part I and Part II).

- Any discussion?
- [Motion 11-01-02] approved.

3. The Student Affairs Committee submits the following motion:

[11-01-03] Section I of the committee charter is to be revised as follows to agree with the stated wishes of the VCSA and President of the Faculty Senate and to reflect the current reality of how the committee operates.

Duties. To provide advice to the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs on non-academic student-related issues as needed by the VCSA.

- McKinney: The Student Affairs committee has been a standing committee. People have complained that they never meet and should be disbanded. The committee recommends meeting once a semester or as needed to address arising issues.
- A Senator noted that the language could be interpreted to preclude making motions. President McKinney said the committee can bring motions to the Faculty Senate just as any other Senate committee is able to do.
- Ken Gurganis noted that this motion would change the bylaws therefore, a hand count necessary to assure a minimum two-thirds vote which is 50 or more senators.
- Further discussion?
- McKinney counted yeas up to 51 to confirm a minimum two-thirds vote. [Motion 11-01-03] approved.

Old Business

1. Computer and oral competency requirements. Martin Posey and Jimmy Reeves reported. (More information in Word)

- Posey: We are in the process of reviewing competencies for the 2012 SACS review. One area required by SACS is college level competencies: what students should know and whether they have achieved these competencies. We’ve identified the computer and oral competencies as possible problems with regard to specifically how we define them and how we’re assessing them. We need to
show that we have defined these competencies and how we measure whether students meet them.

- Reeves: Thank you, Martin, for doing the job you’re doing. I think this year in the senate will be critical. What we’ve decided in the FS is what we have to show to SACS.
  - Reeves: I make a motion that the Academic Standards Committee should meet to review computer and oral competencies and determine specifically what the competencies are, or should be, and how they’re being assessed by all the departments. The committee should report their findings to the Senate at the December meeting.

- Discussion?
  - Posey noted that SACS expects each Major in each department to assess these competencies.
  - Reeves provided an existing chart with the nine basic competencies (More information in Word)
  - G. Lugo said the competency chart is misleading because it implies all departments and all majors should be teaching and assessing all competencies. The UNCW catalogue states that all students must meet computer and oral competencies.
  - Mark Spaulding asked why such a competency chart exists?
  - Ken Gurganis believes University studies will take care of most of these competencies. Second language outcomes are built into the basic studies program. SACS requires that competencies be designated. They don’t say what they must be.
  - Senator: Can we collapse computer competency into the information literacy category and oral competency into the thoughtful expression category?
  - Reeves: Would rather not. It is better to clarify the computer and oral competencies than to collapse them, undefined, in other categories.

- Motion approved.

2. UNCW Honor Code-Update of Statistics from 2009-2010 Academic Year – Dr. Mike Walker, Dean of Students

- Reported violations of the honor code have increased due to the elevated awareness of UNCW’s honor code policy.
- The number of violations reported by faculty increased substantially in Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 due to increased awareness.
- Most cases were reported through a secure online link or, through e-mail.
- Most faculty who participated in the honor code reporting process said it wasn’t too cumbersome and they felt supported by the university.
- Offenders were 58% male and 80% female which is similar to the gender breakdown of the current student body.
- All faculty should be encouraged to continue reporting potential honor violations to the Dean of Students at http://www.uncw.edu/staff/ofos/

New Business

1. Kate Bruce of the Honors Program announced that a proposal will come before the Faculty Senate in a couple of months seeking to change the name of the Honors Program to the Honors College.
2. Lisa Pollard (History) asked, on behalf of her department, if the Faculty Senate was an appropriate forum to ask Dr. DePaolo and Dr. Barlow if it was justified to use research money to promote attendance at faculty meetings.

- President McKinney affirmed that yes, the Faculty Senate was an appropriate forum.

Announcements

1. UNCW TV is offering free advertising. Log onto uncwtv.edu\submissions to post your ad or, send your ad to chwk@uncw.edu
Meeting adjourned at 3:24 p.m.
Chairman, Secretary, and Quorum were present. Roll sign-in

- Attendance sheets were distributed. If you don't sign them, email Michele Parker (parkerma AT uncw.edu).
- Absent: Noland (English), Boersma (Foreign Languages and Literatures), Hickman (Music), Albergo (Music), Sawrey (Psychology), Blundo (Social Work), Hall (Social Work), Clark (Dean of Cameron School of Business), Glew (Management), Mahar (Information Systems and Operations Management), Roer (Dean of Graduate School Administration).

Approval of the September 2010 minutes

- March 2010 minutes were approved.

Special order of the day

- Election of a new Secretary

Senator Michele A. Parker was elected Secretary by acclamation. Liza Palmer has the gratitude of the Senate for her prior excellent service in that position.

Individual reports

1. President of the Senate McKinney

   - RTP Survey: Faculty should complete the survey by the weekend.
   - Online SPOT Committee: Diana Ashe will be chairing a committee to align SPOT with the 1000+ online courses taught at UNCW.
   - Committee on Evaluation Process: This committee will be reviewing the RTP survey and making recommendations to the Senate.
   - Students and SPOT Confidentiality: SGA’s request that individual faculty SPOT data be released for student use was noted.
   - Reorganization of Faculty Senate Representation: A review has begun of the alignment of faculty voting divisions as a result of the newly reorganized professional school. A review is also being made of the ratio of 10 faculty per senator as the appropriate base to determine Senate representation. Recommendations to the Senate will be forthcoming.
   - Faculty Handbook: A new template is being developed.

2. Sue Combs reported about the Athletic Director search process.

   - The search committee will include two faculty members, two coaches and off campus representatives assisted by a consultant.

3. Faculty Assembly Report: Raymond Burt

   - Raymond Burt reported that one can visit uncfacultyassembly.org to investigate how the Faculty Assembly has organized itself around the completion of major tasks rather than around standing committees. An academic freedom resolution endorsed by the Faculty Assembly will be discussed by the Senate at the November meeting. Due to continuing significant budget shortfalls, general administration has discussed elimination of some programs and future furloughs. All system schools have been asked to plan for additional 5 and 10% reductions.
4. Martin Posey: UNCW SACS Coordinator

- Martin Posey reported that our SACS report will be due in September of 2012 to be followed with a site visit in late 2012 or early 2013. The final decision on accreditation will be in November 2013. UNCW already has committees reviewing our compliance with SACS standards and best practices. A major component of this self governing regulatory process is the university’s Quality Enhancement Plan. Kim Cooke addressed the Senate regarding the QEP development process and task force that will “play a pivotal role in UNCW’s continuous improvement as an institution of higher education and a required part of our SACS accreditation.”

5. Linda Siefert: Results of General Education Assessment Spring 2010

- Linda Siefert, General Education Assessment Director, reported upon the Results of General Education Assessment Spring 2010. Fifteen faculty analyzed work products from a sample nearly 300 students demographically representative of the UNCW student body drawn from thirteen sections of ENG 201, FST 210, MUS 115, PSY 105 and SOC 105. The process measured achievement in the areas of written communication, inquiry, critical thinking, and foundational knowledge (pilot). The general conclusions were: “Student abilities in understanding purpose, explaining issues, and presenting information—those used to begin communication and investigation—are stronger than their skills in identifying assumptions, stating conclusion or position, and discussing limitations, implications, and consequences—those used to critically evaluate information. The findings...all point towards the need to provide students more opportunities to practice higher-order thinking skills.” As a result, the “Learning Assessment Council recommends:
  - Set levels of expectations for basic studies/lower division University Studies
  - Increase faculty exposure to the UNCW Learning Goals
  - Increase student exposure to the writing process
  - Make modifications to the process based on feedback

   This year we will continue to assess student abilities with regard to the Learning Goals in Basic Studies courses.
   - Fall – Critical Thinking and Diversity
   - Spring – Information Literacy

   Next year, we will transition to University Studies courses.”

Committee reports

6. The Academic Standards Committee submits the following motions which passed:

   [Motion 11-02-04]
   1. Remove computer competency as a distinct competency requirement in our undergraduate catalogue.

   Rationale: Not all departments specifically indicate the learning outcomes for computer competency at the major’s level and few have assessment for student proficiency in computer use. The computer competency was adopted in 2000 and is somewhat dated in its current wording. Aspects of the overall intent of computer use in communications would seem implicit in several of the 9 learning goals previously adopted (e.g. Information Literacy).

   [Motion 11-02-05]
   2. Remove oral competency as a distinct competency requirement in our undergraduate catalogue, recognizing that oral communication is specified in the Thoughtful Expression learning goal.

   Rationale: Oral competency is included within the oral communication component of the Thoughtful Expression learning goal and is redundant as a competency set apart from the 9 learning goals. Since
proficiency in oral communication is part of Thoughtful Expression, all majors would still need to have courses identified to meet this oral communication requirement, should identify what learning outcome they expect in these courses, and would assess student achievement of those outcomes. This would not be a change from current expectations.

7. The University Curriculum Committee submits the following motion which passed:

[Motion 11-02-06] The Senate approves the following recommendations:

Watson School of Education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WSE CC</strong></td>
<td>Degree Requirement change (licensure and non-licensure) Catalogue Changes document included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDN 227</strong></td>
<td>Deletion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDN 385</strong></td>
<td>Deletion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDN 386</strong></td>
<td>Deletion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDN 387</strong></td>
<td>Deletion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PED 350</strong></td>
<td>Deletion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEA 207</strong></td>
<td>Deletion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDN 204</strong></td>
<td>EDN 204 course change and syllabus (credit hours change from 2 to 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDN 302</strong></td>
<td>Course change (add co-requisite EDNL 302)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDNL 302</strong></td>
<td>Course change (course number change from EDN 385 to EDNL 302; add co-requisite EDN 302)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDN 380</strong></td>
<td>New course and syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDNL 388</strong></td>
<td>New course and syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDN 382</strong></td>
<td>Course change and syllabus (credit hours change from 2 to 3; add pre-requisite EDN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EDN 383  Course change and syllabus (credit hours change from 2 to 3; add pre-requisite  EDN 204)

EDN 424  Course change and syllabus (credit hours change from 2 to 3)

EDN 450  Course change (add co-requisite EDNL 450 and EDN 452; prerequisite NSG 345 or PSY 320) (EDN 450)

EDN 452  New course and syllabus

SED 367  Prerequisite change

Old business

No old business.

New business

The Department of Communication Studies submits the following motion which was withdrawn:

[Motion 11-02-07]

In order to recognize the significant role part time faculty play in the mission of the university, part-time faculty should be allowed to take one course per two semesters taught providing that the course is not full and there is adequate space for them in the course.

Announcements

No announcements.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Michele Parker (parkerma AT uncw.edu).
Chairman, Secretary, and Quorum were present. Roll sign-in

Attendance sheets were distributed. If you don't sign them, email Michele Parker (parkerma AT uncw.edu).

Absent: Roer (Graduate School), Roberts (Nursing), Dumas (Economics and Finance), Graham (Economics and Finance), Blundo (Social Work), Hall (Social Work), Burgh (Philosophy and Religion), Turrisi (Philosophy and Religion), Hickman (Music), Albergo (Music), Siedman (History), Spaulding (History), Usilton (History), Henry (Geography and Geology), Silva (Film Studies), Buttino (Film Studies), Messer (Creative Writing), Gessner (Creative Writing), Reeves (Chemistry and Biochemistry), Wilcox (Art and Art History), Moore (Dean Univ College).

Approval of the 12 October Minutes will occur at the December meeting.

Meeting started at 2:01 pm

Important Note: The next Senate Meeting will be December 7, not December 14. Location Lumina Theatre

Mark Lanier was asked to give a brief overview of the Chancellor search

Special Motion:

1. The Faculty Senate Steering Committee offers the following motion in light of the search for a new Chancellor:

[Motion 11-03-07] The UNCW Faculty Senate asks the UNCW Chancellor Search Committee to seek the following qualities in their candidates for Chancellor:

A commitment to scholarly values and the diverse mission of a public comprehensive university, with a tradition of substantial research activity combined with a hallmark of teaching excellence as expressed in the university mission statement;

Academic scholarship and teaching credentials, or professional credentials, that are tenurable at the level of full professor;

Outstanding leadership qualities, including:

* Successful leadership in higher education or professional administration
* Personal integrity, intellectual curiosity, fairness, resilience and energy
* Commitment to shared governance with faculty, staff and students
* Collaborative leadership style that emphasizes openness and fairness
* Demonstrated ability to secure funding from government and private sources
* Determination to expand and seek increased support for the graduate program while maintaining the high quality and standards of undergraduate education.

* A commitment to equal employment opportunity and non-discriminatory practices.

Mark Lanier has suggested that we at some examples of leadership statements at other UNC schools who have had recent searches for chancellors:
NCA&T:  http://www.ncat.edu/chansrch/members.html


UNCCH:  http://www.unc.edu/chan/search/members.php

UNCG:  http://www.uncg.edu/ure/chancellorsearch/

UNCP:  http://www.uncp.edu/chancellorsearch/committee/

- motion approved

2. Chancellor DePaolo

- The Chancellor sent Tom Ross Motion 11-03-07. He agrees with the qualities we are seeking in a chancellor. Tom Ross will lead search because Erskine Bowles believes that he should be involved in the process from the beginning. Tom will be here this Friday (Nov. 12, 2010). The Chancellor says we can expect the new chancellor to be named in the spring. This is the right time to make the transition in regards to the silent phase of the campaign. In terms of the legislation session this is a good time as well. The Chancellor has been asked to examine a performance based system. This transition is an opportunity for empowerment.

- Comment from the floor: We need more faculty ambassadors for QEP. There is a list of forums on www.uncw.edu/qep, which provide information and an opportunity to get involved.

- There was also a comment about the new legislature not liking us and a 15-20% pending cut. Another person asked about the Chancellor’s departure: was it hastened by the future? The Chancellor said no, she’s been doing this job for approximately 14 years.

3. President of the Senate McKinney

- RTP Survey
  - 52% response rate, which is good. Results will be posted on the website along with a report.

- Faculty Assembly Motion on Academic Freedom
  - The Faculty Assembly requests that the UNCW Faculty Senate approve the following motion on Academic Freedom

[Motion 11-03-08] Academic Freedom at all UNC Campuses:

(related document for above: Resolution on Academic Freedom UNC Faculty Assembly)

Faculty endorsed aforementioned resolution

- SPOT Committee
  - report will be posted to website soon. Faculty will have ample time to review it prior to the December meeting.

4. Marla Rice Evans, University Advancement (related document: University Advancement)

- Marla Evans explained the different phases of the campaign. Feb 17-20, 2010 is the kickoff (homecoming weekend) of the public phase, wherein the campaign will be launched. Our goal is $65 million. Thus far $55,884,892 has been raised. The report covered the breakdown by various constituents (e.g., alumni, friends) and campus units (College of Arts and Sciences, Education, etc).

- There was a question about return rate of pledges, 2 out of 100 major pledges were withdrawn/altered. In terms of phone-a-thon, for $25 and $50 from younger donors, there is a 70-80% return rate that is consistent with the
national average. We do compare ourselves to other institutions, but no other institution is just like us. We are 86% toward our goal. Each goal is set using complex analyses of how many people have supported an academic unit, who is more likely to give, etc.

Committee reports

1. The University Curriculum Committee submits the following motion:

[Motion 11-03-09] That the Senate approve the following recommendations:

- **Biology**
  - Degree requirements for a major in Biology for the B.A. Degree
  - Degree requirements for a major in Biology for the B.S. Degree
  (related documents for above: BIO - change in hours, BIO catalogue copy, BIO new conservation option, UCC Cover - BIO change in hours, UCC Cover - BIO new cons. option)

- **Computer Science**
  - Course change of CSC 385 from one to three credits
  (related documents for above: CSC - change in hours, UCCCover-CSC- Change in hours)

- **History**
  - Reducing the number of hours in the major from 46 to 40, and restructuring and /renumbering the curriculum
  (related documents for above HSTCatalogueCopy, UCC Cover - HST change in hours)

- **Music**
  - Reducing the number of hours for the Bachelor of Music in Music Education from 91-93 hours to 89-91 hours
  (related documents for above UCC Cover - Music change in hours, Music degree change)

- **Oceanography**
  - Needed approval for a new prefix—OCN—to designate several previously approved courses for the new Oceanography Major
  (related documents for above: UCC Cover - OCN, Oceanography Curriculum)

- **Parks and Recreation Management**
  - Pre/Corequisite and Restrictive Statement for REC 303, 351, 352, 353, 359, 380, 448
  - Change in the name of a major
  (related documents for above: REC 303, REC 351, REC 352, REC 353, REC 359, REC 380, REC 448, REC name change)

- **Psychology**
  - Restructuring of the Psychology curriculum based on APA recommendations
  (related documents for above: PSY Curric Change Overview, PSY Catalogue Copy, UCC Cover - PSY change in hours)

- **School of Health and Applied Human Sciences**
  - Course change Restrictive Statement for HEA 351
  - Addition of Concentration in Gerontology to B.S. in Community Health Education
  - Revised Catalog Description for a Major in Exercise Science for the B. S. Degree
  - Establishment of an Exercise Science elective
  - Course prefix changes, PED 216 to EXS 216, PED 217 to EXS 21, PED 266 to EXS 266, PED 340 to EXS 340, PED 342 to EXS 342, PED 347 to EXS 347, PED 349 to EXS 349, PED 350 to EXS 350, PED 355 to EXS 355, PED 359 to EXS 359, PED 379 to EXS 379, PED 460 to EXS 460, PED 470 to EXS 470, PED 471 to EXS 471
  - Course change: REC 475 Pre/Corequisite, Restrictive statement
  - REC 475 added to requirements for Recreational Sports Leadership Option
  - Change in required hours in Sports Leadership Option
New courses: RTH 372, 475, 497, 499
- Increase the number of hours for Recreation Therapy Major from 70-73

(related documents for above: CAF HEA 351, Concentration in Gerontology requirements, Copy of UCC program change form GRN concentration, CURRENT REVISED Catalog Description, EXS CAF Electives 9 hours, PED 216 Conversion to EXS Prefix, PED 217 Conversion to EXS Prefix, PED 340 Conversion to EXS Prefix, PED 342 Conversion to EXS Prefix, PED 347 Conversion to EXS Prefix, PED 349 Conversion to EXS Prefix, PED 350 Conversion to EXS Prefix, PED 355 Conversion to EXS Prefix, PED 359 Conversion to EXS Prefix, PED 372, RTH 372 syllabus revised October 2010, RTH 475, CAF HEA 497 final fall 2010, Syllabus HEA 497, CAF HEA 498 final fall 2010, RTH 499, RTH 499 syllabus, RTH to 73 hours

- School of Nursing
  - Delete NSG 251, 325, 327, 328, 404
  - New courses NSG 252, 320, 322, 324, 329, 335, 409
  - Course name change NSG 326, 330, 401, 403, 405, 405-800, 415


- Theatre
  - Deletion of a General Theatre Studies Option and addition of Customized option

(related documents for above: UCC Cover - THR - new option, THR new option, UCC Cover - THR - new option

- motion approved

2. The University Studies Committee submits the following motion:

- Kim Sawrey gave a brief overview of the process and the need to be flexible as amendments occur because of omissions, misplacement of courses, or student feedback. This list of courses is not exhaustive. The ones that are displayed are most closely aligned to the existing Basic Studies program.

[Motion 11-03-10] That the Senate approve the following recommendations:

- The passage below (from page 104 of the current undergraduate catalogue)

Basic studies at the University of North Carolina Wilmington is defined as the acquisition of essential skills and an introduction to the broad spectrum of studies which are basic to our intellectual and cultural heritage. The program is designed to develop skills in comprehension, composition, reasoning and analysis; to introduce students to the structure, methodology and knowledge of academic disciplines; and to address important human concerns from disciplinary or interdisciplinary perspectives.

be replaced with:
The University Studies Program at UNCW encourages students to begin a life-long journey of engaged inquiry and societal contribution. As a consciously integrated component of each student’s overall educational experience, the program reflects our institution’s fundamental commitment to fostering ethical and intellectual development and to promoting the growth of well-informed, creative, literate members of society. The University Studies Program first establishes the basis of an essential liberal education through a multi-faceted exploration of our diverse intellectual heritage. As it extends through each student's educational career, the University Studies Program builds upon this foundation through a course of study designed to cultivate the skills and capacities students require to respond to and anticipate the complexities of modern citizenship in an inclusive and creative manner.

In the report *Revising General Education at UNCW* (approved by the Faculty Senate 3-17-09), we recommend the following changes:

On page 8 -

Students who compete meet the requirements of the University Studies program will:

Goal 1. Acquire foundational knowledge, theories and perspectives in a variety of disciplines (*Foundational Knowledge*);

Goal 2. Engage in rigorous, open-minded and imaginative inquiry (*Inquiry*);

Goal 3. Locate, evaluate, and effectively use information by applying a variety of academic and technological skills (*Information Literacy*);

Goal 4. Integrate multiple methods and perspectives to critically examine complex problems (*Critical Thinking*);

Goal 5. Effectively express meaningful ideas in speech and writing (*Thoughtful Expression*);

Goal 6. Demonstrate basic proficiency in speaking, listening, writing and reading in a language in addition to English (*Foreign Language*);

Goal 7. Describe and examine the importance and implications of human diversity (*Diversity*);

Goal 8. Describe and examine the intellectual and ethical responsibilities of active global citizenship (*Global Citizenship*);

Goal 9. Demonstrate the ability to work effectively in teams (*Teamwork*).

On page 35 -

HPA 3. Demonstrate an understanding of the historical, philosophical, or religious construction of differences and similarities among groups and regions over time, within or between groups, regions, or traditions.

HPA 4. Draw on global historical, philosophical, or religious perspectives to evaluate contemporary problems/issues demonstrate an understanding of human values, challenges, priorities, and problems over time

On page 38 -

SAN 3. Demonstrate the ability to write and speak critically about the essential questions addressed by the natural sciences, using the conventions and language of one of those disciplines.

That the following courses to populate the *Foundations* and *Approaches and Perspectives* components of University Studies in the fall of 2011.

(related documents for above: [U.S. submissions by component 10-27-102](#))
• motion approved

3. The Budget Committee submits the following motion:

[Motion 11-03-11] That the Senate approve the following recommendations for a 3% pay raise for all faculty.

• The chair of the budget committee discussed discomfort in bringing this issue forward. However, faculty morale may be threatened as a result of successive years of no raises. He stated that we are justified in asking for a 15 to 20% increase based on what other institutions are doing. Public officials have had a 2.9% increase nationwide. If we ask the CITI committee that is meeting at 4 pm then we may receive a modest tuition increase. Ed addressed the faculty member who wanted to hear counterarguments (parents being upset by another tuition increase, etc.). These raises would cost $2.4 million, which is about $200 a year per student. There was discussion of positive and negative signals that will be sent if this issue moves forward.

• Motion defeated

(related document: 2011-12 Faculty Salary Proposal)

Old business

• No old business

New business

• Marketing faculty brought motion forward regarding the University course repeat policy that was referred to the academic standards committee.

Announcements

• No announcements

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.
Meeting started at 2:05 am

Chairman, Secretary, and Quorum were present. Roll sign-in (Electronically)

Absent: Albergo (Music), Blundo (Social Work), Evers (Accountancy and Business Law), McCann (School of Nursing), Pavil (School of Nursing), Pollard (History), Posey (Biology and Marine Biology), Seo (Public and International Affairs), Simmonds (Computer Science) Stapleton (Biology and Marine Biology), Taylor (Biology and Marine Biology).

Approval of the February Minutes

- February 2011 minutes were approved.

Individual Reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo, Provost Barlow, Vice Chancellor Maimone: Budget Update

Chancellor DePaolo

- Briefing books are being created by Vice Chancellors in each area. There are some things that haven’t changed since 8 years ago such as no raises in 3 years, the lack of equity, etc.
- Budget forums have not attracted many faculty. We want to have as much information out there as possible. The numbers that are being discussed are much higher than previously stated (e.g., 30%). The scenario is generally predictable because the actual cuts will be much lower. The Chancellor answered a question about privatization of UNCW. This is unlikely because it’s not cost effective.

Vice Chancellor Maimone: Budget Update

- He went through the Budget Forum PowerPoint. All the materials related to the budget are located at www.uncw.edu/budget. The 15% cut is the most dramatic. It would mean a $9.7 million reduction in our operating budget.
- Questions from the floor involved the breakdown from the various units if we have a 15% budget reduction. For instance, one question was, is Academic Affairs a “catch all” bucket for various things. The answer was yes. Another question was whether or not additional dollars come from other places (e.g., Business Affairs receives revenue outside of the general fund).

Provost Barlow

- Addressed the question about faculty salaries going up even though they are not competitive. She said that the goal is to have faculty salaries be 80% of those at comparable institutions.
- Another budget session is being held tomorrow March 23, 2011 at the Fisher Student Center.

2. President of the Senate McKinney

- Chancellor search update – the committee met with a group of candidates in Chapel Hill. Five candidates will visit in the next several weeks and will meet with various groups on campus.
- RTP Revisions committee – still working on their final report, which should be ready for the April faculty senate
Staff Senate/Faculty Senate Have a Heart Campaign – This was a successive venture.
Ah Hoc Budget Committee – received feedback about formation of the committee. Waiting to hear more to see where things go.

3. Sarah B. Watstein, University Librarian

- Discussed presentation. The library staff is closely examining the UNCW collection and expenditures. Sarah Watstein is using an informed vision. One of the major initiatives, aside from facilities and digital resources, is working on transparency so that faculty/staff, students, etc. know exactly how the library is being used in real-time.

Committee Reports

The Academic Standards Committee submits the following motions:

[Motion 11-07-17] That the Senate approve the following recommendations:

- The Academic Standards Committee submits this change to the policy on Repeating of Courses for consideration of the Faculty Senate. Additions to the wording of the current catalogue are in red italics. The proposed new Request to Audit with Grade requires a cross-reference to be included in the Auditing section of the catalogue.

REPEATING OF COURSES

Students who receive a grade of "C" (2.00) or better in a course may not repeat the course but may audit without credit. Students who repeat a course in which they have earned credit or for which transfer credit has been awarded, will have the status changed to audit during the term the course is repeated. Students who wish to have the grade for the course repeat show on their transcripts without the course counting in their credit total or grade point average may arrange this before the end of add/drop by submitting a Request to Audit With Grade form. The form and instructions are available in the Registrar’s Office.

- The Academic Standards Committee submits this change to the second paragraph ("forgiveness") of the policy on Repeating of Courses for consideration of the Faculty Senate. Changes to the wording of the current catalogue are in red italics. Double strike-through notation indicates deletions to existing wording. Note that this motion is the committee’s response to that introduced by the Marketing faculty under New Business during the November 2010 meeting of the Faculty Senate.

Students who receive a grade below a "C" (2.00) in a course taken at UNCW may repeat the course at UNCW. For the first three different courses repeated, the previous grade and hours of credit for the repeated course will not be used in calculating the student's grade point average and hours toward graduation. All grades shall remain on the student's transcript. In interpreting the policy it is to be understood that: 1. the term “first three times” means a. that the policy is automatically operative for a student the first time that the student repeats a course, and b. that the three repeats involve three different courses; 2. a student may go beyond three course repeats, but such repeats will not enjoy the privilege of the policy; 3. all students will be able to enjoy the benefits of this policy irrespective of prior course repeat activity; 4. this policy does not govern the repeating of graduate courses (see the Graduate Catalogue for the appropriate policy). Students enrolled in a special topics course for a grade replacement must enroll in the same topic for which they originally received an unsatisfactory grade. Note: A failing grade received owing to admitted or adjudicated academic dishonesty shall not be replaced if the course is repeated. Both the penalty grade and the new grade shall appear on the student's transcript and count in the student's grade point average. A student may not appeal the policy stated in this paragraph to any faculty or administrative level.
• Discussion centered on the original policy being for students who do poorly in any one semester (5 courses) and whether or not we should protect this core intent. Other questions were about how it would affect revenue? Graduation rates?
• Tammie provided statistics on how students use this policy. Few students use the original policy to drop 5 classes in any given semester. Most students use the policy to repeat 1-3 classes.

• Motion was approved.

AUDITING

The auditing of courses without credit is approved by special permission of the registrar and of the instructor involved. Individuals not regularly enrolled as students in the university who wish to audit courses will be classified as special students and will be required to pay regular tuition and fees. Auditing by special students is restricted to classroom-based courses only. No distance education or computer-based courses may be audited by special students. These individuals must complete all registration and any other administrative processes in person at the Office of the Registrar. University students with regular status will be permitted to audit courses and must pay the same tuition and fees required for credit courses. See also Repeating of Courses.

• Motion was approved.

Kate Bruce, Honors Program and John Huntsman, Academic Standards Committee would like to address the senate before a vote is taken on the following motion:

• Kate emphasized that this changing from an Honors program to an Honors College can be done with existing resources. She highlighted the rationale for doing so.

[Motion 11-07-18] That the Senate approve the following recommendation:

WHEREAS, UNCW has successfully provided opportunities for more that 1600 undergraduate students to pursue rigorous independent research projects under the supervision of a faculty mentor and to graduate from UNCW with honors in their major; and

WHEREAS, the Honors Scholars Program that was established by the Faculty Senate in 1994 built upon the success of the independent research experience and consists of an expanded program of study that is open to entering students and includes honors sections of basic studies courses, honors experiential and interdisciplinary seminars, and a capstone academic research project; and

WHEREAS, the Honors Scholars Program at UNCW attracts and retains academically talented students, offering a powerful learning experience by encouraging curiosity, critical thinking, and independent work skills that together contribute to creating a community of honors scholars on campus; and

WHEREAS, UNCW is a recognized leader in quality undergraduate education with exceptional opportunities that create a powerful learning environment for its students; and

WHEREAS, the Honors Scholars Program at UNCW enjoys a strong reputation nationally because it exceeds the basic characteristics of honors programs and already meets most of the characteristics of honors colleges as recommended by the National Collegiate Honors Council; and

WHEREAS, the revenue-neutral transition of UNCW’s Honors Scholars Program to an Honors College could be done immediately with existing resources and administrative titles; and

WHEREAS, Honors Colleges that currently exist at many of our benchmark and sister institutions have proven success in attracting donor support to the home institution as well as extending honors experiences to more students on campus;
NOW, THEREFORE, THE ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE MOVES that the Faculty Senate accepts the Proposal [for the] Transition from Honors Program to Honors College and supports the establishment of an Honors College at UNCW with current staff and funding.

(Background Information: A Summary of the Proposal to Transition the UNCW Honors Scholars Program to an Honors College; UNCW Honors College Proposal).

- Motion was approved.

**Individual Reports**

**Old business**

- Old business postponed until next meeting.

**New business**

- No new business.

**Announcements**

- No announcements.

**Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 4:05 pm.
Tuesday, 18 January 2011

2:00 p.m., EB 162

Meeting 2011-05

Chairman, Secretary, and Quorum were present. Roll sign-in

Electronic attendance. If you didn't sign-in, email Michele Parker (parkerma AT uncw.edu).

Absent: Barlow (Provost), Alexander (Anthropology), Bailey (Biology and Marine Biology), Stapleton (Biology and Marine Biology), Reeves (Chemistry and Biochemistry), Simmonds (Computer Science), Gessner (Creative Writing), Messer (Creative Writing), Peel (English), Albergo (Music), Burgh (Philosophy and Religion), Blundo (Social Work), Hall (Social Work), Evers (Accountancy and Business Law), Dumas (Economics and Finance), Andrews (Management), Glew (Management), Mahar (Information Systems and Operations Management).

Meeting started at 2:07 pm

Approval of the December 7, 2010 minutes

December minutes were approved.

Individual Reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo

A board meeting with the New President just occurred. The Chancellor gave us an overview of their interactions. In terms of budget it is still early in the legislative session. Things are starting to turn around. We may hear about budget cuts as high as 15%. We should be in good shape based on our planning. The book from our local press is receiving rave reviews in the New York Times, LA Times, etc. This is excellent publicity for the University and the students involved.

2. President of the Senate McKinney

1. Student complaints about academic calendar – Students are complaining about the UNCW calendar not being in pace with calendars at other UNC schools.
2. Religious observance absence policy – Dr. Gill from the registrar’s office said he will keep track of the requests and send an email to the instructor. However he will not be discussing specifics of the religion.
3. SPOT committee report – This will be addressed later in this meeting.
4. Chancellor search update – About 30 people have been nominated or applied for the position.
5. RTP Revisions committee – This will be based on the recent survey. The committee is still being formed. The goal is to have a report from the committee by the end of the semester.
6. Parking by Trask – A brief history of the situation was provided: parking near HAAS was unavailable for a whole workday last semester due to a basketball game. Bruce presented a compromise, which was that HAAS faculty can park there up until 5 pm on game days.

3. Kate Bruce and Pam Evers, Undergraduate Research Involvement Project (Background information: www.uncw.edu/uri)

- CSURF wants to pilot a method to collect data on undergraduate involvement. They are specifically interested in extracurricular endeavors such as conference attendance or awards. These entries would not necessarily appear in digital measures. This may be a conduit to recognize our students and their achievements. These recognitions can be placed on a student’s transcript. We can discuss placing this information on a student’s transcript at a later time. The primary purpose of today is the following motion:
“The Faculty Senate supports the creation of the URI and encourages faculty and students to participate.”

- Discussion: this motion is limited to use of the URI database. Several questions arose about using digital measures to capture this information or to communicate with the URI database. The response was that students do not have access to Digital Measures and that Digital Measures cannot be modified. URI could potentially be extended to graduate students. Additional questions from the floor: Is there a way for faculty to receive credit for entering student info? No response was given. Can faculty go in and request a report with anything that has their name? Yes, this can be built into the system.

Motion approved.

- The issue of reporting on transcripts will be submitted to the academic standards committee.

Committee reports

- Craig Galbraith: Ad Hoc Committee on SPOTS (see presentation)
  - Also seen in the research as Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness (SETE). Part of the committees charge was to determine what others were doing and to create a set of recommendations. Eight individuals at different stages of their career were involved. They had bi-weekly meetings.
  - SPOTS are not a global measure of teaching effectiveness (our Q16). They capture 6 to 20% of teaching effectiveness. Hundreds of studies have examined various aspects (likability, manipulation, race, age, etc).
  - They also examined UNC and UNCW Policy as well as UNCW Reality. They pondered what could be used (e.g., peer evaluations. However there is less research published on peer evaluation). Peer evaluations encompass classroom visits, listening to conference presentations, etc.
  - 10 Recommendations (see report) – Eliminate Q16 from SPOTS; Q1-15 not reported with any dept, school, etc; Q1-15 be reported for comparison over time; some questions be tailored to specific departmental missions and expectations; SETEs not be weighted more than 25-33%; the qualitative/written comments from students evaluations be more systematically administered and reported in order for them to be used more effectively; individual faculty member has a right to explain/comment/respond; the process of peer evaluation be more uniform across campus for RPT decisions; peer evaluations be weighted at least equal to student evaluation of teaching; UNCW investigate the IDEA Center’s evaluation system for student evaluation (www.theideacenter.org).
  - Questions from the floor were about the validity of SPOTS for some purposes but not others. Another question was about whether or not these recommendations will be used for RPT. If we have evidence that something is ineffective don’t we have a responsibility not to use it or to take action immediately?
  - The report is available for senators. We will revisit this information in 1-2 months.

- Kim Cook, QEP Update
  - Great faculty participation in QEP process. In the next 2 weeks there will be QEP topic development focus groups. On Feb 7th there will be a QEP town hall session 9:30–11:30 a.m. in the Lumina Theatre. Topics and implementation will be discussed. The website has updates: http://uncw.edu/QEP/index.html

4. The University Studies Committee makes the following motion:

[Motion 11-05-13] That the Senate approves the following recommendations:

To remove Goal 9 Teamwork from the list of the University Studies Learning Goals to be included in the 2011-2012 Undergraduate Catalog.

- These goals were approved in 2009 as part of the ongoing revision of the general education program.
- The Teamwork Learning Goal has yet to be put in place broadly enough to guarantee that all students will
receive adequate opportunities to learn and hone *Teamwork* skills.

- *Teamwork* is only currently addressed in two components of the University Studies revision (and required in only one – *Composition*).
- *Teamwork* is also explicitly addressed in less than a third of the majors.

- Therefore, we recommend postponing adoption of this *Learning Goal* until such time as the necessary curriculum can be put in place.

Motion approved.

**Old business**

- In regards to the Chancellor’s search committee update, Bruce stated that faculty have communicated that they want someone from an academic background. He will ensure that our voice is heard in this area.

**New business**

- No new business

**Announcements**

- Someone will need to replace Gabriel Lugo as Election Officer and shadow him this semester. Please contact him if you are interested.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned 3:29 p.m.
Tuesday, February 15, 2011
2:00 p.m., EB 162
Meeting 2011-06

Chairman, Secretary, and Quorum were present.

Roll sign-in (Electronic). If you didn't sign-in, email Michele Parker (parkerma AT uncw.edu).

Absent: Alexander (Anthropology), Blundo (Social Work), Brown (Art and Art History), Evers (Accountancy and Business Law), Fonvielle (History), Gessner (Creative Writing), Hall (Social Work), Hickman (Music), Messer (Creative Writing), Noland (English), Patterson (Computer Science), Pavill (School of Nursing), Simmonds (Computer Science), Swafford (Elementary, Middle, and Literacy Education), Taylor (Biology and Marine Biology).

Meeting started at 2:05 pm

Approval of the January 2011 minutes.

Individual Reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo

- The Chancellor announced homecoming events this weekend. She mentioned that the budget is evolving. The governor discussed it yesterday. The projected cuts for education statewide were 3.7 billion, which has been reduced to 2.7 billion. Mark Lanier explained the reason for the decrease. The governor’s budget comes out this week. Charley reiterated that 6% budget cuts have already been planned. Therefore if there is a 10% budget cut, we only need to cut another 4%. There are two open forums for budget review: March 1st and 2nd. There will also be budget brown bags once a month for February, March, and April. Cathy Barlow is willing to talk about the budget and welcomes suggestions.

- There were concerns from the floor about student’s being kept in the dark about tuition increases, especially since this is the second year in the row. The Chancellor says when students go to ASG they learn that 50% of tuition is allocated for faculty salaries. These students tend to be involved and “in the know.” There was another comment from the floor about going straight to student’s parents to inform them of budgetary information. The Chancellor informed us that she meets with parents in June during orientation. A Senator mentioned that UNC Chapel Hill sent an informative letter to parents about the budget situation. Another senator indicated that there is a service you can sign-up to automatically deduct money from ones account to pay tuition fees. There may be a subset of parents who don’t see the bill and/or the letter that would accompany it. The Chancellor noted this information.

2. President of the Senate McKinney

- SPOT committee report – the committee is looking into developing a form for online courses. Hopefully, it will be developed by the end of the semester.

- Chancellor search update – search firm is still narrowing the pool of applicants. The Parker search firm will come up with 15 candidates. The Chancellor said that every search firm conducts searches differently. Eighty percent of the candidates are from academia and some don’t have a terminal degree. Comment from the floor that it is important that the candidate has gone through and is familiar with the RPT process.

- RTP Revisions committee - they are still completing their work and should have a report at the end of the semester.

- Staff Senate/Faculty Senate Have a Heart Campaign – bags for canned goods should be in your department. If
you get a chance, bring canned goods in.

- Ah Hoc Budget Committee (PowerPoint) - A person from University College is welcome to join this committee. Bruce displayed and explained the strategic model that will guide decision making. The Chancellor provided some additional context: Chapel Hill faculty/staff to student ratio is 3:1 whereas for UNCW its 10:1. That has implications for Figure 1. This committee will recommend changes. Otherwise Tom Ross and others will make the budget decisions. There was a question from the floor about who the decision makers are. Bruce responded that it would be Deans and Vice Chancellors. The IPEDS data is from 2009. More recent data is currently unavailable. There was a comment from the floor about the interconnectivity of decisions, which often have ripple effects and unintended consequences. The recommendations that the ad hoc committee creates will be brought before the Faculty Senate approximately 2 weeks from this Friday.

Committee Reports

- Martin Posey, Overview for the SACSCOC Reaffirmation Process (PowerPoint)
  - Explained why we obtain SACS accreditation. The reaffirmation process has changed since 2003. We are examined as a unit (the entire University). The timeline was provided. SACS involves all colleges and universities. That includes community colleges. Essentially SACS is asking: Are you doing what you promised? The main tasks at the Department level will be assessment.
  - Question from floor: what happens when we don’t have the staff to do things because of the budget? Answer: this depends on the situation because we may not have the money but will have the money to do those tasks before our next SACS review.
- Kim Cook, QEP (PowerPoint)
  - Eight focus groups were conducted. Applied learning was the main topic that resulted from focus group conversations.
  - Request for Pre-Proposal forms was distributed to Senators. Faculty are encouraged to work on proposals in teams. A template is being created for submissions, which will be posted on the QEP website. A finalist forum will occur.
- Ken Gurganus, Senate Steering Committee, Faculty Senate Reorganization (rationale: Bylaws Amendments). Ken explained the proposed changes that allow for more equal representation among divisions. There are a total of 3 recommendations.

  [Motion 11-06-15] That the Senate approve the amending Senate Bylaws with respect to Faculty Senate Reorganization for Representation (rationale: Bylaws Amendments).

  Motion approved. Implementation will occur right away.

3. The University Curriculum Committee makes the following motion:

  [Motion 11-06-16] That the Senate approves the following recommendations:

  The reorganization of the School of Nursing into two departments: The Department of Adult Health and Learning Technology, and the Department of Family and Community Health (rationale: Nursing Reorganization).

  Motion approved.

Individual Reports

1. Sarah Watstein, University Librarian – due to time constraints this will be postponed until the next meeting.

2. SGA Senator Dylan Figlo, Laptop Policy Task Force Resolution

  - They passed out a handout for the resolution. The discussion centered on inconsistency around laptop use in classrooms. A suggestion from the floor was made that faculty communicate their rationale for or against laptop
use in the classroom formally at the beginning of the semester in the syllabus.
• Gabriel Lugo stated that this issue had be dealt with several years ago and resulted in the Tablet PC initiative, which needs to be revisited. During that timeframe a list of classes that approved tablet PCs or other related technologies were posted to aid students with class selection.
• Question from floor about modifying the resolution because there is an assumption that we must have a universal laptop policy. It was suggested that the resolution come from the discussion that faculty have with SGA. This issue will be sent to SGA.

3. Mary Gornto, Vice Chancellor University Advancement, *The Campaign for UNCW: Soaring to Greatness*
   - A handout about publicly launching the campaign and a list of events was distributed. She indicated that questions or concerns can be directed to her.

**Old business**

• RPT Committee recommendations will be discussed and voted on one by one at the next meeting.

**New business**

• No new business.

**Announcements**

• No announcements.

**Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned 4:05 pm
Minutes Dec. 7, 2010

Tuesday, 7 December 2010
2:00 p.m., Lumina Theatre

Meeting 2011-04

Chairman, Secretary, and Quorum were present. Roll sign-in

Attendance sheets were distributed. If you don't sign them, email Michele Parker (parkerma AT uncw.edu).

Absent: Cordle (Dean CAS), Moore (Dean Univ. College), Bailey (Biology and Marine Biology), Almeida (Chemistry and Biochemistry), Reeves (Chemistry and Biochemistry), Simmonds (Computer Science), Noland (English), Buttino (Film Studies), Brown (Health and Applied Human Sciences), Usilton (History), Hickman (Music), Albergo (Music), Hungerford (Psychology), Van Camp (Psychology), Seo (Public and International Affairs), Blundo (Social Work), Elikai (Accountancy and Business Law), Evers (Accountancy and Business Law), Dumas (Economics and Finance), Wray (Information Systems and Operations Management), Orton (Nursing), Roberts (Nursing).

Meeting started at 2:08 pm

Approval of the November 9, 2010 minutes

November minutes were approved.

Special order of the day

Election of a new Faculty Senate President

- Gabriel Lugo elected by acclimation

Individual Reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo

- The Chancellor discussed the budget cuts. All state agencies have been asked to consider a 15% scenario. We (UNCW) are planning for 10%, which may be what Universities are asked to do. The Chancellor will let us know. If we have a 15% reduction in funds, we may be allowed to raise tuition to make up for the cuts. The legislative session starts in January. Mark Lanier made a brief statement about public positions on this issue in terms related to the new composition of the legislature. There was a question from the floor: what does a 10% cut mean for Basic Studies? The Chancellor's response was that various recommendations are being heard and considered prior to going to the Board. She is hopeful that we can go forward with Basic Studies. She also mentioned the timing (5 pm) of the recent email about the budget. They had been checking on various elements but she knew it had to go out that day before anything else came up.

2. President of the Senate McKinney

   a. RTP Survey (see attached document: RTP Final Report 11 10)

   There was a 42% response rate. Highlights of the results were shared: More faculty were in favor of keeping the 3 page narrative. Overall, people understood their departmental requirements but not those of other departments. Bruce is seeking individuals who have previously been involved with the RPT process to be on ad hoc committee to discuss the results and make recommendations. Any recommendations will go through the RPT committee and have to be approved by Faculty Senate.

   b. Online SPOT Committee
In the spring there will be a form for departments to specify what they need in terms of online SPOTS. An online SPOTS instrument is being developed.

c. Policy on Religious Holidays/Class Attendance (see attached document: Policy on Religious Observances)

The policy was displayed. Bruce asked for suggestions from the floor about implementing this policy. Faculty suggested this be handled on an individual basis by faculty, Dean of Students, or the Registrar so that a central location would be responsible with keeping track of excused absences for religious reasons. Bruce will contact the registrar for his opinion and this issue will be brought [back] to the Faculty Senate in January.

d. Chancellor search forums

There have been emails from faculty who were not thrilled about the timing of the Chancellor search forums. It is difficult to find a time that satisfies everyone. Approximately 60 faculty were in attendance. The message that was sent was that we [UNCW] are doing well. We want someone who understands this and can move us ahead based on what we have done in the past. We want the new chancellor to be from academia.

3. Faculty Assembly Report: Raymond Burt

- A new administration for the UNC Faculty Assembly is forming due to departures and hires. This website has information: www.uncfacultyassembly.org and there is an informative blog. In the meeting on the November 12 the assembly was talking about how faculty may interact with various campus offices (e.g., registrar), best practices, and lean budget requests, which targets deferred maintenance. A program elimination committee has also been formed for next year to see what is permissible in terms of: What is the process for letting go of a program? What constitutes a program? What is the process for letting go of tenured faculty?
- It's up to the general campuses to make decisions. However the committee will explore what is reasonable assistance if programs or tenured faculty are eliminated. There is a strong sentiment that faculty will examine various strategies that have been taken by universities across the country and this information will be cataloged in a database. The database, in Sharepoint, with this information will be available so that people can view the material. Faculty from across disciplines have been appointed to the committee. Contact Ray Burt if you would like to be part of this process that is being setup under CTE.

Committee reports

1. The University Curriculum Committee submits the following motion:

[Motion 11-04-12] That the Senate approve the following recommendations:

- Requirements for a Major in Physical Education and Health for the B.S. Degree with a Concentration in Exercise Science be reduced from 67 to 64 hours
  (related documents for above: EXS Catalog Description; CAF EXS Catalog Description 11112010)

  Motion approved.

Old business

- No old business

New business

- No new business
Announcements

- No announcements

Adjournment

- Meeting adjourned at 2:53 pm
Tuesday, 19 April

2:00 p.m., EB 162

Meeting 2011-08

Chairman, Secretary, and Quorum were present.

Roll sign-in (Electronic). If you didn't sign-in, email Michele Parker (parkerma AT uncw.edu).

Absent: Blundo (Social Work), Brown (Art and Art History), Bullers (Sociology and Criminology), Burgh (Philosophy and Religion), Dumas (Economics and Finance), Evers (Accountancy and Business Law), Gessner (Creative Writing), Hall (Social Work), Henry (Geography and Geology), Hickman (Music), Jackson (Psychology), McCann (School of Nursing), McMurray (Mathematics and Statistics), Messer (Creative Writing), Mount (Foreign Languages and Literatures), Patterson (Computer Science), Pavill (School of Nursing), Posey (Biology and Marine Biology), Reeves (Chemistry and Biochemistry), Silva (Film Studies), Simmonds (Computer Science), Thomas (Early Childhood and Special Education), Turrisi (Philosophy and Religion), Wray (Information Systems and Operations Management).

Meeting commenced at 2:04 pm.

Approval of the March Minutes

   Approved amended March minutes.

Individual Reports

1. Chancellor DePaolo

   President Tim Ross will be visiting campus next week. We will be emphasizing interactions with students and what makes our campus unique: excellent teaching and our focus on research. There was an 8 a.m. budget meeting in Raleigh this morning. The budget cut is expected to decrease slightly as time goes on.

2. President of the Senate McKinney

   • Chancellor search update – We are looking for someone to help us continue on a upward path. The three candidates will meet with Tim Ross in early May and then we will know who the new chancellor will be.
   • RTP Revisions committee – There will be a May meeting. RTP will be one of the main foci for this meeting.
   • Staff Senate/Faculty Senate Have a Heart Campaign (new Guinness record set!!) - Set the record for the 550,000 tons of food collected.
   • Ad Hoc Budget Committee – this committee is waiting to receive budgetary data so that they can make recommendations to the administration with respect to budget cuts.
   • Online SPOTS - The Evaluation Committee is continuing to work on making online SPOTS easier to administer and to increase response rates.
   • Healthcare – Premiums will be going up. Smoking and obesity initiatives are going away. The state will be seeking alternatives to Blue Cross Blue Shield. This information is located on the internet.

3. Raymond Burt, Faculty Assembly Report
Info about the faculty assembly is available (click here). Faculty need to be part of the duplication study. It is important for us to be engaged and involved. Dr. Burt also encouraged individuals to run for faculty assembly. The March meeting was about distance education. There were presentations from the UNC online proctoring portal and various discussion groups. Kim is leaving the faculty assembly because she’s concluding her 3 year term. She’s enjoyed being a delegate and spoke of the importance of being in that role. Any faculty can be nominated, not just those who are senators.

4. Nomination of Faculty Assembly Representative

We need two nominations for the regular representative and two nominations for the alternate. Bruce nominated the current alternate, who would like to remain in that role. Based on the ensuing discussion about contacting potential nominees it was agreed that nominations will be collected via email by the end of next week and then ballots will be sent before the end of the semester.

Committee Reports

1. The University Studies Committee makes the following motion:

[Motion 11-08-19] That the Senate approves the following recommendations in changes to the charge to the University Studies Committee:

c. Basic Studies
   i. Duties. To review existing and proposed content of Basic Studies curriculum and catalog copy. To receive analysis of basic studies assessment results from the Learning Assessment Council and formulate recommendations as appropriate to the Faculty Senate for curricular changes based on assessment findings. To coordinate efforts to refine Basic Studies offerings to promote the academic mission of the university. To work with academic units to ensure that Basic Studies courses are offered on a reasonable and regular basis.
   ii. Membership. Nine faculty members, including at least four from the College of Arts and Sciences and at least one from each of the professional schools, and two other from the faculty at large. Term of membership shall be three years with staggered term so that one-third of the committee terms expire in a given year. A member may serve a second consecutive term. At the initial Fall meeting the Committee shall elect a vice-chair who will normally assume the role of chair in the following year. The chief academic officer, the Dean of the University College, a representative from the library faculty, the General Education Assessment Director, and the Early College Liaison shall be ex-officio non-voting members.

Motion approved.

2. The Faculty Senate Steering Committee makes the following motion:

[Motion 11-08-20] To allow for a one-time suspension of the FPRC election bylaws and have the lower vote-getter of the two members of division III elected in 2011 to serve only for one year.

Rationale
Passing this motion would restore the staggering terms intended by the bylaws. The current non-staggered status will cause a problem if division III has two vacancies but falls in a cycle with the responsibility to elect one member of a predetermined rank.
Motion approved.

3. Gabriel Lugo: Autonomous Committee Election Results ([Excel File](#)). This file can also be accessed for the Senators and Officers Faculty Senate webpage.

**Old business**

1. The Department of Mathematics and Statistics submits the following motion:

   [Motion 11-08-21] That the Senate approves the following recommendation:

   The consideration of the report of the ad hoc committee on 'use of SPOTs for RTP' be referred to both the recently-appointed Senate RPT Committee and to the Senate Evaluation Committee.

   Link to [SPOT Report](#)

   The discussion centered on the rationale for sending this back to the committee. Questions were raised about making the recommendations into motions, who/when these recommendations will be implemented, committee composition and productivity, etc. It was agreed upon that we need to go through the appropriate channels in order to strengthen and support the faculty senate.

   Motion approved.

**New business**

- Election of Faculty Assembly Representative.
- Kathleen Berkeley, Faculty Senate Nominating Committee – spoke about rationale for this process. It strengthens the Senate and this is even more important with a new Chancellor. She volunteered to look at different models to bring forward qualified candidates for our positions. Suggestions from the floor included email reminders about upcoming nominations prior to meetings. This would give people a chance to discuss opportunities with their colleagues. Another suggestion was for Senators to know their bylaws. For instance, the Faculty Senate Steering committee will be elected at the first meeting of the academic year. Another suggestion was to have more information about the respective positions because the information in the Faculty Senate Handbook is limited.

**Announcements**

- No announcements.

**Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 3:01 pm.
Minutes for Faculty Senate Meeting
13 September 2011
2:00 p.m. EB 162
Meeting 2011-09

1. Meeting started at 2 p.m.

   Chairman, Secretary, and Quorum were present. Roll sign-in (Electronically)

   Absent: Not applicable

2. Approval of April 2011 Minutes

   • The April minutes were approved.

   • Special order of the day:
     Senate Officers and other steering committee members for 2011-2012 were elected:
     o Patty Turrisi: Vice President, Philosophy and Religion
     o Jess Boersma: Secretary, Foreign Languages and Literature
     o Steering Committee:
        ▪ Jennifer Horan, Public and International Affairs
        ▪ Andy Jackson, Psychology
        ▪ Ed Graham, Economics and Finance
        ▪ Pamela Evers, Accountancy and business Law

     Bruce McKinney, as the previous Faculty Senate President, will continue to serve on the Steering Committee.

Individual Reports

a. Chancellor Miller.

   • Discussed the importance of shared governance.

   • He will share information from the Board of Governors on a regular basis:
     o He reiterated what is in Tim Ross’ report to the Board.
     o We have developed a new set of peer institutions that will go before the board for approval. We needed to be matched correctly in terms of tuition, salary, research, etc.
     o We will continue to consider graduation and retention rates.
     o Faculty retention and workload will be examined. The Texas model is being considered.
     o They will look at performance funding. We will continue to focus on research.
     o Tuition planning will be discussed and may work in our favor. There may be some adjustment in the out-of-state rules. This will work for us due to the large numbers of out of state
students.

- General administration will re-examine program duplication.
- We have a great university and a number of challenges; looking forward to working closely with the Senators to continue to be among the best Universities in the system.
- Encouraged faculty to think about pressures on this University, being held to a higher level of accountability.
- Fiscal environment will not get better for awhile, but we have leadership that believes in flexibility and getting external revenue.
- We will find new ways of doing things that save money and time that allow us to continue to achieve excellence. We will do more but differently. We will be asking faculty to step up and participate in forums that address this.

b. President of the Senate Lugo.

- Shared governance (AFT Higher Education).
  - His main principle: to defend shared governance and academic freedom
  - To be effective we must become more participatory. We need to use our own faculty and resources to improve.
  - Let’s streamline the work we do by becoming paperless. For example SPOTS can be moved to an electronic system in the classroom.
  - We will bring the most important matters to the Senate and conduct other business through other means such as the new system that will be demonstrated.

- Handbook.
  - This project is shared between the faculty and Academic Affairs. The Senate will be engaged. He showed an electronic version of the handbook, which is being created. The electronic version will be searchable via PDF.

- Senate forum demo. (Jarrett Piner)
  - The website is https://share.uncw.edu
  - Once you log-in there are a number of team sites listed, click on the link for Faculty Senate.
  - The various features (ask a question, the calendar, submit an agenda item, etc) were displayed and described.

SACS – Update

a. Martin Posey.

- Provided an overview of what the Faculty Senate will be looking at over the upcoming months.
- The PowerPoint contained a timeline and listed focal areas.
This year SACS will be looking at faculty credentialing and policy
The faculty senate will be dealing with multiple issues as it pertains to SACS
About 75% of the syllabi include a brief description of the course, all faculty are encouraged to do this.

b. Kim Cook.

The pilot for QEP on applied learning is running this fall
The Membership on the QEP taskforce has changed.
Detailed information about the pilot will be provided at the upcoming forums (handout).
The new QEP Task force will work collaboratively with the Pilot team
E-Teal is the acronym will be using. It stands for experiencing Transformative education through applied learning.
We will work together to create the best QEP possible
We need to define what applied learning means to us. We will decide how we will measure what students gain from applied learning experiences and how will we evaluate these experiences.
QEP Ambassadors will be invited to participate in the process again and we will expand the number of people who are involved. If you’re interested in being an ambassador or know people who are interested contact Kim Cook (cook AT uncw.edu).

Committee Reports

a. The Evaluation Committee offers the following motions:

Diana Ashe spoke about the report based on the recommendations that were examined earlier this year by the evaluation committee (PowerPoint)

[Motion 2011-09-M01]: (From 2011-12 committee)
That beginning in the fall semester of 2011, all courses categorized as information highway (INHWY), remote (REMOT) or web-enhanced (WEBE) will be administered online student evaluations as their default option. Instructors of WEBE courses may opt for paper-based student evaluations by making a written request to their department chairs before the fifth week of classes each semester.

Discussion/Sample questions from the floor:

- Are we considering extreme positive or negative responses correctly?
- How are we ensuring that not only student evaluations are being considered in the RPT process?
- How much of the process can be automated?
- What do we do about the SPOTS we have now?
- What do we do about SPOTS long term?
The motion was approved.

[Motion 2011-09-M02]: (From 2010-11 committee)
That in the fall semester of 2011, IDEA Center and IOTA Solutions representatives be invited to campus to meet with members of the Faculty Senate so that we may consider the potential benefits and drawbacks of moving to an off-site evaluation provider.

- 2010 Ad-hoc committee report on SPOT/RPT.
- 2011_09 evaluation Committee report on SPOT.

Discussion/Sample questions:

- How much are we paying for these people to visit?
- There is no harm in having them visit.
- Instrument and delivery/process are being considered simultaneously

The motion was approved.

b. The University Studies Committee offers the following motions:

[Motion 2011-09-M03]: US-Phase II motions.

- Explorations Beyond the Classroom and Thematic Transdisciplinary Clusters. (2011)

The discussion was started, but halted due to time constraints. The conversation will continue via SharePoint so that a vote can be taken at the October faculty senate meeting.

Old Business

- Old business postponed until next meeting.

New Business

- No new business.

Announcements

- No announcements.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 3:58 p.m.
Facility Senate Meeting October 04, 2011
2:00 p.m. EB 162
Meeting 2011-10

Meeting called to order at 2:00 p.m.

a. Chairman, Secretary, and Quorum were present. Roll sign-in (Electronically)

   • Absent: Brubaker, Jennifer (COM), Dennison, Darwin (HAHS), Fonvielle, Chris (HIS), Kieber, Robert (CHM), Miller, Derrick (FLL), Moody, Amy (ECSE), Ousley, Denise (ITFSE), Richardson, Sue (FST).

September 23, 2011 minutes approved

Individual Reports

a. Chancellor Miller (2:02-2:15)

   • Presentation of *Dare to Soar*

      o Discussion of:

         o University Planning Space

         o Great framework. No major changes, but room for innovation

         o Innovation tied to improving measurable outcomes

         o Planning-Innovation paired

            ▪ Importance of environment

            ▪ Creation of new business model

         o More faculty input

         o Cost allocation

         o Department involvement

         o Innovation Space

            ▪ Restructure CITI Committee

            ▪ University Innovation Council and University Budget Committee better coordinated

         o Budget Timeline

         o Make up of University Budget Committee

         o Restructured CITI Committee

         o Make up of University Innovation Council
Questions (2:15-2:25):
  o Senator: Relationship between Faculty Senate Budget Committee and University Budget Committee?
  o Chancellor: Not sure what the role of Faculty Senate Budget Committee is.
  o Senator: What do you mean by business model at the departmental level?
  o Chancellor: Calculate cost to deliver program.
  o Need to think about how we afford a program, not just question of it being a good idea.
  o Senator: How do we define the product?
  o Chancellor:
    ▪ Creating fiscal environment that supports academic product that doesn’t follow standard business models
    ▪ Current model is not sustainable
  o Senator: How do we evaluate benefit of faculty having more time, e.g., to do research and teach?
  o Chancellor: Need to understand finances at department level to create incentives that reward that department, not punish it.
    ▪ New plans without funding ideas unlikely to be approved
    ▪ Georgia Tech Innovation
  o President Lugo: I will insert seed in Senate Forum to further discussion.

b. President of the Senate Lugo. (2:25-2:40)

  • Academics First and Faculty Assembly
    o Raymond Burt (2:27-2:33)
      o How to best coordinate amongst the 16 campuses
      o Call for feedback on Academics First on Faculty Senate SharePoint site. Updated list.
      o Senator: President Ross’s portrait of situation was very dark. Less support for higher education by state legislature.
      o Need to rethink our education with public regarding why it’s important to support the university

Special Order of the day: SACS: Gabriel Lugo for Martin Posey. (2:33-2:40) Vice President Turrisi presiding

a. [Motion 2011-10-M01]: Credit Hours Policy – to be added to the Academic Affairs Policy site and linked from the Registrar’s

  o Senator: Standardize traditional definitions and other instructional modes of delivery?
Turrisi: Yes.

Senator: 15-week definition consistent if we take into account final exams?

Turrisi: Yes.

Senator: How are lab hours considered?

Evers: Call the question

- Motion passed unanimously

Committee Reports (2:41-3:12)

a. The University Studies Committee offers the following motions: (From 2011-09 meeting)

- [Motion 2011-09-M03]: University Studies - Phase II motions
  - Motion [2011-09-M03] approved with majority

- [Motion 2011-09-M05]:
  That the USAC present to the Faculty Senate the proposed catalogue copy for Explorations Beyond the Classroom and Thematic Transdisciplinary Clusters during the November 2011 meeting and then present for the Senate’s approval the specific experiences/courses that will populate those components in the spring.

Documents:

  o Explorations Beyond the Classroom and Thematic Transdisciplinary Clusters. (2011)
    - Senator: Implementing both clusters and EBC seems rather daunting. I’d like to see clusters postponed a year.
    - Senator: I agree. Question of planning
    - Senator: I move that the implementation of the clusters be postponed until AY 2013-2014. Seconded.
    - Senator: A point in favor of not postponing is avoiding advising problems with different students in different years.
    - Vote on motion to postpone: Ayes 22 Nays: Greater than 22. Motion fails.

  o Motion [2011-09-M05] approved with majority

b. Report of the University Curriculum Committee – PHY/GAG Merger

Documents

  o 2011-09-30 UCC Minutes
  o GAG White Paper
  o PHY - Statement

- Senator: Move Motion 2011-10-M02 to consideration here.
Seconded and Approved.

- **[Motion 2011-10-M02]** – Joint Motion from PHY/GAG
  In view of unanimous opposition by the faculties in the Department of Geography and Geology and the Department of Physics and Physical Oceanography, and whereas these Departments have submitted written statements opposing the proposed merger and outlining the serious problems with the proposed merger (see posted documents on senate web page), we move that the UNCW Faculty Senate recommend to the University Administration that the Department of Geography and Geology and the Department of Physics and Physical Oceanography not be merged.

  - Discussion:
    - Senator: How process dealt with directly tied to questions of faculty governance. Either the university values faculty governance or it doesn’t.
    - Senator: Only given a directive to merge.
    - Senator: Don’t agree with motion in that it doesn’t act to address need to review departments.
    - Senator: On the other hand, this will cause many problems for the two departments.
    - Senator: Question of vertical vs. horizontal budget cuts. I support vertical cuts.
    - Senator: Is such a motion done in the best interests of the University?
    - Senator: We do need a process to vet such issues
    - Senator: Can’t support motion, but yes the procedural issue.
    - Senator: The public needs to realize any cuts at this point will hurt academic experience.
    - Senator: The university needs to follow procedures.
    - Senator: As an alternative, why not Task GAG and Physics and Physical Oceanography with alternative cost-saving measures?

  - Senator: We’ve already suffered significant cuts
  - Senator: UCC report based on these issues
  - Senator: As member of UCC I noticed that no statement was made.
  - Senator: What are the implications of passing the motion?
  - Lugo: The will of the senate will be passed on to the pertinent administrators.
Motion 2011-10-M02 passes with vocal majority


- 2011_10_CFO Report

  - Highlight: Hypothetical tuition increase of $1,404 per student needed to recover what was lost in appropriations.

  - Student: Faculty ratio has increased as a result of cuts.

    - Senator: Any talk of raising the limit of out-of-state students in the case of UNCW?

    - Maimone: I’m in favor of averaging across the 16 campuses. This would help us since we bump up against the 18% cap versus institutions such as UNC-Pembroke which hover around 2-3%.

    - Senator: Could be more creative with how cap is handled.

Old Business (3:12-3:13)

a. The Honors College offers the following motion (Kate Bruce available for questions):

[Motion 2011-09-M04]: Honors Scholars College Motion.

Documents

- Honors College Proposal – December 2010

  - Motion [2011-09-M04] approved unanimously

New Business

a. [Motion 2011-10-M03] – Motion from Steering Committee: Faculty Governance. (3:13-3:22)

  - Discussion:

    - Senator: How would the issue have been resolved in light of the resolution?

    - Senator: Timing, not the key component. Question of following existing procedures, e.g. UCC reviewing the reports of GAG and Physics and Physical Oceanography.

    - Chancellor: First of all, I strongly support this kind of review. However, the authority to delete programs rests with President of the system. The initial wording of the resolution is inconsistent with Board of Governor policy.

  - Motion 2011-10-M03 approved unanimously

b. [Motion 2011-10-M04] – SPOT motion from Pam Evers. (3:22-3:43)

  - Senator: What do we do if Q 16 taken out, RTP?

  - President Lugo: Should be summary of all questions 1 through 16. This is not current practice.

  - Senator: This is not about actual learning, but rather perception of teaching.

  - Galbraith (Management, Chair of Ad-hoc Committee on SPOTs):
Summary of Ad-Hoc committee’s findings

- Senator: I’m strongly against this motion.
- Timing conflicts with dealings with outside vendors
- There are major conflicts in the literature regarding student evaluations.
- Removing Q 16 would not be consistent with peer institutional practices.
- Q 16 does have value as a tool.

- Senator: My department is against its removal. Only Q 16 is not a good practice, but doesn’t mean it should be removed.

- Galbraith: Global questions are problematic due to influence of recency effect, which is easy to manipulate, e.g., “fudging” the administration of evaluations.

- Senator: There are ways to address the issue of manipulating
  - Use of only Q 16 is not best practice
  - Senator: Problem with administration and manipulation of delivery of SPOTs

- Galbraith: Studies showing validity of global question based on very controlled environment. Recent studies argue that mid- and high-level classes and global question are not positively correlated.

- Senator: Question not of throwing out SPOTs, but making evaluation comprehensive

- Senator: Q1-15 often gives contradictory information to Q16.

- Senator: Need to go to Evaluation Committee and do this systematically.

- Senator: There are plenty of counter examples that show global questions do have value.

- Senator: The Evaluation committee should handle this.

- Senator: Call the question

- **Motion 2011-10-M05 fails (majority dissenting)**

  c. **Vietnam Program** – Bruce McKinney (3:43-3:46)

    - If interested, contact Bruce McKinney or Denise Dipuccio

Announcements

- No announcements

Adjournment

- Meeting adjourned at 3:47
Agenda for Faculty Senate Meeting
November 08, 2011
2:00 p.m. EB 162
Meeting 2011-11 2011 - 11

Called to order at 2:00.

- **Chairman, Secretary, and Quorum were present. Roll sign-in** (Electronically)

- **Absent:** Combs, Sue; Craig, Bailey, J.; Elikai, Fara; Galizio, Mark; Hickman, Joe; Kieber, Robert; Kim-Godwin, Soo; Lee, Rebecca; Patterson, Iorie; Reinicke, Bryan; Richardson, Sue; Simmonds, Devon; Southwood-Willard, Amanda; Taylor, Amy; White, Michael; Wray, Barry

October 04, 2011 minutes approved.

**Individual Reports**

a. **Chancellor Miller.**

- Thanks to those who participated in Seahawk Saturday
- Kudos to the History department kudos for Sherman Lectures. Great turnout.
- Staff Appreciation.
- Importance of continuing to handle all the important curricular matters.
- Budget update
- In process of discussing tuition and fee increases with Board of Governors
- Possibility of going above 6.5% limit for campuses such as UNCW that have sufficient headroom with respect to peer institutions
- Masters in Marine Biology is at GA and has received positive feedback
- Three townhouse meeting scheduled with Chancellor and Provost
- The chancellor and his partner are doing a lot of traveling in support of fundraising activities with alumni
- Reassurance regarding Penn State situation
- Title 9 provisions require the university to report violations. This responsibility is clearly understood here at UNCW

b. **President of the Senate Lugo.**

- Report on motions passed at last meeting ([Chancellor’s Letter](#))
- Report and concerns were communicated to Faculty Assembly in Raleigh
- Similar concerns at other institutions were noted
- Senate Committee Structure
- Current structure is outdated, based on a time when the faculty were in charge of administrative duties now held by UNCW administrators
  - Innovation Challenge: SPOTs on paper to Paperless SPOTs
  - Challenge to move to completely paperless system
· By December the Evaluation committee should have report regarding the tool used for student evaluation of faculty

· Handbook, senate website update
  o Old site will be phased out
  o New site will be much simpler

· Call for December nominations for Faculty Assembly
  o Colleen Reilly is still eligible
  o Raymond Burt not eligible, but will stay on in advisory role on the Assembly Board

· Chancellor has directed the Provost to work with Steering Committee regarding future departmental consolidations.
  o Physics and Geology (complete name) will keep basic structures, but with one administrative chair.

· More Faculty Senate guides available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Order of the day - SACS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Motion 2011-11-M01]: Curricular Change Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To amend the Curricular Change policy in the handbook to reflect: the new CHHS, the change from Basic to University Studies, the new Credit Hour Definition policy, and the external review process by the BOG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original policy: <a href="http://www.uncw.edu/fac_handbook/responsibilities/teaching/curriculum.htm">http://www.uncw.edu/fac_handbook/responsibilities/teaching/curriculum.htm</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

· Representative of UCC

· Representative of USAC: The floor was ceded to Cara Cilano, USAC Chair
  o Importance of both committees working forward.

· Pam Evers: Motion: Refer motion to be directed to Steering Committee for further consideration

· Posey: Need to carry out any changes by December so as to be in compliance with SACS

· Motion carries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Motion 2011-11-M02]: Distance Education Authentication and Privacy Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>· Point of information. Motion is minimalist.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

· [Motion 2011-11-M02] approved unanimously.

Committee Reports
a. The Academic Standards Committee offers the following motion:
[Motion 2011-11-M03]: Honor Code
To amend section 1b of the Academic Honor Code
From:

· 1b. The unauthorized acquisition, buying, selling, trading, or theft of an examination, quiz, term paper, or project.

To:

· 1b. The unauthorized acquisition, buying, selling, trading, or theft of an examination, quiz, term paper, or project. Any course materials (including but not limited to tests, quizzes, or assignments) returned to the
student by the instructor are not considered unauthorized for distribution purposes unless otherwise stated in the faculty’s syllabus.

· Discussion:
  o Issue of copyright. Material is the professor’s unless active process to license material is carried out. This is a question of law. Same holds true for open source.
  o What about Blackboard?
  o What is the motivation for changing code?
  o Cases where ambiguity in current code has created problems in

· Amendment to 1b. The unauthorized acquisition, buying, selling, trading, or theft of an examination, quiz, term paper, or project. Any course materials (including but not limited to tests, quizzes, or assignments) returned to the student by the instructor are considered unauthorized for distribution purposes unless otherwise stated in the faculty’s syllabus.
  o General Counsel: Not sure amended version is correct. I’d be willing to work with senate to rework last sentence.
  o Call the question on amendment. Amendment fails.
  o Original motion is back on the floor.
  o Issue involve question of student work vs. course material

· Motion: refer to back to committee and general counsel to redraft language. Motion passed unanimously.

[Motion 2011-11-M03] sent back to committee

b. Budget Committee Report
  · We will have report next in December

c. The University Studies Committee offers the following motion:
[Motion 2011-11-M04]: University Studies Curriculum.
  That the 2012 catalogue be updated to reflect the Phase II implementation of University Studies as listed in the enclosed document.
Documents:
  · University Studies Catalogue Page
  · Question about including QMM 280 in Math and Statistics as Foundations course.
  · Amendment: Move that we remove QMM 280 from Foundations.
  · Discussion: Do we want a specialized course to count for Foundations.
  · USAC: we review all proposals. Committee felt the class addresses objectives for the Math and Statistics section of Foundations
  · Motion to remove QMM 280 fails.


d. The University Curriculum Committee offers the following motion:
[Motion 2011-11-M05]
  That the curricular changes listed in the enclosed document be approved for inclusion in the catalogue. The list
includes major revisions in CHHS.

Documents:

  · Curricular changes for 2012 catalogue
  · [Motion 2011-11-M05] Passes.

Old Business. None noted.
New Business. None noted.
Announcements

  · QEP update. Kim Cook
    o What is meant by Intentional Learning?
    o You intend for them to learn a specific skill, not necessarily focused on the background knowledge related to the skill.

Adjournment. Meeting adjourned at 3:10
Agenda for Faculty Senate Meeting
December 13, 2011
2:00 p.m. EB 162
Meeting 2011-12

Called to order at 2:00 p.m.

- **Chairman, Secretary, and Quorum were present. Roll sign-in** (Electronically) Quorum noted.
  - **Absent:** Albergo, Cathy; Ciner, Cetin; Combs, Sue; Craig, Bailey, J.; Elikai, Fara; Fonvielle, Chris; Fritzler, Peter; Galizio, Mark; Hanson, Randall; Hudson, Nicholas; Kieber, Robert; Kim, Sangmoon; Laws, Richard; Miller, Derrick; Murrell, Samuel; Noland, Dan; Orton, Chris; Pemberton, Anne; Johnson, Mariana; Rosa, Kathleen; Simmonds, Devon; Taggart, John; Wray, Barry

- **List of those attending**

November 29, 2011 minutes approved

Special order of the day: Election of the 2012-2013 senate President. (P. Turrisi)

- Gabriel Lugo nominated
- Nominations closed
- Gabriel Lugo approved unanimously

Special order of the day: Nominations for Faculty Assembly

- Colleen Reilly eligible for a second term
- Raymond Burt term expired.

Individual Reports

A. Chancellor Miller.

- Friday recommendations for tuitions and fees will be forwarded to Board of Trustees, and then move on to Board of Governors via the GA President
- In light of recent events involving misconduct at Penn State and Syracuse, we’re revisiting relevant policies.
  - Don’t view our policies as an ambiguous obligation. If in doubt, report.
- Congratulations on great semester.
- 4-year and 6-year cohorts: On positive note, UNCW is behind only Chapel Hill in 4-year graduation rates. On a negative note, we are also only behind Chapel Hill with regard to state appropriations.
- This points to exceptional faculty at UNCW
- Have a Happy Holiday.
B. President of the Senate Lugo.

- UNCW Police have a good video and training module regarding on campus violence.

- Faculty Assembly update
  
  o Faculty Workload
    
    ▪ Seeded thread in SharePoint
    
    ▪ Faculty Welfare Committee putting numbers together
    
    ▪ Need to highlight a day in the life of the faculty member
  
  o Low productivity
    
    o Revisiting parameters for low productivity

- Music UCC proposal on correction to program length approved

- Follow up on:
  
  o Senate committee structure
    
    ▪ Steering committee tasked with examining current structure and making suggestions to Faculty Senate.
  
  o SPOTs without spots → IT committee
    
    ▪ History of SPOTs. Our system is grossly outdated and inefficient. 100,000 evaluations need to be processed by hand.
    
    ▪ Need to use technology so that the Evaluation committee isn’t tied up with merely processing the SPOTs, rather than reflecting on best practices for SPOTs.
    
    ▪ Faculty Senate support needed to work to update SPOTs practices. Please give feedback via SharePoint.
  
  o SACS reports
    
    ▪ 15 people working furiously to write all the relevant reports.

C. Committee Reports

- The Steering committee returns [Motion 2011-11-M01]: Curricular Change. (The original motion was referred to the steering committee at the 2011-11 meeting.)
  
  To amend the Curricular Change policy in the handbook to reflect: the new CHHS, the change from Basic to University Studies, the new Credit Hour Definition policy, and the external review process by the BOG.
    
    o Proposed revision to policy – (tracking changes)
    
    o Proposed revision -- (without tracking changes)
    
    o Reeves moved that the document be amended to reflect that the action forms be exclusively available online. The amendment passed.
[Motion 2011-11-M01, as amended, passes without dissent]

- The Academic Standards Committee offers the following motion:

  [Motion 2011-12-M01]

  i. A catalogue change to raise the admission GPA for Social Work from 2.4 to 2.5

  ii. A catalogue change to raise the admission GPA for Athletic Training from 2.5 to 2.7

  iii. Proposed EXS Catalog Description

          Requirements for a Major in Exercise Science for the B.S. Degree: 62 hours. Students wishing to declare
          a major in Exercise Science must: Complete a minimum of 24 semester credit hours; Achieve a
          cumulative GPA of 2.70 or better (inclusive of UNCW and transfer credits); and a minimum grade of “C”
          (2.0) in each of the following courses: BIO 201 Principles of Biology: Cell (4); CHM 101 General
          Chemistry (4); and MAT 111 College Algebra (3) or higher.

          Once admitted into the Exercise Science program, students are required to complete: HEA 465; CSC 105;
          EXS 216, 217, 340, 347, 349, PED 350, 355, 359, 379, 410, PED 415, 460, 470, 471. Additionally,
          students must take a minimum of 9 credit hours of EXS elective courses (see advisor for approved list).

          A grade of “C” (2.00) or better is required in each course within the Exercise Science major core
          requirements. Students must provide written documentation of current First Aid and CPR (including
          AED) certifications during the term they expect to graduate.

  iv. The grade point average (GPA) is determined by dividing the accumulated number of grade points (quality
      points) earned by the accumulated number of quality hours. The resulting quotient is carried to thousandths
      place and then truncated. Hours for which grades of “F” or “WF” have been assigned are included in the
      calculation of the GPA. Grades of “I”, “W”, “NR”, “Z”, and “P” are not included in the calculation of the
      GPA.

[Motion 2011-12-M01 passes without dissent]

- The University Curriculum Committee offers the following motion:

  [Motion 2011-12-M02] Curricular changes for catalogue.

  i. Recreational Therapy (RTH)

     a. Add RTH 359 as a degree requirement for the RTH/RT major—this course replaces REC 359 as a
        degree requirement thus there are no additional hours added to the major Remove REC 265 as a
        degree requirement for the RTH/RT major—a supportive course will be added to the degree
        requirement thus there is no change in the number of hours needed for the major

     b. Add three hours of support course work to RTH/RT major to replace REC 265

     c. Add prerequisite and restrictive statement to RTH 368

     d. Name change for RTH 370

     e. Name change for RTH 373

     f. Introduction of a new course—RTH 384

  ii. Elementary, Middle Level, and Literacy Education (expedited, report only)

     a. Reduce EDN 421 from 2 credit hours to 1 credit hour
b. Align courses to the current Standard Course of Study and future Common Core or Essential Standards as necessary for pre-service middle grades teachers

c. Update course names and numbers to reflect the current university studies requirements

iii. Music

a. Decrease the number of hours in the BA degree, from 55 to 54 (for senate action)
b. Correct the number of hours for the BM Music Performance degree (expedited, report only)

[Motion 2011-12-M02 passes without dissent]

- The steering committee offers the following resolution:

[Motion 2011-12-M03]

In light of recent incidences involving the use of force at several United States universities, the UNCW faculty rises in support of the constitutional right of students to freedom of expression and peaceful assembly in university campuses.

[Motion 2011-12-M03 passes without dissent]

- Budget Committee report

  o Report by Ed Graham

  o Budget Committee tasked with not just faculty raises, but also enhancements such as Graduate assistantships, new faculty hires, support for new faculty

  o If we were allowed faculty raises over the last 3-4 years each student would be paying one to two hundred dollars more.

  o We stand with non-faculty employees.

  o UNCW ranks last among 18 peer institutions regarding faculty compensation.

  o Chancellor: Developing case for each university regarding faculty compensation. But we need a receptive ear to hear that argument. UNCW will be asking for tuition increase to support the second most efficient campus in the UNCW system.

  o Chancellor: Innovations. UNCW is at a tipping point. Need to fund University Studies and QEP to continue quality trajectory. Asking for more graduate student stipends, support of library, advising, etc.

  o None of funding can be used to restore budget cuts or for faculty and non-faculty salaries.

  o Lugo: SGA should be commended for approving tuition and fee increases.

- Buildings and Grounds Committee report

  o Report by Andy Steele (Art History)

    - Follow up regarding water run-off management, gutters, and other systems.

    - Request for two memorials to be installed. How do we deal with who gets a memorial and where are they placed?
- Plan regarding 5-year rotational burning. Next burn scheduled in 2012.
- Invasive plants on campus.

- Faculty Handbook Committee report
  - Report by Lugo in place of Chair.
    - Graduate Student tasked with updating handbook, and has been extremely efficient.

- Faculty Welfare Committee report
  - Report by Dan Johnson
  - Two agenda items
    - Faculty compensation for DIS teaching, thesis direction, and internship supervision (we will present a motion early next semester).
    - Establishing a Faculty Commons

Old Business. None noted.

New Business. None noted.

Announcements

- Soaring to Greatness; Campaign update
  - Report by Marla Rice-Evans – (PowerPoint slides)

- Diana Ashe
  - Evaluation committee will be piloting new instrument through Idea Center. Need tenured faculty. Can email at ashed@uncw.edu

- G. Lugo (Acknowledgements)
  - Recognize Gene Tagliarini, Diana Ashe, and Cara Cilano for their great work on University Committees.
  - Also recognize John Fischetti for body of work in the service of UNCW

Adjournment. Meeting adjourned at 3:25.
Agenda for Faculty Senate Meeting
January 17, 2012
2:00 p.m. EB 162
Meeting 2012-01

Meeting called to order 2:04 p.m.

- **Chairman, Secretary, and Quorum were present. Roll sign-in (paper)**

- **Absent:** Albergo, Cathy; Bailey, Craig J.; Brown, Jeffrey; Burgh, Teddy; Fonville, Chris; Galizio, Mark; Graham, Edward; Hanson, Randall; Hickman, Joe; Higgins, Heidi; Hudson, Nicholas; Johnson, Mariana; Murrell, Samuel; Nice, Scott; Patterson, Laurie; Taggart, John.

December 13, 2011 minutes approved

Individual Reports

A. President of the Senate Lugo.

1. Faculty Assembly updates.

   i. Meeting Jan 20. Tuition increases

      - Pope Center will be present.
      - Senate President will insert agenda and Pope Center report in SharePoint.
      - Will also insert letter from former BOG that opposes tuition increases.
      - We’re at a very delicate stage. Need to communicate faculty’s position to our Faculty Assembly delegate.
      - Please articulate your goals via SharePoint.
      - If funding increases don’t go through, funding for University Studies and QEP will be at threat.
      - Arguments need to be based in numbers, not anecdotes.

   ii. Academics First. UNCW position

      - Question: Do we have any data regarding access to courses and time to graduation?

2. Follow up on Senate committee structure. Two motions today:

   - Based on review of previous work done. Need to eliminate unnecessary and/or unproductive committees and revive pertinent ones.

B. SACS reports (Martin Posey)
Thanks to SACS Compliance Steering Committee

Posey explained review process and timeline.
  
  o Begin in-house review process in February
  
  o Some areas are more highly scrutinized:
    
    ▪ Assessment
    
    ▪ Faculty Credential

Final SACS report due 10 September, 2012, no extensions.

Question: How is this SACS process different from last one, e.g., “Must Statements” coming from individual departments and sections?

Now focus on showing how institution as a whole complies. Tailored to institution

Two pieces of SACS:
  
  o Documentation and compliance
  
  o QEP: This is bottom-up.

Can you fail QEP and be in compliance?

Theoretically yes, practically no. However, it is extremely rare to fail QEP, as so much feedback is provided.

What if funding for QEP is denied by BOG?

Must tailor QEP to financial resources available.

C. Committee Reports

The University Curriculum Committee offers the following motion:

[Motion 2012-01-M01]: Supporting materials and full proposal (On SharePoint)

1. A change to pre-requisites (BIO 246-no longer required),

2. Five course deletions (NSG 250, NSG 325, CLR 305, CLR/L 450, and CLR 498);

3. Four new course additions (CLR 325, CLR 350, CLR 498-I, and CLR 498-II);

4. Three credit hour changes (increasing by one credit hour each of CLR 420, CLR 430, and CLR 450)

5. A name change for CLR 440 (Pharmacoeconomics renamed to Bioanalytics)

[Motion 2012-01-M01 passes without dissent]
The Faculty Welfare Committee offers the following motion:

**[Motion 2012-01-M02] Faculty compensation for thesis/DIS**
That all departments within CAS and the professional schools at UNCW create formal, written policies to recognize and systematically reward faculty for their cumulative participation in these significant teaching activities.

- Why isn’t working with graduate students included?
- We were using benchmarks and policies provided by CAS. Our motion was based on CAS policies.
- Aim is to provide models for rewarding additional work. No one, universal model suggested, but rather a uniform policy within each department.

**[Motion 2012-01-M02 passes without dissent]**

The Steering committee offers the following motions:

**[Motion 2012-01-M03]: Curricular Change, Duties of the UCC and USAC**
To align the bylaws description of the duties of UCC and USAC with the Curricular Change policy in the Faculty Handbook

**[Motion 2012-01-M03 passes with greater than 2/3 of voting senators]**

**[Motion 2012-01-M04]: Consolidation of IT and Library committees**
- These committees haven’t made consolidations
- On behalf of the library, motion to refer back to committee.
- Library does think it is a win-win idea, but we’d like to see some reworking of the language to address a number of issues.

**[Motion 2012-01-M04. Referred to Steering Committee for reworking.]**

**[Motion 2012-01-M05] On Academics First**
Whereas, Faculty members of UNCW are sensitive to the increasing need of UNC wide guidelines that promote student’s Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP) as outlined in Academics First;
Whereas, Faculty members of UNCW are aware of the connection between student financial aid and accountability on SAP; and
Whereas, Faculty members of UNCW recognize that student academic and economic profiles differ considerably across UNC campuses;

**Resolved**, That individual campuses continue to set their own policies on drops, withdrawals, course repeats, maximum course loads, GPA, probation, and all other such policies related to SAP, if necessary, under reasonable limits and criteria set by General Administration.

- Raymond Burt given the floor: Hope to clear up some misunderstandings.
- This is faculty-driven.
- For example, reasoning behind course repeat policies.
Attempt at improving dialogue among UNC institutions, not at imposing unification across campuses.

Barlow: There is a disconnect, e.g., suggestion that there should be a common calendar does seem to be a top-down process. Could you clear this up?

Burt: Some proposals are tied to GA, but other aspects of academic policy is indeed faculty-driven.

Senator: Appropriate to separate faculty-driven aspects from GA initiatives.

Motion to refer back to Steering Committee

Senator: Academics First is coming from Faculty Assembly. Discussion should be carried out at Faculty Assembly first, then UNCW should respond.

Senator: There does appear to be many useful proposals, so we should refer this back to Steering Committee

[Motion 2012-01-M05 referred back to Steering Committee]

New Business

- What is status of RPT report generated last year?
  - Report has not been presented to Senate.
  - Steering Committee has discussed creating ad hoc committee to continue work done by previous committee on RPT.

New Business. None reported.

Announcements

- New Faculty Assembly Delegates elected: Colleen Reilly and Laurie Patterson

Adjournment. Meeting adjourned at 3:17.
Minutes for Faculty Senate Meeting
February 21, 2012
2:00 p.m. EB 162
Meeting 2012-02

Meeting called to order at 2:08.

Chairman, Secretary, and Quorum were present.

Attendance: 2012-02-Attendance.pdf

January 17, 2012 minutes approved

Individual Reports

- Chancellor Miller.
  - Thanked faculty for work done at the University
  - Budget Discussion. Summary of budget approved by Board of Governors
  - In process of working through budget for next year.
  - Likely that shortfalls will continue over next few years
  - Continue to look for efficiencies at all levels:
    - Stopped search for Chief Information Officer and Dean of Health and Human Services in light of search for Provost.
    - Investigating whether or not to replace position occupied by Cindy Lawson
  - Innovation Council has been working hard. Will be reaching out to faculty in the upcoming weeks.
  - Concern regarding off-campus facilities as a possible way to cut costs.
  - Search Committee for Provost has met.
    - Position is considered as Chief Operating Officer
    - Not just oversight of academics, but other units as well
    - No rush. Right candidate is more important than timely replacement.

- President of the Senate Lugo.

  a. Faculty Assembly update: Performance Funding: Proposed Academic Progress Model (75%) (From Suzanne Ortega)
    i. Freshman sophomore retention rates
    ii. Degree efficiency
    iii. Six year graduation rates
    iv. Degree efficiency for Pell eligible students
      - Provost Barlow: Each campus can pick two more to add to the list (e.g. Graduation rates of CC transfers, number of degrees in high demand majors, STEM majors etc).
      - More flexibility given selection of goals, and how the achievement of the goals are judged.
  b. Campus security (Yield to Chief Donaldson)
    - Hope these burglaries will attract the attention of the faculty, since while theft does occur, these incidents are particularly systematic and well-planned.
o These recent burglaries appear to be related, and limited to the UNCW campus.

o UNCW Police is actively investigating the incidents.

o Importance of locking all interior doors. This action has helped to deter intrusions.

c. Update on Provost search (Yield to Pat Leonard)

o Ad has been posted on HR webpage and relevant national organization sites.

o March 9th is first deadline for early consideration.

o Goal is to bring 3-4 candidates to campus in April.

o There will be multiple venues for the faculty to provide feedback.

o Two open forums will be convened.

d. Consent Calendar (Yield to Ken Gurganus)

o History of this motion tied to desire to expedite items in Consent Calendar, so that the business of the senate is not bogged down by items that are not controversial and that comply with the policies of the senate.

o Benefits. More efficient. Will allow time for discussion of more complex issues.

o Suggestion: Examine Consent Calendar and if item appears in need of discussion, then it should be requested that that item be pulled out.

Committee Reports

The Steering committee returns [Motion 2012-01-M04]:

Consolidation of IT and Library committees (Revised)

(Original motion on 2012-01 agenda)

[Motion 2012-01-M04 passes with consent of 2/3 vote of senate]

[Motion 2012-01-M05] On Academics First (Revised): The UNCW Faculty Senate endorses the Academics First idea of examining our own policies in the light of dialog and information from other UNC campuses to learn potential best practices and assess how following the policies of other campuses might affect cost, accessibility, and quality of education.

We sustain that individual campuses continue to set their own policies on drops, withdrawals, course repeats, maximum course loads, GPA, probation, and all other such policies related to SAP if necessary, under reasonable limits and criteria set by General Administration.

o Yield to Raymond Burt, Faculty Assembly Delegate.
  ▪ I’m in full agreement with motion and will share it with the Faculty Assembly

[Motion 2012-01-M05 passes without dissent]

The University Studies Advisory Committee offers the following motion: [Motion 2012-02-M01] UNI 101. Catalogue description and change to 3 hours as in UNI 101 Curricular Action Form

o Supporting documents
  a. UNI 101_Sample syllabus (3 credit hours)
  b. UNI 101 Proposal for FS
Comment: CAF was left out of batch submission by oversight.

Questions:
- How is curriculum being evaluated, given that this is normally done at level of the department?
- Is there a common syllabus?
- Why does UNI 101 have to be taken in first semester?
- What are the differences between 2-credit, optional course, and making it a 3-credit, obligatory course for all freshmen?
- Why must this course be mandatory?

Responses:
- Course concept was approved in 2009.
- Yield to Kemille Moore: SLOs are matched to University Studies.
  - UNI 101 has gone through UCC and USAC.
  - Textbook is customized. Large parts written by UNCW faculty.
  - Switch to 3-credit course is aimed at deepening critical thinking, information literacy, and other vital skills, as well as linking UNI course to academic disciplines.
  - Reasons for doing this in the first semester of first year are past history and logistical concerns. Currently, 85% of freshmen take the UNI 101 course in their first semester.
  - Do transfer students have to take this course?
  - No.

[Motion 2012-02-M01 passes]

The Steering Committee offers the following motion:
[Motion 2012-02-M02] Qualities of new Provost.

[Motion 2012-02-M02 passes without dissent]

Old Business. RPT document status?

New Business. No new business noted.

Good of the order (Open forum)

- Importance of revisiting the efficacy of university committees.

- Need for more volunteers to participate in the Idea Center pilot. Contact Diana Ashe.. Must be tenured.

Meeting adjourned at 3:25
Minutes for Faculty Senate Meeting
March 20, 2012
2:00 p.m. EB 162
Meeting 2012-03

Meeting called to order at 2:00 p.m.

Chairman, Secretary, and Quorum were present.

Attendance: 3-20-2012

February 21, 2012 minutes approved.

Individual Reports

Chancellor Miller

  o Kudos to Professor Messina for being recognized by UNC system for excellence in teaching.
  o Encourage everyone to participate in Innovation site.
  o Ongoing formulation of performance model and which criteria the university would like to include.
  o New assistant to Chancellor hired.
  o Provost Search Update: Will be conducting phone updates next week.

President of the Senate Lugo.

Committee Structure. Back to the future (Thanks to UNCW archival librarian)

i. Standing Committees

  ▪ Senate Bylaws: 1982

  ▪ Committee structure. Basically identical to what we have now.

ii. RTP

  ▪ Senate bylaws: 1980, 1987

  ▪ In 1980 no RTP committee

  ▪ In 1987, RTP committee appears. Unchanged since then.

  ▪ Does this suggest that the faculty have not adapted to the times?

  ▪ Is the lack of change due to inertia or because we’re at a stable point?

  ▪ Do we need university-wide RTP committee?

iii. Process of working on consolidating committees.
- More to follow in upcoming meetings.
- About to create new, ad hoc RTP committee. Will build on reports created by the Evaluation committee and the last ad hoc RTP committee

iv. Paperless CAF’s

- Proposal forthcoming.

v. Consolidation of Curricular Committee and University Studies forms.

Committee Reports

The Academic Standards committee offers the following motions

[Motion 2012-01-M01]: Residency Requirement
To qualify for the bachelor’s degree, students must be enrolled in a degree program at UNCW and must have completed:(1) a minimum of 25 percent of the credit hours required for graduation through courses offered at UNCW and (2) 15 semester hours in the major at the 300-400 level. Exceptions to requirement (2) may be made only with the approval of the department chair or school director, and the appropriate dean. Requirement (1) may not be waived.

Motion 2012-01-M01 passes without dissent]

Motion 2012-03-M02] UNI 101 Waiver requirements and repeat policy
Unanimous consent to strike “and pass” from wording.

Motion 2012-03-M02 passes, as amended, without dissent]

The Steering Committee offers the following motions:

Motion 2012-03-M03] Faculty Handbook –Library special faculty update

- Special Faculty terminology clarified.

[Motion 2012-03-M03 passes with 2/3 majority]

[Motion 2012-03-M04] e-Learning Awards
Starting in the 2012/2013 academic year, the office of e-Learning proposes the “Excellence in e-Learning” faculty awards to be awarded annually. Nominees will submit self-evaluation via the Exemplary Course Program (ECP) rubric, which will be reviewed by committee to determine the winners.

[Motion 2012-03-M04 passes without dissent]

The University Curriculum Committee offers the following motion:

[Motion 2012-03-M05] WSE to WCE
That the name of the Watson School of Education be changed to the Watson College of Education.

- If approved it will have to pass through Academic Affairs and Board of Trustees.
Question: How will changing the name change the status of the entity?

Cameron School of Business: Matter of changing the name to College has not been addressed officially by School of Business. Straw poll suggests desire to keep name as school.

Again, what is the import of changing the name?

Desire to maintain parallel structures. WSE currently has four departments within it. Also desire to match designation with relevant UNC-system schools and peer institutions.

[Motion 2012-03-M05 passes]

The Steering Committee offers the following motion

[Motion 2012-03-M06] Intellectual Property

That the entire section in the Faculty Handbook on patents and copyrights be replaced by the following:

**Institutional Patent and Copyright Procedures**

The University of North Carolina at Wilmington

Approved by Board of Trustees January 2004, 2007

As defined by the *patent and copyright policies of the Board of Governors*, to which these procedures are expressly subject, The University of North Carolina at Wilmington has articulated intellectual property guidelines and procedures governing patents and copyrights. These policies were approved by the Board of Trustees in 2004 and 2007 respectively.


Need to do rapid revision of all relevant documents to reflect changes so as to not confuse SACS reviewers.

Important to understand policy, especially if you are a faculty member involved with creating content that may generate a significant profit for the university.

[Motion 2012-03-M06 passes without dissent]

Old Business

**2011 RPT Ad-Hoc committee report**

This report will be posted on SharePoint site for ENTIRE Faculty, not the Faculty Senate site.

Intention is to create new ad hoc committee and build off of this document.
New Business

Motion from Pamela Evers re: waiver of Public Service Requirement for Military Veterans

- I’m Pam Evers, former LT in the Navy, and have been involved with the Student Veterans Organization and Military Task Force since its inception many years ago. We have an increasing number of students enrolling who are veterans and with the military drawdown, we will surely see a further increased enrollment. As we move towards requiring public service from our students, I propose that we waive the requirement for public service for our Military Veterans. To this end, I make the following motion:

“UNCW waives the public service requirement for Military Veterans.”

- Question: What do you mean by public service requirement? University Studies? Explorations?

Motion seconded, and will be sent to Steering Committee.

Announcements

QEP Presentation (Kim Cook)

- How does QEP implementation possibly impact RPT?

- Hope Faculty Senate and Chairs will support QEP.

- For QEP Applied Learning to be successful and fair, there need to be support and recognition mechanisms in place.

- Possible backlash. Why are resources going to QEP, e.g. the director, when departments are facing severe budget constraints that hinder ability to carry out basic mission?

- Senate will seed Faculty Senate SharePoint site with discussion thread.

Campaign Completion

- Marla Rice Evans, director of Advancement, goal: $65 M, $66.5 M 11 months ahead of schedule.

  Innovation Council

- Jessica Magnus: http://uncw.edu/innovate/

Meeting adjourned at 3:40.
Minutes for Faculty Senate Meeting
April 17, 2012
2:00 p.m. EB 162
Meeting 2012-04

Meeting called to order at 2:00 p.m.

Chairman, Secretary, and Quorum were present.

Attendance: 2012 04 Faculty Senate Attendance

March 20, 2012 minutes approved

Individual Reports

Chancellor Miller.

   i. Thanks again for all your hard work.
   ii. BOG report: Faculty Workload
       o Suzanne Ortega did a fabulous job educating the BOG regarding everything that the faculty actually do:
           research, teaching, and service.
           o More timely reporting of workload
           o More specific regarding research and service, re: workloads and reductions
           o Report on performance funding
           o Move from growth- to performance-based model.
           o Appears to be a good model for UNCW
           o Senate Bill 575: Give supervision over SPA employees to BOG
           o This is something that the community colleges already do.
           o Please refer to BOG policy. I don't believe that it hurts staff's rights.
           o Reminders about Installation events, and encouragement to participate in Commencement.

President of the Senate Lugo.

   i. Faculty Assembly update
       o Academics First – Highlights of workgroup discussion on April 26 (Yield to R. Burt).
          ▪ Background initiative that came out of Faculty Assembly
         o Changes in two general areas: 1. general minimum admission requirements; 2. academic policies developed by faculty on individual campuses.
         o Committee tasked with forming general guidelines that focused on admission requirements and that would then be customized by the individual campuses.
         o Next phase focuses on academic policies
         o Survey of Provosts conducted shows general agreement regarding point #1, and a wide range on point #2.
         o Process will be gradual, and there should be plenty of time for campuses to respond to any possible impositions from above.
         o Question from Provost Barlow: Now that the champion, Sandy Gravett, is leaving her post, are there others looking to champion Academics First?
         o Response: Yes, many in General Administration.
         o Why is this seen as beneficial?
         o Public perception is that the UNC system is capricious.
         o Attempt to establish baseline for comparative purposes regarding retention rates.
            ▪ Students can repeat a course they passed with D± only once.
- Both courses count as attempted hours in GPA
- Students can repeat a course with an F until they pass
- Faculty should be involved in "intervention contracts"
- Grade replacement not permitted
- W's limited to three allowed until the last day of classes

**Performance-based model:**
- Seven items prescribed by GA
- Three to be negotiated. Provost working with a committee.
- One critique: the performance-based models don't measure quality of education, but rather focus on quantitative methods.
- Hope items addressing quality can be included as one or more of the three items to be negotiated.

**Ad-Hoc RTP** committee formed
- Tasked with providing a report with actionable items by March-April 2013

**Special order of the day:** SACS update (Lugo yields to Posey)

**Committee Reports**

**i. The University Studies committee offers the following motion**

[Motion 2012-04-M01]:
- Recommendations for Explorations Beyond the Classroom and Thematic Transdisciplinary Clusters, and catalogue copy to finalize phase II implementation of US (this motion follows up on Senate motion 2011-09-M05).
  [2012_04_M01a].
- Motion from CSB for a waiver from Thematic Transdisciplinary Clusters for Cameron students who enroll in a second option within the school.
  [2012_04_M01b].
- Motion from CSC for a waiver from Thematic Transdisciplinary Clusters for majors who opt for the Digital Arts or Business Concentration.
  [2012_04_M01c].
- Motion from WSE for a waiver from Thematic Transdisciplinary Clusters for students who major in Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, or Middle Grades Education, and for those who pursue licensure in Secondary Education.
  [2012_04_M01d].

[Motion 2012-04-M01 passes]

**ii. The Steering Committee offers the following motions:**

- [Motion 2012-04-M02] Committee on Student Matters
  To replace the committees on Admissions, Student Affairs, Financial Aid and Bookstore.

  [Motion 2012-04-M02 passes without dissent]

- [Motion 2012-04-M03] QEP
  That the Faculty Senate endorse the proposed Quality Enhancement Plan titled "eTeal: experiencing Transformative education through applied learning."

  - (Proposed amendment)

  [Motion 2012-04-M03 withdrawn]
New motion introduced: [Motion 2012-04-MO4]:
The Faculty Senate endorses a QEP centered on Applied Learning with an emphasis on instructor-centered development opportunities.

Discussion:

Kim Cook:
- Original intent was to gain support for concept of applied learning, not for the wording of the plan itself.
- Final plan won't be submitted to SACS until January 2013.

Other discussion:
- Where is additional money going?
- For director, for faculty opportunities.
- Much feedback is tied to how can we streamline process, e.g., student travel.
- Issue is that UNCW is amazingly innovative in terms of applied learning. Focus needs to be on improving applied learning as a two-way street, so that the people who are doing the best work in applied learning.
- Wording of document seems top-down. Hope focus is on faculty, not administrative concerns.
- So much emphasis on training faculty when major issue is that money could be better spent on applied learning already being done.
- Speaking to motion actually on the floor, we need to remember that SACS mandates that we have a QEP.

[Motion 2012-04-MO4 passed by a vote of 27 in favor, 17 against]

Report from the IT committee (Pemberton)
- Use of online SPOTS
- Next generation library system
- More consistent policy regarding borrowing
- Scholarly communication issues, Copyright issues.
- Please complete survey on Randall Library
- Blackboard is going to change format, but content should be maintained.

Report from the Evaluation Committee (Ashe)
- Pilot of Idea Center instrument has been implemented.
- Data acquisition process for SPOT being reexamined.

Report from the Handbook Committee (Lugo)
- Revisions still in process.
- Goal is to have the Handbook as a single pdf document.

Report from the Research Committee (Evers)
- Work done on Cahill and Scholar Award

Old Business. None noted.

New Business. None noted.

Good of the order (Open forum)

QEP
- I hope we don't have a second set of assessment on faculty who are already doing applied learning.
- Main concern. What does instructor-centered mean with regard to centralized administration vs. individual needs and expertise of departments?

Two Faculty Senate Forums to be seeded in Faculty Senate Sharepoint site:
- RPT
Minutes for Faculty Senate Meeting

- QEP
  - What's status of proficiency profile?
    - Participation was high, thanks to online method of administration of survey.
    - Learning Council invited to communicate with Faculty Senate. Issue drawn to attention of Steering Committee.
  - Concern raised regarding ensuring student participation in online evaluation methods.
    - Evaluation Committee is investigating appropriate strategies.
    - Yes, we want to improve numbers, but also make sure process is carried out correctly.
  - What are the guiding principles regarding control over class seats?
    - Newly formed Committee on Student Matters could address this.

- Plans for next academic year:
  - Continued work on consolidation and efficacy of university committees on Advancement

Announcements. None.

Meeting adjourned at 3:20.
Minutes for Faculty Senate Meeting
September 11, 2012
2:00 p.m. EB 162
Meeting 2012-09

Meeting called to order at 2:00.

Chairman, Secretary, and Quorum were present.

Attendance: 55 voting members signed in. Due to Computer/UNCW Sign-In Systems malfunction, individual senator attendance records remain unretrievable.

April 2012 minutes approved.

Special order of the day:
Election of the Vice President, the Secretary and the Steering Committee of the Senate:

- Vice President: Nominations: Patty Turrisi. Elected unanimously.
- Secretary: Nominations: Jess Boersma. Elected unanimously.
- Steering Committee: Nominations: Mark Spaulding, Jennifer Horan, Andy Jackson, Jimmy Reeves. All elected unanimously

Individual Reports

Provost Battles: [PowerPoint]

- I’m glad to be here and have the opportunity to speak with all of you. The Chancellor had to be in Raleigh to discuss the Strategic Plan, so I’ll be covering for him.
- Presentation of Fall 2012 enrollment data.

  - Record enrollment. Concern regarding student:faculty ratio (currently at 16.44, goal is 15:1). Data is preliminary, as some positions are in the process of being filled.
  - Salary Increases. Total 2.5%. 1.2% across the board for all eligible faculty. The additional 1.3% identified for performance, equity, merit, and retention. Salary increase will be retroactive to July 1, 2012

    - Question: What’s the difference between performance and merit?
    - No major distinction made at UNCW.

- Performance Funding. Listing of 10 measures.
- Assigned FTFT, Retention, 6-Year Graduation Rate, Degree Efficiency, Degree Efficiency—Pell Recipients, UNC FIT
- We selected Annual Giving, Energy Efficiency, STEM + Health Graduates, University Honors Graduates, Community College Transfer Graduation Rate.
- UNCW is evaluated by comparison to itself, not to other institutions in UNC system

- Chancellor Miller working on implementation of new strategic mission.
- Innovation Council: Important theme in the Chancellor’s vision.

President of the Senate Lugo.

- [Shared governance documents](#) (primer, handbook, senate bylaws): Revised to be more user-friendly. Much easier to maintain. Only changes have been in format, and the removal of dead hyperlinks.
  - Changes that need to be made include updating committee structures

- CAF: now completely electronic. New Course Action Forms need to be approved by Faculty Senate.
- Evaluations and RTP projects [Flow chart]
  - Series of binary choices: electronic or not? Same instrument or other? Same questions or new ones?

- SACS (Posey)
  - Thanks given to major contributors to process
  - Next step in process is off-site review, 6-8 November; near 100% of institutions have compliance concerns in this phase.
  - Response to comments addressed by Focused report, due 28 January 2013.

Committee Reports

i. The Steering Committee offers the following motion:

- [Motion 2012-09-M01]: That the senate adopt the new electronic signature [Course Action Form].
  [Motion 2012-09-M01 approved unanimously]
ii. The University Curriculum Committee (USAC) offers the following motion:

- [Motion 2012-09-M02]: Blanket Explorations – Internship designation -E491, -E498

[Motion 2012-09-M02 passes unanimously.]

iii. The University Studies Advisory Committee offers the following motion:

- [Motion 2012-09-M03] Writing Intensive/Information Literacy supplemental substitution form

  - Statement of the WI/IL motion
    - Supplemental substitution form.

  - Discussion: Concerns regarding use of document and process of review. For example, is curriculum tied to SLOs? Would like to see language concerning operational aspects of substitution forms.
  - Do we want an additional form? If so, not this form, because it’s flawed.
  - Not in agreement with not routing substitution waiver through department chairs, as SLOs in Writing Intensive and Information Literacy are tied to curricular concerns.
  - Not only tied to SLOs
  - No major negative consequence to sending back to USAC, since there are existing substitution waiver forms.

[Motion to send Motion 2012-09-M03 back to committee for larger conversation regarding process of substitutions. Motion passes.]

iv. Report of the Budget Committee [Report by Charles Maimone], [Salary Survey]

v. Report of the Committee on Student Matters (Yield to Garay)

  - Vision for new committee is that we are a liaison with corresponding administrative units.
  - New options from Bookstore. Publishing books and course packets.

Old Business. None noted.
New Business. None noted.
Announcements: Senate reception for Provost Battles 3:30 – 4:00. EB Lobby

Meeting adjourned at 3:25.
Faculty Senate Meeting
October 16, 2012
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm. EB 162
Meeting 2012-10

1. Meeting called to order at 2:03
   Attendance log
2. September 2012 minutes approved
3. Individual Reports
   a. Chancellor Miller.
      • General Administration Strategic Planning Process
        o Emphasis on accountability, performance-based funding, decoupling certification
        o There’s a very tight deadline. Report due end of January
        o President Ross has expanded faculty representation
      • New legislative session starts in January.
        o Working on relevant aspects of budget. Ask Charles Maimone for more details.
      • In process of review of Marine Science. Part of state-wide review.
      • New Executive Director of University Relations Janine Iamuno introduced.
      • Board of Trustees meets next week. Last year BOT did self-study of process. As a result, they will be changing meeting structure.
        o Opportunity to interact with University on issues such as GA Strategic Planning
        o 6 possible changes in composition of Board of Trustees
        o We’re hosting a number of alumni events in places such as Charlotte and Washington, D.C.
          ▪ Question: What kind of person are you looking for to fill position of Board of Trustees
            Aspects such as ties to university, geographical concerns, abilities to contribute ideas.
   b. President of the Senate Lugo.
      • Faculty Assembly update
      • Strategic Plan
        o More faculty input being incorporated
        o Articulation issues. Compliance issues need to be addressed.
        UNCW continues to work on transfer credit issues
        o Student success and performance model
        o Shared Governance: Faculty Assembly has asked President Ross to reaffirm shared governance document. Still waiting for a response
        o University Studies transfer credit clarification for Year 2012-13
      • Small things that make a difference
        o Booklists – Be mindful that sending booklists to the bookstore is helpful for staff who otherwise do not get the books costs covered by staff scholarship.
Clocks during tests. Please provide time updates, since many students depend on mobile devices, but these aren’t allowed during exams in many classrooms.

Faculty absences. Refer to policy. Please send out class email.

- Academic Partnerships. Referred to Academic Standards Committee
- SPOTs. Evaluation Committee hard at work looking at other models. Current process unsustainable.

4. Committee Reports
   a. The Steering Committee offers the following motions:
      - [Motion 2012-10-M01]: That the senate endorse the following Strategic Plan Resolution [Alternate Motion]
        [Motion 2012-10-M01 passed with majority]:
      - [Motion 2012-10-M02]: That Article III.A.2 and Appendix B.1 of the senate bylaws be amended by indicating that the Vice President of the senate will also serve as the elections officer.
        [Motion 2012-10-M02 passes unanimously]
   b. The University Curriculum Committee offers the following motions:
      - [Motion 2012-10-M03]: CHHS program changes. CLS Pre-Requisites, CHHS prefix
        Discussion.
        - Concerns that curriculum is being watered down
        - Clinical Research program is more a management position than a scientific position at undergraduate level.
        - Current curriculum suggests problem with four-year graduation rates. Attempt to address community partner concerns.
        [Motion 2012-10-M03 motion passes unanimously]
   c. The Budget Committee offers the following motion:
      - [Motion 2012-10-M04]: That a tuition increase of 4.3% to 4.6% for 2012-2013 be assessed to be used for a requested faculty salary increase of 2%.
        - Budget committee discussion
        - Budget: 80th percentile report
        - Amendment: In view of the erosion of continued state support for the University of North Carolina that a tuition increase of the necessary amount for 2013-2014 be assessed to be used for a requested faculty salary increase of 2%.
        - Amended language passes 24-21.
        - Clarification: Administration
        [Motion 2012-10-M04 as amended, passes]

5. Old Business
6. New Business
7. Announcements
   - Applied Learning and Teaching Community Events
8. Adjournment
Minutes for Faculty Senate Meeting
November 13, 2012
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm. EB 162

Meeting 2012-11

1. Meeting called to order at 2:00 pm. President present. Presence of quorum noted.
2. October 2012 minutes approved.
3. Individual Reports
   a. Chancellor Miller.
      • Chancellor’s Report. Topics:
         o Campus Strategic Planning
         o Tuition and Fee recommendations
         o University Innovation Council
         o Marine Science review and MARBIONC
         o BOG strategic planning
   b. President of the Senate Lugo.
      • Faculty Assembly update – Strategic Plan flow rate model
      • Paws4People
         o Program to train service dogs. Pilot phase. 2 students/dog. Discussions have occurred throughout the campus. Contact Candy Ashton in CHHS for questions.
      • BA Policy on Travel
         o Business Affairs is working very hard to solve problems generated by new travel policy. Direct questions or concerns to Senate Steering Committee.
      • SACS Focus report
         o Sometime later this week or next week UNCW should receive initial report. Focused report will be due end of January.
      • Work on progress: RTP, Evaluations, Transfer Credit.
         o Reports and related motions forthcoming
4. Special order of the day: Consent Calendar
      • Approved without dissent
   b. [Motion 2012-10-M02] UCC proposals: Transition date for UCC chair; Number of hours in OCN, GEO, MAT.
      • Approved without dissent
   c. [Motion 2012-10-M03] USAC 2013 Catalogue additions. Long list
      • Approved without dissent
5. Committee Reports
The University Studies Advisory Committee offered the following motion:

[**Motion 2012-10-M04**] 2013-14 Catalogue Recommendations

II. b. Historical and Philosophical Approaches
   ANT 207: Archaeology
   ENG 210: Mythology
   • Floor seded
   • [Objection memo from History Department](#)
   • [Objection memo from PAR faculty](#)
   • [ANT senator comments on HST/PAR objection](#)

b. Report of committee on Student Matters


6. Old Business
7. New Business
8. For the Good of the Order
   a. AA restructure. Provost Battles
   b. QEP. Presentation by Horan/Boersma
      • [QEP memo circulated by Provost](#)
      • [eTEAL Announcement](#)
      • [eTEAL_RFP](#)
   c. Strategic Planning (if time permits) ([Chairman Hans remarks](#))

9. Announcements
10. Adjournment
Meeting called to order at 2:00.

President present. Presence of quorum noted.

**November 2012 minutes** approved

**Individual Reports**

Chancellor Miller. Unable to attend. In Raleigh on UNCW business.

President of the Senate Lugo.

- **SACS Focus Report.** Very positive overall.
  
  - One principal issue that remains is credentialing, in large part resolvable by providing additional information.
  
  - It is possible that certain faculty will no longer be able to teach certain courses due to specificity of credentialing rules by SACS

- **AV search update (Yield to Provost Battles)**
  
  - Currently in process of identifying people for both interim positions
  
  - Applications were in double digits for both.
  
  - Finalists have been identified. Their CVs and confidential feedback mechanism are available on Provost’s SharePoint site.
  
  - Feedback due by December 6th.
  
  - Goal is to make announcements regarding placement in positions by Commencement.

- **Faculty Assembly update**
  
  - Challenges presented by GA (as Teaching opportunity)

- **Move to reduce General Education, both in terms of total hours (to 30 credits) and in variety of classes.**

- **Question of loss of governance at university level**
  
  - Gen Ed; CAA articulation agreement Governance discussions.
• Reevaluation of tenure
• Role of research at Master’s Comprehensive Institutions. Why not leave research to UNC-Chapel Hill?
• Appalachian State. Shared Governance issues.

Committee Reports

a. The Steering Committee offers the following motion:

[Motion 2012-12-M01] Quality Enhancement Plan
That the Senate endorse the Quality Enhancement Plan, “eTEAL: experiencing Transformative Education through Applied Learning,” with a central focus on improving applied learning at UNCW through the implementation of the following three, interrelated parts:

• Applied Learning Summer Institute
• Applied Learning and Teaching Community (ALTC)
• eTEAL-Supported Pedagogy Initiatives
  o Summary
  o QEP Webpage
  o QEP announcement from item 8b in November agenda

[Motion 2012-12-M01 passes unanimously]

b. Report from Academic Standards committee: Report on transfer with distinction policy

c. Report of IT/LIB Committee
  o Higher level of foot traffic this semester (47% greater than last year at this time)
  o Greater number of outlets installed to support computing needs
  o Working with Honors to digitize all Honors theses

Leah Kraus, CIO
  o Blackboard will have planned downtime during break to perform crucial hardware upgrades, starting on December 17th at 5:00 p.m.
  o Email upgrades. Working with Microsoft to improve Spam Filter, moving away from Proofpoint and to the Cloud, at no cost to UNCW.
  o Notifications will be automatically generated for emails in quarantine. Opt-out options will also be available.
d. Report of Research Committee

Paul Townend: 2013 Cahill Awards

- Increased number of Cahill Awards this year, due in part through the support of the Provost’s Office

Old business. None noted.

New business. None noted.

For the Good of the Order

- General Education: Reading material - FA
- Thanks to Cara Cilano and Ken Gurganus for all the relevant supporting material.

- Questions and comments:
  - Where is the push to make these changes coming from?
  - Rather than merely be on our guard should we be proactive? Perhaps the Chancellor could best address strategies.
  - Is Faculty Assembly only voice for faculty concerns?
  - Possibility of drafting resolution.
  - Need to do better job of marketing what we do.
  - Other issues include transfer courses. Last time we revisited this issue was 15 years ago.

Announcements. None noted.

Meeting adjourned at 3:07
Faculty Senate Meeting
January 15, 2013
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm. EB 162
Meeting 2013-01

Meeting called to order at 2:05 by President Lugo.

Roll call. Quorum noted.

December 04, 2012 minutes approved

Special order of the day: Election of the 2012-2013 senate President. (P. Turrisi)

- Gabriel Lugo nominated
- Nominations closed
- Gabriel Lugo elected by acclamation

Individual Reports

Chancellor Miller.

Chancellor Miller’s report is attached to these minutes.

President of the Senate Lugo.

- At the state level, “shared governance is threatened and needs protection.”

- As a result, the Faculty Assembly and the Faculty Advisory Council of the Faculty Assembly are working on responses to the most recent drafts of the UNC Strategic Plan. These responses will be discussed at the next Faculty Assembly meeting on Friday, January 18, 2013. (See http://www.northcarolina.edu/facultyassembly/19Jan2013_Faculty_Assembly_Response_to_the_Jan16_Draft_of_th.pdf for these responses.)

- US/QEP position update: A position statement is being developed by search committee co-chairs Gabriel Lugo and Steve McFarland.

- Major space adjustments are in order due to future S&B building renovations in 2014, as up to 83 offices will be relocated. The Faculty Welfare Committee will be involved.

- UNCW’s Intellectual Property policy needs to include non-patentable items.

Committee Reports
The Steering Committee offers the following motions:

a.  **[Motion 2013-01-M01] Grade Policies**
Amend the charge of AS to explicitly include grade policies.

**Motion 2013-01-M01 passes.**

[**Motion 2013-01-M02**] **Revision of standing committees ex-officio memberships**
That to reflect the new AA restructure, membership of senate standing committees be amended as follows:

- **AS:** Change “Director of the University College” to “Associate VC & Dean of Undergraduate Studies.”
- **UCC:** Change ex-officio member, “Director of the University College” to “Associate VC & Dean of Undergraduate Studies.”
- **USAC:** Change ex-officio member, “Director of the University College” to “Associate VC & Dean of Undergraduate Studies.” Add ex-officio member “Director of US/QEP.”

A motion passed to amend the last bullet to read: **USAC:** Add “Associate VC & Dean of Undergraduate Studies.” Add ex-officio member “Director of US/QEP.”

**Motion 2013-01-M02 as amended passes.**

b.  **[Motion 2013-01-M03] US Competency Crediting Form**
That the senate adopt the University Studies Competency Crediting form included herein.

There was considerable discussion from the Provost and faculty about how does UNCW treat transfer students, will potential transfer students be informed of the transferability of competencies before enrolling or soon thereafter, and will UNCW continue to be attractive to transfer students if our competency crediting process is perceived to be unnecessarily complex.

After this discussion, **Motion 2013-01-M03 passes.**

As a result of this discussion, a motion was made and seconded to extend the “patch” for a year. President Lugo indicated that this motion would be referred to USAG.
c. [Motion 2013-01-M04] Faculty Assembly resolution on general education
   That the senate endorse the Faculty Assembly resolution included below and that
   President Ross be notified of this endorsement.

   • FA resolution on minimum GS competencies

   Motion 2013-01-M04 passes unanimously.

No old business noted
No new business noted

For the Good of the Order

The following items related to the UNC Strategic Plan draft were raised.

   Senator: There seems to be a decoupling of where teaching is done and where
   the crediting or degrees are earned. What are the consequences?

   Chancellor Miller: This questioning of the value of place is partly due to various
   national e-learning initiatives. Faculty views are expected to prevail even in the
   teaching of general education.

   Senator: Graduates of Ph.D. programs do not typically stay within in the state.
   Are there problems about making a case about our value to the state for these
   programs?

   Chancellor Miller: This should not be a problem.

   Senator: For the future what is the mix of duties seen for UNCW faculty by the
   Board of Governors?

   Chancellor Miller: Research will continue to be part of the mission. We will have
   to pay a lot of emphasis on transfers to help reach the goal of 32% of NC citizens
   having bachelor degrees. Some institutions such as Carnegie Mellon are
   increasing learning and access through e-learning initiatives. Students with e-
   learning appropriately integrated in their programs have higher graduation rates.

Announcements
Michelle Scatton-Tessier; Director of Women’s Studies and Resources Center: Please review details about UNCW’s Lactation Policy and the location of the three campus lactation rooms. See http://uncw.edu/hr/resources-lactation.html.

Meeting adjourned at 3:51.

Attachment:

**UNC Strategic Directions: Managing a Future of Change**

Report to

The Faculty Senate
The University of North Carolina Wilmington

Gary L. Miller
Chancellor

Thank you for the opportunity to report to you today on an important emerging program of transformation in higher education in North Carolina. I have deposited a copy of these comments with President Lugo who will make them available to you on the Faculty Senate web page.

Let me begin with some comments on how we got to where we are now and where we will go from here with the UNC strategic planning process. Then, I will make some general comments about the draft plan you may have seen. I should note that several chancellors (including me) and several faculty leaders from around the system have provided written reviews of the current Strategic Directions draft. I have provided President Lugo with an electronic version of those to be posted on the Faculty Senate web page.
The process in which we find ourselves – the development of a strategic plan for the UNC system—is required by statute. System level strategic planning has taken different forms over the years in accordance to the wishes of the different presidents and the perspectives of their boards. The most recent iteration – UNC Tomorrow – has expired. A new five-year plan is required for the system. The right and responsibility of developing and implementing a strategic plan for the University of North Carolina belongs to the UNC Board of Governors and the President of UNC. So, this plan is a part of the normal and appropriate functioning of the Board of Governors and the UNC President.

In thinking about the development of this plan, the Board of Governors wished to create a strategy that would both support the covenants of UNC (i.e., Academic Excellence and Access; Value for Students and North Carolina; Solutions to the State’s Biggest Challenges; Engagement with North Carolina Communities) and serve as a compelling case to the legislature for increased investment in higher education. The General Assembly faces economic constraints not seen in many decades and, unfortunately, the education budget in the state of North Carolina, like most states, is the single biggest discretionary budget item and is, thus, a tempting source of funds for resolving seemingly intractable state budgetary issues.

As you know, the draft we are considering was developed by the Strategic Directions Committee, a small group of General Administration Staff and four chancellors (Miller, Anderson, Dubois, Woodson) led by a member of the Board of Governors. This Committee held numerous meetings through the late summer and fall (indeed, I met with the group yesterday in Chapel Hill). The group considered a vast amount of data (much of it imprecise and unhelpful—a feature of
higher education data in general), commissioned studies, reviewed programs from other states, and read scholarly works about higher education. Some of these sources are cited in the draft report. The work of this group is to be considered, revised and approved by a high-level advisory group chaired by the Chair of the Board of Governors and the President of the University of North Carolina.

In their introductory comments to the BOG last week, Chairperson Peter Hans and President Ross emphasized that they consider this to be a “living” document subject not only to the revisions of the current draft but to future revisions based on experience and new knowledge. This is an important acknowledgement of the complexity of both the system and the challenges we face.

I want to note that the four Chancellors who agreed to serve on this committee were not directly involved in the drafting of the current draft documents primarily because of the ambitious writing schedule. All of us have submitted detailed comments on the draft and have been engaged in very active conversations with the Board regarding areas where we believe more consideration is needed. For example, I strongly objected to the omission of a system research focus area in Marine Science. I am happy to report that that situation is being corrected. Future drafts will include Marine Science as an important research investment area for the state. I will mention some other accommodations we have gained through our informal conversations later in my comments.

Let me spend the rest of my time with you making a few observations about the current draft of this plan in the hope of adding some context. Hopefully, we will have time at the end for questions.
Observation 1. – There is no doubt this plan is heavily influenced by a confluence of interrelated political, social and economic forces shaping a dramatic transition in American higher education. Among the most important of these are: (1) the economic realities of the Great Recession including the likelihood of both a slow recovery and lingering structural challenges with entitlements, health care and other social programs; (2) rising costs of public higher education, stagnating middle class wages and, consequently, increasing student debt; (3) advancements in technology and its relationship to learning, transforming traditional classroom practices and having the potential (not yet fully realized) to create significant efficiencies and new markets for learning; (4) declining public interest in the commonwealth value of colleges and universities and growing ambivalence (supported by some data) of the individual value of the liberal arts based college degree and (5) a strong perception among policy makers and business people of a disconnect between curriculum and career. Taken together, these forces signify a period of dramatic change for the enterprise of public higher education and for the way each of us conducts our work in that enterprise. Our opportunity here is to understand the environment and shepherd the most precious parts of enterprise – our beliefs in the importance of the liberal arts and our assiduous dedication to free inquiry, discovery and thought – through this period of change. To be as direct as possible: UNCW will continue as a world-class institution and UNCW will not be able to achieve that in the same way we are achieving it now.

Observation 2.—It is evident that the draft sections of this plan were prepared separately by different authors and, thus, the document is in need of careful editing which is underway. Because the draft is unusually undeveloped for a first public document there are great opportunities to influence the outcome if you work rapidly. So, this is a good time to dig deeply into the narrative
and make specific comments and suggestions about it and to relay those to me and the Faculty Assembly.

Because I was part of the discussions resulting in this draft, I am aware that the current narrative tends to mask some of the more positive aspects of the plan, underemphasize important operating principles (the two most notable are mentioned in Observation 3), and misrepresent the intent of some of the tactics suggested. There are many big ideas about the future of higher education in North Carolina, some of which derive from important and difficult questions about the efficacy of university operations in the environment of transformation in which we find ourselves. While some of the strategies and actions represented here may seem almost revolutionary, it is important to know that those working on this project have attempted to balance the need for change, supported by the strong forces noted in my first observation, with the need to preserve the most important features of an already excellent higher education system.

**Observation 3.** – In addition to the impending inclusion of Marine Science as an area of research focus for the state, there are two important principles that in my opinion must be better emphasized. These are: (1) the essential requirement of shared governance and (2) a full and direct commitment to the importance of regionalism in the UNC system. The principle of shared governance is a founding precept of the UNC system and codified in state law. It is clearly discussed in the preamble to the “Strengthen Academics Quality” section of the draft proposal (as appropriate) but many of us, including me, continue to argue for a stronger commitment to these principles in the very beginning of the document and throughout. All of us believe true commitment to shared governance necessarily includes the full practice of it throughout the system.
including at the General Administration level. Our committee discussions yesterday suggest to me there will be a more appropriate emphasis on these principles in coming drafts.

Regionalism is the foundation of the variable missions of the universities in the UNC system and, in order to sustain the integrity of the system with this precious variability intact, regional university missions must be acknowledged and, where appropriate, emphasized. This is important for all of the key elements of the university mission: teaching, research, service, community engagement. Embracing variation in mission is also necessary for this plan to succeed. Each campus will address the requirements of the plan in ways that fit their mission and operating philosophy. For these reasons, am confident that regionalism will be more prominent in future drafts of this plan.

Observation 4. – The “Degree Attainment” section of this draft sets forth a very ambitious state-wide goal of moving from about 28% of citizens having a four-year degree to just over 32%, which would put the state in the top ten in the nation (assuming other states don’t improve). Much of the rationale for this is based on workforce analyses which, as the report acknowledges, are imperfect. I am very much in favor of the attainment goal but I (and many others) have argued strongly that there are other reasons besides workforce development for desiring a high proportion of educated citizens. Many degree holders choose not to work and we know those with college degrees are more engaged citizens. I am encouraged that this view continues to gain strength among the Board and others who have worked on this plan. While the new attainment goal will no doubt require us to rethink some of our processes, because of our success with transfer students (UNCW has the second highest transfer population and the highest transfer graduation rate) and military personnel and their families, we are in a good position to meet new attainment goals.
Observation 5. – “Strengthen Academic Quality” is the section of most importance to faculty. I am not sure how President Lugo intends to organize your thinking about this but I would encourage you to use one of your committees or to form a special group to very carefully review this plan with me so that I can give you some perspective of what the committee was thinking as these ideas emerged. I want to commit to you that I will be happy to participate in a working session on this in the near future.

Let me make a few broad comments about this section. First, you probably noticed as you read this – I certainly did – the academic plan seems to move the center of gravity of academic planning away from campus and to the general administration. With respect to ideas about general studies, I do not believe this is the intent. Indeed, the creation of a system-wide General Education Council to manage system changes in general studies was an idea lifted from the Faculty Assembly report and intended to make sure faculty retained control of this important part of the curriculum. I believe our best strategy at this point is to participate in the General Education Council with great vigor.

Secondly, I am convinced that a strong system-centric approach to distance education (eLearning) will emerge from this plan. The forces urging more eLearning throughout the system to affect efficiency, lower costs and reduce redundancy are extremely strong. UNC as a system is not considered a national leader in this area which is rich with innovation. And, more than with general education (the theory of which has stagnated for decades in my opinion), there are emerging compelling models of the transformational power of technology and learning. In my view, the
eLearning movement is much more of a potential disruptor for regional universities like UNCW than is the discussion of general studies.

Finally, this section makes assumptions about retention and graduation rates that do not fully apply to selective universities like ours. One of the most important of these is that all or most retention and graduation problems are related to student academic performance. While this is true for most universities with low retention and graduation rates, it may not be the main driver of such rates for universities like ours. Our rates are much more dependent on inputs (admissions) and on student choices (e.g., to transfer to another fine university, to study abroad, to take a third or fourth major). These assumptions drive actions steps such as summer bridge programs, more intensive advising, etc. that, while always useful to us, may not represent the best way for us to improve already very high retention and graduation rates. I am optimistic considerable inter-institutional variation in approach will be accommodated in working to increase retention and graduation rates.

Observation 6. – The importance of strongly incorporating regionalism into the plan is particularly important in the section on “Serve the People of North Carolina.” As I mentioned above, I believe this will be better emphasized in the next draft. Several of us have also argued – successfully I hope – that this section must have much stronger language, including specific examples, of the importance of service, community engagement, extension and all those intangible services that contribute to the roughly $1.1 Billion economic impact of UNCW on the region. Among the most important reasons for including this theme is the strong acknowledgment of the Board of Governors – emphasized in the faculty workload policy approved at their January meeting – of the role of faculty in providing these services and the need to document this as part of faculty workload. One of the major challenges here is developing methodology to quantify (return on
investment) our engagement and service activities. Because of the work of our Community Partnership office, we have already begun thinking about how this might be accomplished.

Observation 7. – There are two sections of this plan that I have seen that are not yet available to the public. These deal with university efficiency and the strategic plan budget. These sections will be extremely important to us and, in many ways, favor us. The Board appears to have settled on a methodology based on the Delta Cost Project of the Lumina Foundation for studying university efficiency. It involves a standard method for calculating cost of degree that is gaining support throughout the country. Vice Chancellor Maimone and his group are preparing a full analysis of this method which we will be happy to share with you in the near future. Using this method for the UNC system, the average cost per degree has dropped 12.2% and the average annual number of degrees has risen 17.6% since 2007-2008. This is a great story but, as you can imagine, there is a desire to continue this trend. UNCW looks very good in this analysis and, some of the analytical approaches we have instituted over the past year or so are now being used by General Administration. So, I believe we will continue to be a leader in this area.

Perhaps the most important element of these last two sections will be a re-consideration of university missions. I am not yet aware how this will be configured but the outcome will be significant to us since our current mission prevents us from moving forward with long-planned and essential doctoral program. An important part of the UNCW Strategic Action Planning Workgroup is to revise the university mission statement.

Observation 8. – Although the Provost and I have not completed a full comparison of the draft strategic directions document with our existing strategic plan, it is my view that the two can be
complementary. It is likely our process of strategic refreshing now underway under the direction of the Provost will reaffirm many of our specific strategic goals. However, there is no doubt that the new Strategic Directions of the Board of Governors will require us to dramatically change many of our approaches and, perhaps, priorities. It will be necessary for us to begin to merge these two documents beginning in late spring and through the summer and fall.

Observation 9. – What keeps me awake at night is how the vast change in direction and strategy embodied in this ambitious plan will affect this precious place: UNCW. What helps me sleep is my admiration for and trust in the people in this room and all the others who work for this university. There are many, many opportunities for us here. Together, we will find and exploit those opportunities.

Thank you President Lugo. I will be happy to answer questions if there is time.

G.L.M
Faculty Senate Meeting
February 19, 2013
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm. EB 162
Meeting 2013-02
Meeting called to order at 2:05.

Individual Reports

Chancellor Miller.

- Thank you for your work, particularly in support of Homecoming
- Strategic Plan
  - Inclusion of Academic Freedom language
  - Invite the senators to continue to discuss the plan as it moves into its implementation phase.
  - There is funding tied to it: performance model
- Budget issues
  - Issues tied to sequestration have been taken care of
- Faculty invited to join community in sharing their comments about Athletic Review process

President of the Senate Lugo.

- Thank you for your work on resolution tied to Strategic Plan
- Faculty Assembly update
  - Final version of GA Strategic Plan
  - CAA under revision
  - Fostering Student Success (Policy 400.1.5)
    - Concern about language related to third bullet point about possible “seamless” transfer policies between UNC campuses and other educational entities.
- SACS [Floor ceded to Martin Posey]
  - Latest SACS visit went very favorably
  - Tuesday Feb 12, Preliminary visit with compliance members to discuss March review.

- US/QEP position update
  - At least one applicant noted.
  - Search process will be open.
- S&B building renovations committee formed
  - Displacement of nearly 65 faculty members
There will be a certain amount of discomfort involved in temporary relocations.

- Coming up on March – SPOT proposal – Adopt IDEA
  - Yes or no vote coming: “Yes” will signify moving forward with new instrument. “No” means that we will have to rapidly come up with an alternative solution, as current instrument will crash this summer

- Coming up on March – RPT proposal
  - Proposed changes will be presented in an edited draft of RPT document. As we approve changes, the edits will be accepted, and then final vote on entire document will take place.
  - This process will take place in parts and over multiple meetings as necessary.
  - Process then goes through Academic Affairs, then Board of Trustees, and the Board of Governors. (Typical duration is 1-2 years)

- Grievance/Hearing primer (draft)
  - Faculty Assembly has expressed concern that faculty UNC-system wide do not have sufficient knowledge of grievance/hearing processes.
  - Campuses are badly in need of an Ombudsman.
    - There is one at UNC-CH

Committee Reports

The Steering Committee offers the following motion:

[Motion 2013-02-M01] Transfer Patch

To extend the “patch” for transfer credit that was brought to the senate by Steering on October 02, 2012 for one more year, through June 2014.

Students entering UNCW in Fall 2012, Spring 2013, Summer I and II 2013, Fall 2013, Spring 2014, and Summer I and II 2014 who receive credit for previous coursework will also receive credit for all University Studies competencies attached to the equivalent University Studies courses.

Comments:

- Be careful about negative implications for curriculum

[Motion 2013-02-M01 passes unanimously]

No old business noted
No new business noted
For the Good of the Order
Topic: Student Evaluation of Teaching Instruments
  - What is proposal? To implement IDEA
• What are implications for faculty? How will the instrument be used for faculty evaluation?
• The instrument and its implementation are separate issues.
• Comment from IDEA pilot member: I liked using the instrument.
  ▪ There’s formative and evaluative feedback.
  ▪ It is harder to boil down evaluations to one, global question.
  ▪ Online aspect less intrusive regarding delivery of classroom content
• Query of other UNC schools. ECU has crafted an instrument that avoids problems of reductive, global question.
• Another Pilot member: I second first pilot members comments. In addition, we have different classes, and different SLOs.
• Student participation is good using IDEA
• How will costs of implementation be handled? Sent to AA. Direct cost around $55,000.
• All changes will have to be reflected in related documents, such as policy manuals.
• If we change instrument, we’ll need some type of amnesty before we implement it.
• 3rd Pilot Member: There is, in fact, a core set of questions available. I also found the instrument superior to current SPOT instrument.
• Another set of items include raw and scaled scores. Implications for obligatory vs. elective courses.
• We’ve said for year after year that we’re not supposed to only use Question 16, yet we always use it.
• Q 16 is used reductively for a number of reasons, including at departmental level.
• Diana Ashe will post names of pilot members of Faculty Senate site.
• Evaluation Committee is asked to put proposal forward as soon as possible, so that senators have ample time to study and discuss it before the March meeting.

Announcements
• Janine Iamunno, Director of University Relations: Please take a look at new faculty and staff newsletter, SWOOP, and send in your suggestions: http://uncw.edu/swoop/.
• Academic Freedom Forum on Thursday Feb. 21st, 12:30 p.m., Azalea Coast Room, Fisher University Union
• Johnson Akinleye: New academic partnerships recently signed. More information coming soon.
• President Ross might be visiting UNCW in the upcoming months.

Meeting adjourned at 3:03.
Agenda for Faculty Senate Meeting
March 19, 2013
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm. EB 162
Meeting 2013-03

1. Call to order.
2. Approval of January and February 2013 minutes
3. Individual Reports
   a. Chancellor Miller.
   b. Senate Report. VP Turrisi presiding
      • Faculty Assembly update
         o Faculty working groups for Gen-Ed, E-Learning and Class Size
         o CAA meeting with chairs of each the UNC campuses. Goal: to change the 44 core to 30 hours Gen-Ed credits that will transfer among all campuses.
      • Report on part-time parking – Yield to Maimone
      • SACS - Here
      • Coming up on April – SPOT proposal. Will include full verbiage with proposed modification of Faculty Handbook
      • Coming up on May – RPT proposal
4. Committee Reports
   a. The UCC offers the following motion: [Motion 2013-03-M01]
      • Department of Early Childhood and Special Education: Delete of BIO 160 from the core requirements of the EYC program
      • Dept. of Elementary, Middle level and Literacy*: Broaden the range of courses that students can take for their Education Concentrations and encourage students to study abroad (1-6 hours can count towards the Concentration) (* Not a catalogue change)
   b. Report from Buildings & Grounds
5. Old Business
6. New Business
7. For the Good of the Order
   a. Transfer of general education courses – From USAC
      • USAC cover letter
      • IL/WI graduation requirements
      • External transfer policy
      • Internal transfer policy
   b. Part time faculty parking. Questions for VCBA
8. Announcement
9. Adjournment
Agenda for Faculty Senate Meeting  
April 16, 2013  
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm. EB 162  
Meeting 2013-04

1. Meeting call to order.

2. Approval of January and February 2013 minutes

3. Individual Reports
   
   a. Chancellor’s report – Yields to Chancellor Miller

   Will have open meeting at 2:00 on the 22nd.

   Please read carefully President Ross’ comments in paper today.

   We have some work to do together on budget process, so that we’re not lurching from one budget to the next.

   Mark Lanier has been following a number of bills, e.g., handguns on campus, consolidation of IT, and student access to legal services

   3 things that are in process:

   1. Athletic Review
      a. Questions include: Do we have the right balance of types of sports fielded
      b. Recommendations to be made in May

   2. Entrepreneurship Center
      a. Action arm moved to Research Foundation, Academic arm remains in Cameron
      b. In order to make center self-sustainable, we have to connect our intellectual entrepreneurs with capital from the community
      c. Roll-out will be in fall, but some news should be coming out soon

   3. Fund Raising. We have retained counsel to strategize how to best conduct campaigns going forward. This is background work, and faculty will be engaged, as we move to

   b. Senate President’s report – Lugo

   We did make a good dent in maintaining faculty control over the curriculum. Good progress made on pathways and Gen-Ed credits

   • Faculty Assembly update
o Legislation Day held on April 03. Laurie Patterson represented UNCW for the FA delegation.

o More CAA meeting on articulation matrices: Replace 44 core to 30 hours of guaranteed Gen-Ed credits. CC pathways structure basically unchanged

• SACS – Has come but not gone
  
  Overall, process went very well
  
  Minor Citations on:
  
  Some credentials
  
  Community Service and focus
  
  Citation on QEP

• Budget – Intellectual potential model
  
  Energy needs to be put into particle for particle to be freed.
  
  Students need faculty, who have been resourced properly, to help activate them to succeed academically.

4. Committee Reports

a. The Evaluation committee offers the following motion: [Motion 2013-04-M01]
   
   That, beginning with the fall semester 2013, the Student Perceptions of Teaching (SPOT) student evaluation of instruction instrument be replaced for all UNCW courses by the online Diagnostic Survey Form of The IDEA Center; and further, to accomplish this change, that the Faculty Handbook be amended as indicated in the attached document

   • Faculty Handbook changes

   • Background information on The IDEA Center and rationale.

Two questions:

Substantively, the evaluation tool will not be used differently in terms of RTP. Is this right?
There are two parts, a summative and formative part. The summative part will be used for RTP. The formative aspect will not.

The students fill out all the questions. The faculty member chooses 12 that they want to prioritize.

Is this tool used only online? Is there an option other than online?

Answer to online question. I understand that mobile devices from students can be used to administer tool.

Concerns about appropriateness and validity of students evaluating faculty effectiveness.

Recommend system that focuses on peer evaluation and qualitative feedback.

I support motion. The tool is better

The research on student teaching effectiveness is rich and varied, so different conclusions can be made. Charge of Evaluation Committee is to replace old instrument (SPOTs) with a better tool.

I’d also like to speak in favor of the motion. I was able to tell the instrument what was more relevant about that particular class. Instrument is more flexible and presents richer feedback

Can time students have to perform evaluation be limited? Yes. Individual faculty can do so.

Evaluation instrument can only be carried out electronically? Yes.

[Motion 2013-04-M01 passes]

President Lugo: I would like to thank Ellen Gurganous for her many years of behind-the-scenes service dealing with SPOTs

b. The Faculty Welfare Committee offers the following motion

[Motion 2013-04-02] Parking rates for part-time faculty

[Motion 2013-04-02 passes without dissent]
c. The University Curriculum Committee offers the following motion
   [Motion 2013-04-03] Merger of The Department of Early Childhood and Special Education (ECSE) and the Department of Elementary, Middle Level and Literacy Education (EMLLE)

   [Motion 2013-04-03 passes]

5. Steering Committee offers the following motion
   [Motion 2013-04-04] To the reconstitute the senate Public Relations and Extended Education committee into a new committee as follows
   Faculty Engagement and Outreach committee

   a. Duties: To advise in the planning, innovation, and operation of external applied learning programs, especially in terms of content and overall relevance of its operations to the institution and its service mission. To work with all units related to public service, extended education and public relations on improving the visibility and impact of the university on our community. To foster and publicize scholarly faculty engagement,

   b. Membership: Seven faculty members. The ACC & Dean for Undergraduate Studies, the Executive Director for Public Relations and the chair of the Innovations Council shall be ex officio non-voting members.

   Chancellor Miller. I am responsible for the messages coming out of the University. I sup

   [Motion 2013-04-04 passes with 2/3 majority]

6. No old business noted

7. No new business noted

8. For the Good of the Order

   • Budget

   Very serious consequences. Loss of faculty.

   Importance to protect academic core.

   Reason we suspended current searches is to give us flexibility and time (from here to next biennium).

   Cuts are permanent in time of our careers. We’re not getting money back.
This will be a slow recovery for education, even if economic recovery is speedier.

There will be a review of programs, and we expect the GA to be speaking about redundancy for a long time.

Example of ECU in which decided to review programs themselves.

Western did that last year.

What about how we create more revenue?

Virtually any innovative approach to pedagogical delivery will be entertained.

9. Announcement

- Designs on eLearning – CTE
- Applied Learning and Teaching Community Events – Boersma
- Unified Budget Planning- Presentation by VCBA at spring faculty meeting

Please read thoroughly and respond with your comments

10. Adjournment
Agenda for Faculty Senate Meeting
May 14, 2013
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm. EB 162

Meeting 2013-05

1. Call to order – 49 senators present
2. April 2013 minutes approved
3. Individual Reports
   a. Chancellor’s report - Delegated to Provost Battles
      • Gov budget released 3/2013, senate budget delayed; we expect cut of
        several percent we don’t expect it to be a small number. We expect funds
        for enrollment growth and building expansion. SDI priorities; final budget
        expected after GA action, likely late June.
      • House bill 937 – amend various firearms laws – allows people with
        concealed carry permits to keep guns in locked cars. Has been passed by
        the house is and is at the Senate – efforts are underway to grant campuses
        authority to decide for themselves about guns on campus.
      • Personnel transitions:
        o David Cordle – Emporia State University, July 1, Steve McNamee
          has been appointed interim.
        o Jesse Sova -- Will be going to NC State! Friday May 24th.
        o Jose Hernandez -- Chief Diversity Officer U of S. Florida.
          Chancellor will appoint a small faculty/staff group to participate in
          the diversity re-assessment of UNCW’s overall approach to
          diversity and inclusion. Nominations by August. Wants a small
          group to work quickly and over the summer.
      • Summer innovation initiative
        o Work on the full 12 month calendar (without changing faculty
          salaries to full 12 months). Task Force established.
        o Charge: Study and recommend by Oct.15, plan for restructuring
          summer programs in 2014
        o Nick Troutman. Scott James, Johnson Akinleye (and others) are
          on this – if interested reach out to them and provide input.
   b. Strategic Action Planning
      o Workgroup charged November 2012
      o Mission statement development and revision leading to BOT
        approval April 2013
      o Vision statement and core values drafted
      o Work on goals and objectives underway
      o Fall 2013 target date for completion BOG action on mission
        statements by November. Plan to be completed after that.
• S&B renovations
  o Timeline: State grants request to use funds from teaching lab project for S&B, fall 2012; Analysis of renovation options began – we have insufficient funds for the renovation that the building really requires.
  o Option one was a phased renovation; vacant animal lab has less efficient single pass air. Insufficient funds for this option due to needed supplemental HVAC. In fall decided to do the renovation all at once – Small planning committee create in January – included people with a broader perspective and who were not personally effected (D. Cordle, S. McFarland, A. Vaughn, E. Pappamihiel, A. Steele, S. Pickard, M. Morgan). Recommendation by April 1 to get information to construction/engineering people for a January to August renovation.
  o No other major renovation or construction projects in the next 5-10 years have been approved by GA.
  o Campus space analysis shows we have 157% general purpose classroom space and over 200% of required meeting space. Lack of faculty office space might be the primary barrier to hiring new faculty -- raised by Gabriel Lugo; also we have a gap in research/teaching lab space. Out of space for hiring new faculty.
  o Performance goals include increasing our number of graduates in STEM fields, health, honors and energy efficiency.
  o We get 4.2 million dollars from the Teaching Lab building, if we achieve greater energy efficiency we can get more funds for the SB renovation.
  o Recommendation and outcome:
    a. Theme for the building: “STEM, UG research, honors”
    b. Increase in research/teaching labs and offices. Decrease general purpose classrooms. Non-credit hour producing units relocated out.
    c. On April 1 the committee finished and made their recommendation – presented to the Chancellor, all approved and gone to the design team all done in April.
    d. Renovation relocations will happen in December 2013. Renovation period will be January to mid-August 2014.
    e. This is an inherently disruptive process and she is appreciative and understanding.
    f. Announcement made in SWOOP. Deans informed before cabinet meeting.
b. Senate President’s report -- Lugo

- Committee preferences. Still time to add your name to the 193 faculty members who have filled out the survey
- Handgun legislation
  - Support of FA resolution:
    - 186 (80%) Yes
    - 47 (20%) No
  - Results of survey included in memo from FA to President Ross
  - House passes the bill on May 06 by a vote of 78-42.
  - Acknowledges Chief Donaldson
    a. “no evidence that guns on campus creates or enhances campus safety”.
    b. It is intended to create a convenience for people who have concealed weapons. He has carried concealed for 20 years it is not convenient.
    c. Active shooter training video available and also have presentations that we can make to faculty.

- Items for Summer
  - Ad-Hoc RTP will continue working on revisions.
  - Lugo will work on:
    a. Updates to Faculty Handbook
    b. Refinement of Senate SharePoint site
    c. Helping with deployment of IDEA
    d. Becoming more civilized.

4. Committee Reports

a. The University Curriculum Committee offers the following motions:

[Motion 2013-05-M01]

- College of Health and Human Services Reorganization: The dissolution of the two departmental structures within the School of Nursing and adoption of the School Director organizational model as currently in place in the School of Health and Applied Human Sciences and the School of Social Work (CAF)
- School of Nursing designates CLR 460 as the oral competency course within the major (CAF)
  - Senator: Faculty input solicited by the Dean. She understands that this needs to be streamlined but even though it means in the CAF forms that faculty input is solicited – but there is not additional faculty governance here as the director positions are all appointed.
  - Motion passes with voice vote
[Motion 2013-05-M02]
The creation of two Marketing options in the Department of Marketing:
Marketing Strategy and Professional Selling (CAF)
  o Motion passes with voice vote
b. The Faculty Welfare Committee offers the following motion
[Motion 2013-05-M03] Part-time office space and statement of support
c. Final committee reports of
  • IT/LIB – Ann Pemberton
    o Committee created with merger of IT and Library committees.
    o Monitored discussion of SPOTS, provided input about mobile
devices registered on campus,
    o Provided costs of BlackBoard and other resources.
    o Library moves to WorldCat interface in the fall. No need to
research each database.
    o Link in the report about the increasing cost of journals and the
budgets for libraries – has information broken down by field.
    o Answer to a question: Online are more expensive than the paper
  • Faculty Welfare Committee – Dan Johnson
    o Most centered on part time faculty. Parking rates – successfully
influenced BA to have them reduced.
    o Met with folks in facilities about publicizing the existence of
defibrillators. E
    o Encouraged departments to create policies for rewarding non-
remunerated teaching such as DIS
    o Senator – 30 hour a week Obama Care statute access to health
care. Response: Committee will investigate this next year. ace..
  • Research -- Paul Townend
    o Committee worked on ways to improve support for research,
Cahill and distinguished faculty research awards.
    o Suggestions: That senate work with the provost to strengthen the
faculty research award. And the senate should work with AA to
coordinate resources that support research and scholarship.
  • Academic Standards -- Nathaniel Grove
    o Reminder of committee activities – issues surrounding Academic
Partnerships and the U’s desire to contract the org to increase our
online enrollment. Committee continues to monitor this situation.
    o Second major issue from SGA was the transfer policy and the
graduation with distinction policy. We decided to keep the policy
as it currently stands.
- Senate chair comments that there is a report being conducted on campus on grade inflation and he will include that report on SharePoint (no evidence of grade inflation)
- **Budget** -- Ed Graham
  - Represent the faculty in raises and salaries, increasing graduate assistanceships, raises for EPA to 80% of standard. According to BOG guidelines 25% of tuition must be directed to faculty raises.
  - Legislature might provide a salary increase beyond the 1.5% that will likely be provided by the tuition increase.
  - Looking also at a 4 year plan process on campuses to vet initiatives on UBudget committees.
- **UCC** – Pam Evers
  - For the year: 7 proposals all passed by the senate
- **USAC** Cara Cilano
  - Worked on transfer policy
  - Worked with QEP/eTeal on coordinating the learning outcomes.
  - Minutes and agendas and documents are updated on Sharepoint.
  - Will be working with Martin on outstanding transfer students.
  - Incoming chair is Heidi Higgins.

**Faculty Welfare**

5. Old Business

6. New Business

[**Motion 2013-05-M04**] WI and IL motion (Reeves of behalf of science chairs)
  Referred to committee

7. For the Good of the Order

- **Space Management and Shared Services**
  - Faculty Statement 01
  - Faculty Statement 02
  - Faculty Statement 03: Liberal Arts
    Troubles with re-location is small compared to others. Believes that her relocation is a permanent downsizing from several offices to one faculty office. Not sure MALS can operate under the new conditions – successful program, graduated 11 masters; part of the campus goal to increase graduate enrollments. Not concerned with the agenda of the business of the university, only concerned with the academic mission….the ability to work under these circumstances.
      a. Issue of shared staff resources she won’t address.
      b. Essentially saying no more concessions?
      c. Students also don’t have any impact.
d. Wants a university that is responsive to our academic work.

- Faculty Statement 04: Physics
  Scheduled to move into this building. Notes that Provost presentation said: increasing office space, increasing research space, in this move physics is losing 40% of office space; 50% of research lab space and no opportunities for synergy because the groups that traditionally work together will not be together. In particular cannot share lab space for faculty. This is eviscerating STEM faculty.

- Faculty Statement 05: Sociology & Criminology
  Has seen a lot of shenanigans in her years here and this is the worst case of disrespect for faculty in her 36 years here. The process by which this building has been repurposed was secret and the people impacted were not consulted until it came out in SWOOP. Faculty should have been able to discuss a STEM Center – this has been a real missed opportunity. Now the spinoff is going to hit all of campus. These are spinoffs that are larger than those departments directly impacted. Appreciates the report from the Provost but has to most respectfully say too little too late. Respectfully suggests that faculty should go ahead and discuss repurposing the facility. Last comment – last year in Ukraine, mission was to model open, shared governance. And I would not like my Ukrainian colleagues to know about this situation.

- Faculty Statement 06: Sociology & Criminology
  Comment on faculty treatment by the administration and the unhappiness of the junior faculty. Process did not comply with the UNC systems of joint governance – quotes from the code that the faculty were not adequately consulted as required by the CODE.

- Faculty Statement 07: Anthropology
  Younger faculty – continued funding for the Center of Entrepreneurship and Innovation while faculty lines have to be fought for at the end of the academic year. Moving us out of the building without telling us; in fact we assumed we were staying until the last three to four months. Anthropology department reserves its comment on where it ends up we think that we might do better in a new space we don’t know. Loves Wilmington but is troubled by the lack of support for Higher Ed in this state and the consequent constant state of crisis.

- Faculty Statement 07: Math.
  Told about cubicles in SON building but classes in Bear and GTAs
in Bear. Math doesn’t know how much space they would be losing if they moved to the new building. Computer labs – technology labs? Will be able to teach our classes. We have asked the questions several times but ….

a. Senator: that there are only two classrooms left in the building so he knows that the Math department will not be able to teach its classes in the building.

b. Faculty member: wants to know what will become of our expressions of concern.

Faculty Statement 08: Math and Physics
The last years have been difficult, many of these personally bother him; doesn’t see how he can live in a cubicle – no books, files, this goes to effectiveness. Would like to see something take place once the summer gets going. The way things have been happening on this campus people listen and then they do what they want over the summer anyway.

Dean David Cordle
When we talk about the plan, the plan that exists right now is basic – units moving, creating additional science teaching lab spaces and additional teaching lab spaces and what has to happen now is to work out exactly how the departments or any others occupy space in the building. There is time to work that out in a way that hopefully will be a net gain for many people. The temporary situation is going to be tough and there is no way to make that easy in terms of emptying out SB. Really more a question of figuring out who is going to be inconvenienced. Last point – committee members struggled with the work they were doing and the information they were providing and not providing….but the other side of that question is that to involve a situation one of the obvious direct stakeholders is a part of the committee would have put those individuals into a very directly difficult situation. Doesn’t know about how the information would have been shared when it was only just ideas under discussion ….

a. Senate Chair: Notes that he has lots of voices passing through him. It is the faculty who have been displaced. The people who came onto campus from off campus are not in cubicles. The faculty are going to cubicles.

b. Would have been easier to get the buy in of the faculty if this committee could have told people that they were going
to develop a STEM Center. The faculty could have commented and helped shape this.

- Comment – eliminating my program’s resources will cause it to be less effective and less productive. She would understand this decision if the decision was being made that the MALS program is no longer a program the University can continue to support. If so make the decision and let me know.

- Comment: The idea is that things happen on campus and no one knows anything but we are also constantly being told things one way or another. So it would be better to be more transparent so that the faculty know what is going on all at the same time.

8. Announcement
   Diana Ashe hands out the QEP announcement paperwork

9. Adjournment
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Quorum confirmed. Senate President Lugo residing. Meeting called to order at 2:04

I. Encouragement from Dr. Michelle Scatton-Tessier, co-chair of the 2014-2015 Faculty-Staff Campaign, to consider the importance of the campaign and our contributions to it.

II. Special order of the day: Election of Senate Officers
   a. Jimmy Reeves was elected Vice President.
   b. Carol Pilgrim was elected Secretary.
   c. Carrie Clements, Steve Meinhold, Mark Spaulding, and Aaron Wilcox were elected Steering Committee members.

III. Individual Reports
   a. Terry Ismert, Chair of the Staff Senate
      • Staff Senate has been busy building their priority list for the Chancellor’s attention.
      • Applications are being accepted for scholarships for staff and family members (up to $750 twice a year). A website has been developed to help direct options.
      • Staff Senate is working to form a coalition with faculty (via the Faculty Senate) and students (via SGA) to work toward solutions for issues we hold in common. Examples include: waiving fees for faculty and staff to use the Rec Center (confirmed for 2014-2015 by Vice Chancellor Leonard), and an upcoming food drive in February.
   b. Chancellor Sederburg (awarded an honorary, slightly used, CAA baseball by President Lugo)
      • Thanks to Senators for contributing to shared governance.
      • Brief bio. Be on the lookout for Zac.
      • This is not a broken campus, but the Chancellor has been asked to work on a few issues including: governance, trustees, administrative issues, and re-establishing our sense of direction. We need to return to our roots as a student-centered university, with the faculty scholarship that accompanies that.
      • Toward that end, the Chancellor will be establishing a Leadership Council, and plans to hold a series of fora. The first will be on Sept. 17 at 8:30 a.m. and will focus on budgeting and Athletics. There will be a forum focused on each of the Colleges so that we can learn about each other.
      • Chancellor Sederburg is open to questions and will meet with those who wish.
   c. Provost Battles
      • Thanks to all for participating in shared governance.
      • We have a class of high-quality incoming students, approaching 14,000, with approximately 1600 graduate students.
      • There are continuing initiatives, including: Undergraduate Student Success, and Faculty Roles, Responsibilities, and Rewards (F3R). We should expect to receive a survey on the latter from the F3 Committee, chaired by Mark Galizio and Kathy Browder.
      • A new initiative will include focus on Post-tenure Review, as UNCW is currently out of alignment with GA requirements. James Hunt and Dean Charlie Hardy will chair this committee.
      • Dean Hardy will also be chairing the Search Committee for a new Dean of the Cameron School.
Welcome to David Ulaszek, new Assistant Vice Chancellor for Resource Management in AA.

Chancellor Sederburg announced that there will be an upcoming reception at Keenan House for Senators and Trustees.

Questions from the floor:
- Is AA reviewing credit hour production of individual faculty?
  Answer (McFarland) – Credit hour production is reviewed only at an aggregate level.
- How is 3R different from recent Senate work on RPT?
  Answer (Battles) – These efforts are not duplicative at all. 3R is looking to review workload assignments, goal setting, and alignment of workload to rewards, of which RPT is only one piece.
- Will the 3R result in general guidelines for Chairs to follow, or standardized rubrics?
  Answer (Battles) – Committee recommendations are still to be determined, but she anticipates broad parameters, based on best practices.
- Has the committee been in touch with department Chairs?
  Answer (Battles) – Yes, and data are still being collected.

Senate President Lugo
- Regarding the Chancellor Search, he requested and is encouraged that there will be more faculty input than previously, with five rather than four faculty representatives (two from CAS, and one from each of the other Colleges). He has also made clear to the Board of Trustees that we would like the final three candidates to come for campus visits; there seems to be concern that this could discourage some candidates. We still believe that campus visits will be important.
- President Lugo presented his model of the New Teal Experience, emphasizing correspondence between the peaks of student experiences and combined University Studies/eTeal efforts, as determined by the work of the Faculty Senate.
- Our transition to IDEA had a bumpy start, but the additional support needed to help make the system work has been recognized and there will be a new hire toward this end. Faculty should remember to fill out their course forms and should have their students complete the evaluations in the classroom if at all possible.
- Faculty should be aware of, and use, the Senate Sharepoint site that houses all Senate documents, providing for stronger continuity of Senate business. This includes all RPT documents.
- Senate will be working on RPT and on our policies on Academic Freedom and Tenure again, as last year’s Senate report has been returned by AA.
- We will also be working on our PTR policies, as we must be compliant with new rulings by the Board of Governors. The Faculty of all 16 campuses protested the new BOG policies, but we lost. Dean Hardy will lead our compliance efforts. President Lugo recommends that we comply but no more, and that we use our new policy as a tool to protect our tenure process.
- Attention was called to the Senate Primer for new Senators.
- President Lugo recommended our continued focus on The Main Point ( * ), which is, conveniently, the keyboard symbol for 42, the answer to the meaning of life. You can look it up.

IV. Committee Reports

a. Faculty Welfare Committee
- Offers Motion 2014-09-MO1 to bring the UNCW workload policy statement into compliance with GA policies for Masters Comprehensive Universities.
- Mark Galizio and Kathy Browder, co-chairs of the Faculty 3R Task Force, reviewed the work of that
The Task Force was charged with reviewing compliance issues, providing a snapshot of current practices, and developing a model for faculty workload assignments with a link to possible rewards. They emphasized the need for flexibility given current variations across campus, and also the need to have policies that are fair, in compliance, and defensible. There is a current problem and thus a need to reflect accurately and completely everything that faculty do. Faculty will have the opportunity for input via an upcoming survey.

- There were questions about the Motion not addressing variations for some faculty (e.g., full-time lecturers). The sentiment is that the policy statement provides foundational guidelines, but there is still room for individual differences.
- The Motion passed 49-1.

b. Steering Committee past

- Proposes that the Senate meet twice a month until work on the ad hoc RTP report is completed. The extra meetings would be held on the dates posted for Steering Committee meetings.
- If a Senator cannot be present, our policies allow for a substitute individual, who can vote.
- The Motion passed 32-18.

V. For the Good of the Order

a. At the next Senate meeting, President Lugo will present a draft of a list of qualities sought in the new Chancellor

b. Regarding Faculty Governance, there have been important recent problems, particularly in selection of a new CIO with no input from the Senate. Vice Chancellor Whitfield has agreed to conversation on this issue. In looking forward, we need to take steps to ensure that similar actions do not happen again. Considerable applause from the floor ensued.

c. President Lugo recommends improved landscaping at CREST, if it is to attract appropriate occupants.

d. A search is in progress for position to support IDEA.

VI. A Motion to adjourn passed at 3:55 pm.
Announcements:

1. The Chancellor Search Committee has been formed. President Ross will come to charge the committee in early Oct. The first item on the agenda at that initial meeting will be to discuss which search firm will be appointed. The BOT approved the request to increase the number of faculty representatives on the Search Committee from 4 to 5. However, the number of representatives from the community was also increased, such that relative faculty representation is not increased. There are 21 individuals on the Search Committee, with more members from outside the University than faculty. President Lugo has been informed that there are politics at work here, and that the committee composition cannot be changed. The faculty representatives from the Search Committee will be invited to the next regular Senate meeting, to hear faculty thoughts on the search, for the good of the order.

2. President Lugo demonstrated the Senate Sharepoint site, and emphasized its archival importance. Senate members should remember to fill in their complete extension (log-in name plus uncw.edu) when logging into the site. Included on the site are all documents relevant to Chancellor searches from our sister universities.

Special order of the day: to review AA revisions to the Policies of Academic Freedom and Tenure.

I. Discussion began with President Lugo providing a brief background on the basis for the day’s special order. The Policies of Academic Freedom and Tenure (hereafter, the Policies) were exhaustively reviewed and revised by the Faculty Senate (first by committee, and then by the Senate as a whole) over the last two-three years, with a final Policies document approved by the Senate in the spring (2014). The Policies were then submitted to AA, reviewed in turn, and returned by AA to the Senate this summer with requests for revisions. Special Senate meetings have thus been arranged, solely to provide for consideration of the revisions.

II. Rules of Order: We will be considering and voting on individual motions regarding each substantive revision in these special meetings. We will vote on the entire Policies document at a regular Senate meeting, and changes to the Policies document will require approval by 2/3 of the Senate membership (not just of those in attendance at the meeting). Without a 2/3 vote, the originally submitted document will stand as the Senate statement. A 2/3 vote is required by the Senate by-laws for any governance document. Minor revisions involving wordsmithing will be handled separately, so that Senate discussion can focus on the main issues. A version of the Policies document reflecting the revisions from AA was circulated to all Senators prior to the meeting, and served as the focus for the meeting deliberations.

III. (From page 4, Article IV, b, i, 1) MO1 – Change required years of probationary service from 2 to 5 years.

A. Summary of discussion:

1. Main points made by AA representatives:

   a. Original language seemed to encourage faculty to go up for T&P in 2 years, and set up an expectation that was inconsistent with practice, thus the language was confusing. The language should reflect our practice.
b. Recommendation is based on personal experience (rather than review of practices by other universities)
c. Original language may set up basis for appeal. The revision could streamline review process and prevent the system from being bogged down by people going up early. Faculty aren’t generally aware of the basis for special exceptions.d. As an institution that emphasizes teaching, two years is too little to judge sustained quality in teaching.

2. Main points made by Senators:
   a. If exceptions are permissible, the last revision sentence confuses things further.
   b. The historical context is that the “2 years” language was part of a bigger packaged that included a required departmental mentor for each faculty member, and a requirement that the dept. chair keep senior members informed of an individual’s progress toward satisfying RPT criteria. The emphasis was not on time in rank, but rather on meeting all dept guidelines. The mentor, together with the chair’s recommendations on progress, should ensure an individual’s understanding that most faculty would not be ready for RPT after 2 years.
   c. Do we have any evidence or data that the system is being clogged by individuals going up who are not ready? What percentage of candidates are really not qualified when they go up early? How many people actually apply at 2 years, and how many are awarded tenure or promotion? It’s not clear that we have a problem here, especially at the Provost level (which comes after many other levels of review). We need the data to back up stated assumptions.
   d. The revisions seem to add more confusions by adding an “exceptionally outstanding” category with no definition.
   e. An important rationale for having the option of review at 2 years has been to help us keep outstanding faculty around. This is an important retention tool, to help us keep exceptional faculty. There are numerous examples of this provision being successful.
   f. Is time of service relevant to T&P, or is the standard based on your work? We’ve hired people who give up tenure to move into our dept, and who want to go up early. Why should they be held back? Shouldn’t the judgement be based on their work? We need to reward excellent performance.
   g. In addition to retention tool, 2 years can also be an important recruitment tool, especially in these times of scare resources. This helps encourage faculty to come. Retention is also a problem, as the data show. As NC becomes a less attractive place for faculty, recruitment and retention aids are increasingly important.
   h. Two years has traditionally enabled the department to assess a record of teaching, and learn about an individual’s stability.
   i. The critical role of the department in making RPT decisions should be emphasized here.
   j. These faculty policies should allow maximum flexibility for faculty to take action.

B. The vote is called. A “No” vote will reject the revisions shown in red on the document. The vote is 26 in favor, 28 against, so the motion to revise the first paragraph of Article IV, b, i, 1 fails and the original language remains. It is further clarified that there are no objections to the revisions proposed in the second paragraph of this section, so those changes will remain.

IV. (From page 4, Article IV, b, i, 2) MO 2 - Consideration of the language regarding a maximum 9 years of probationary service. There was no motion to change this language, but a concern was expressed, so a short discussion is in order.
   A. Summary of discussion:
      1. Main points made by AA representatives: No comments
      2. Main points made by Senators:
         a. The 9 years is intended to accommodate FMLA.
         b. This provision was carefully considered in conjunction with HR, University Counsel, and AA at the time,
to arrange for postponement of RPT in keeping with the possibility that FMLA could potentially happen twice within a faculty member’s period of evaluation.

c. While FMLA leave periods are 12 weeks each, and the RPT provision allows for a year of postponement for each 12-week FMLA leave; thus, the language on “leave” time alone does not cover the entire postponement period.

B. This provides context for the issue. MO 2 is really a legal matter, and Counsel will need to weigh in, so no vote will be taken.

V. (From page 5, Article IV, b, ii, 6, footnote 3 and comment) MO3 – The composition of senior members can be determined by each academic dept, only if the CRPT is limited to full professors only. Question - do we wish to leave the decision about senior membership to each department?

A. Summary of discussion:

1. Main points made by AA representatives:
   a. To clarify questions from the floor, the issue of defining senior members of a department is intended to hold for all candidates’ RPT consideration (not just for Chairs).
   b. Also by way of clarification, the intention is that departments can continue to define senior membership as usual as long as the CRPT includes only full professors.

2. Main points made by Senators:
   a. Decisions about the composition of departmental senior faculty should be made by the department, regardless of decisions about CRPT.
   b. Discussion of this motion is tied to the next one regarding composition of the CRPT. Should we take that motion first?
   c. Clarifications are made about portions of the footnote that were part of the original document and so should be shown in black rather than in red.
   d. Questions were raised about whether the composition issue pertained to RPT decisions about Chairs only, or to all candidates.
   e. In the case of considering a Chair for RPT according to these revisions, we would need to provide a timeline to allow for the Dean to inform the senior faculty, so that they might in turn prepare a letter of dissent (if applicable).

B. A motion to change the order of motions (to allow consideration of the motion on CRPT membership) was made, seconded, and approved by a voice vote.

VI. (From page 7, Article IV, C, ii) MO 5 - The University-wide RPT should be composed of full professors only.

A. Summary of discussion:

1. Main points made by AA representatives:
   a. Currently there are inconsistencies in our practices. Some depts. include only full professors as senior members, but candidates would be considered by associates and fulls at the next level. We felt there should be consistency in review.
   b. The issue here is not about what departments choose in defining their own senior members. But why should associates decide at the next level if they are not included at the departmental level?
   c. There was no intention to imply that associates are not as qualified as fulls. Rather, full professors have earned their way through all ranks and can share the perspective of their years of service.

2. Main points made by Senators:
   a. There has never been a problem stemming from inclusion of associate profs on the CRPT.
   b. The implication of the revision seems to be that our associates would make poorer decisions than full profs, which is insulting to our faculty.
   c. The standards for promotion are recognizable by people who have not yet met that level. Our associate profs have an stake in the decision-making and should be allowed to participate.
d. Including associate profs helps to mitigate against “old boy” networks.

e. Departments with few full professors may be underrepresented if associates cannot serve.

f. Members of the CRPT are elected by the full faculty, which is important. If the faculty deem an individual eligible, s/he should be able to serve. The election process works here, and we get excellent people to serve on this committee.

g. The inconsistencies would be present either way. With the revision, a department that did allow associates to participate would not have consistent representation at the next level.

h. The argument that full profs should be able to share their perspective is not based on what our full profs actually want. A number have spoken here, and want the CRPT Committee to remain as it is.

B. The vote is called. A vote YES means that the composition of the CRPT Committee stays as it is, while a vote NO means that the AA revisions are accepted. The vote is 47 yes and 6 no, so the AA changes are rejected.

VII. Returing to MO3 – these issues were conditional on MO5, which was rejected, so no action is needed regarding statements on committee composition.

A. Summary of discussion:
   1. Main points by AA representatives: No comments.
   2. Main points by Senators:
      a. The main issue is moot, given the previous vote.
      b. The last sentence allows a dissenting letter from senior faculty for consideration of chairs/directors. This should remain.
      c. In Footnote 3, the phrase “subject to the dean’s approval,” indicates that the decision is not really “local.”

B. MO 3.1 – to accept the final sentence in #6 (page 5). A vote of YES indicates that the revision is accepted, while a vote of NO would indicate that the revision be rejected. The vote is 43 yes, 4 no, so the revision is accepted.

C. MO 3.2 – to accept the revision to Footnote 3, which specifies “subject to dean’s approval.” A vote YES indicates that the revision would be accepted, while a vote NO indicates that the revision would be rejected. The vote is 15 yes, 34 no, so the revision is rejected.

VIII. (From page 5, Article IV, B, ii, 7) MO 4 – to remove, “A faculty member may be promoted at any time.”

A. Summary of discussion:
   1. Main points by AA representatives: No comments
   2. Main points by Senators:
      a. Removing this statement would make us consistent with our previous vote on 2 years.
      b. Considered in the context of the rest of the document, this provides flexibility and doesn’t cause a problem.

B. The vote is called. A vote YES indicates that the sentence in #7 will be deleted, while a vote NO indicates that it will remain. The vote is 44 yes, 3 no, so the sentence will be deleted.

IX. (From page 7, Article IV, C, ii) MO 6 – to accept the revisions to the conflict of interest clause. A vote YES would indicate that the change be accepted, while a vote NO would indicate that the clarification be rejected. The vote was 47 yes, 0 no, so the revision to the clause is accepted.

X. (From page 7, Article IV, C, iv) MO 7 – to accept the text inserted in section iv, involving responsibilities of the CRPT Committee to include review of “the integrity of the RPT process.”

A. Summary of discussion:
   1. Main points by AA representatives:
      a. The intention was to help ensure due process. It would be useful if the committee reported anything observed that was not consistent with due
process – to identify any violations of process.

2. Main points by Senators:
   a. What does it mean to review the integrity of the RPT process? Don’t we have a
      Hearings Committee to handle this? If RPT finds a problem, to whom do they
      address the problem? It’s not clear with this means.
   b. The wording implies a different expectation – to review the process in every
      committee decision, which would be a mistake.
   c. This responsibility seems to be part of the dean’s job, and shouldn’t be an
      additional burden for the committee.
   d. The addition sounds more like a committee charge, and would belong more
      appropriately in the Faculty Handbook.

B. The vote was called. A vote YES would indicate that the revision be accepted, while a
   vote NO would indicate that the revision be rejected. The vote was 3 yes, and 45 no, so
   the revised language was rejected.

XI. (From page 7, Article IV, C, iv) MO 7.1 – to accept “seek additional information” as a CRPT option.
A. Summary of discussion:
   1. Main points by AA representatives: No comments
   2. Main points by Senators:
      a. When any group along the review chain is privy to information that previous
         groups didn’t have, it changes the process. If there is additional information, the
         process should start over because the document has changed. Clarification refers
         to information already in the document, not to new information.
      b. Clarification necessarily involves new information. Refusing to allow new
         information seems contrary to academic decision-making. It seems wrong to say
         to committee members who want to know more, “Sorry – information exists, but
         you can’t have it.”
      c. Are there data on instances in which RPT requests additional information? It has
         happened, but is rare.

B. The vote was called. A vote YES would indicate that the revision to allow requests for
   additional information be allowed, while a vote NO would indicate a rejection of the
   revision. The vote was 24 yes, 20 no, so the revision is accepted.

A motion to adjourn passed at 4:00.
Faculty Senate Minutes  
Oct. 7, 2014  
EB 162  
President Lugo presiding  

Call to Order:  2:05  
Quorum confirmed  
Minutes from previous two meetings approved with no changes  

I. Individual Reports  
   a. Chancellor Sederburg provided his report in writing, as he was unable to be present.  
   b. President Lugo provided updates on several issues:  
      • The Chancellor Search Committee held a six-hour meeting on Oct. 2, and received their charge from President Ross. The main item on the agenda was selection of a hiring firm. Baker was selected; the group has been involved in several other searches within the UNC system, and seems a good choice. President Lugo continues to promote the request for the final three candidates to hold open fora for the campus community, but there are pressures to have a closed search. The compromise may be a hybrid. Past-president of the Senate, Bruce McKinney, noted that candidate materials were not made available ahead of time to those faculty who were allowed to meet with candidates, and he encouraged action ahead of time to prevent this from happening again.  
      • President Lugo asked the Senate to consider allowing a change in the order of the agenda for today’s meeting, to allow the “Good of the Order” discussion and listening session for members of the Chancellor Search Committee to be held as the final agenda item. This opportunity for discussion is of importance because it seems there will be few opportunities for faculty input in the search process. No objections were heard to changing the agenda order.  
      • President Lugo made a call for candidates for the next Senate President. Lugo has served for four years, the maximum allowed. By his view, faculty who love teaching should consider this role, as it provides the opportunity to have many others listen to you. The next president will likely overlap with the next SACS 5-year review, which is a strong route to learning how our university and our systems work.  
      • President Lugo and the Steering Committee have met with all of the Senate committees and communicated charges for the upcoming year. Many thanks to CTE and Chancellor Sederburg for the lunch meeting, which was a positive experience that allowed for significant connections.  
      • As update on RPT and PTR, special Senate sessions are being held to consider AA requested revisions to the RPT document recently approved by the Senate. Great care is needed. Once the Senate completes deliberations on the revisions, the document will go back to AA. The Committee on PTR is working hard right now too. We have to meet compliance, and the committee is currently determining where we are and aren’t out of compliance. The committee work is in response to mandates from the BOG. The latest report of the PTR committee and other relevant documents are posted at the senate SharePoint site.  

II. Committee Reports  
   a. The Faculty Welfare Committee offers MO1, regarding policies for promotion to Senior Lecturer. The motion was reviewed by the committee chair, and the question was called. There were 49 votes in favor, and 6 votes against. MO1 passed.  
   b. The USAC offered MO2, approving new additions to University Studies. Thanks to Cara Cilano and Martin Posey, who continue to work hard behind the scenes with University Studies. All documents will be posted on the SharePoint site. The question was called. There were 57 votes in favor, and 0 votes against. MO2 passed.  
   c. The Steering Committee offers MO3 and MO4.
• **MO3** presents a draft list of characteristics the faculty wish to have highlighted in selection of the new Chancellor. If approved, President Lugo will send the list to either the Co-Chairs of the Search Committee or to Mark Lanier for distribution. The Staff Senate will probably be crafting their own set of sought-after characteristics, as will other groups. It is the hope that the faculty voice will be heard, and that these characteristics will be included as part of the Leadership Statement that serves as part of the position description. The question was called. There were 59 votes in favor, 0 votes against. **MO3 passed.**

• **MO4** (Passed by steering by a vote of 6-1) presents a call for reaffirmation by the Provost on the critical importance of shared governance to successful university functioning. The floor was opened for discussion.

  1. Summary of main discussion points by Senators, or as noted:
     - UNCW has become great only through shared governance. The motion really says just that and reiterates the characteristics we just approved for inclusion in the Chancellor statement. We want to go back to the formula that has been so successful for us. That’s the purpose of the motion.
     - Shared governance can mean different things to different people, which we may want to consider as well. Faculty Assembly is also discussing this issue.
     - The meaning of shared governance for UNCW has been defined in our shared governance documents.
     - The motion is a positive step forward for us. It asks us to reaffirm our commitment, and that’s across the table.
     - What will this motion change?
     - It’s like a married couple reaffirming their vows. There is a sense that we’ve moved away from shared governance, and this reaffirms that we will return.
     - As a point of information, Faculty Assembly has asked President Ross to reaffirm shared governance, and he gave a special response.
     - Faculty have some legitimate concerns about problems that have occurred, but it’s not clear that these all fall under the umbrella of shared governance. It’s not clear that we know what we mean by shared governance.
     - Shared governance is a way of doing things; it’s a process, a commitment, an attitude. It can’t be defined a priori for every circumstance. Faculty documents, the Code, UNCW governance documents, Faculty Assembly statements, SACS – there are lots of guidelines. What we’re really asking for is that the Provost, representing Academic Affairs, will work with the faculty as the best way to move forward.
     - How can the Provost ensure that someone makes this all happen? It’s not just one person.
     - We could ask the Provost to make sure that faculty, staff, and students have the opportunity to participate.
     - Why does this all fall on the Provost? The implications of the previous bullets are not good.
     - We don’t have a permanent Chancellor, and it’s at that level where the things we want to happen need to happen. The Provost may not be uniquely responsible, but she is a representative. It would be good to hear from all senior administrators that we all hold to shared governance. There is the sense that there are forces abroad that would really like to undo this, so it’s useful to reaffirm.
     - Why not include the Board of Trustees?
     - The large decisions that affect faculty and the university come out of AA, not the BOT, and the Provost is the Chief Academic Officer, so it’s appropriate for her to make a statement about faculty participating substantively, which hasn’t happened in the past three years. We were not included, but were ready to be. It’s not like the faculty said we wouldn’t participate in shared governance.
     - Perhaps we should ask for Academic Affairs in general rather than the Provost in particular.
We could replace Provost by Administrators. This proposed change was seconded.

- In discussion of the amendment, it was pointed out that accepting the change would mean that no one was being asked to take action. With the original wording, the request goes directly to the desk of the Provost – it has a destination. The question on the amendment was called. There were 13 votes in favor of the amendment, 44 votes against. The amendment fails and the original wording remains.

- The tone of the motion feels negative. Removing “Whereas” statements 4 and 5 would sound friendlier. The proposed amendment was seconded.

- In discussion of the amendment, it was noted that there has been extraordinary frustration over the past 2-3 years that faculty input has been disregarded. The motion just states the truth. If the tone is negative, it’s because that’s what we’ve been feeling. The motion states what we believe happened. In order to make a juxtaposition with what we want to see going forward, the whereas statements need to stay.

- The principles of shared governance have been disregarded in past years, and the academic core has been damaged.

- Is there anyone in the administration willing to stand up and say they are committed?

- From Provost Battles - I’ve had a hard time sitting here because through my career I’ve been committed to it. Do I embrace shared governance? I can answer directly yes. I can’t speak to everything that’s happened over the past 3 years, but I do embrace shared governance.

- Does someone in administration agree that shared governance did not happen in the past years?

- From Provost Battles - We’ve tried our best.

- A suggestion was made to vote separately on removing Whereas statements #4 and #5, as there might be differing levels of approval. There were no objections to separating the vote.

- The question was called on the amendment to remove Whereas statement #4 from the motion. There were 28 votes in favor, and 27 votes against. Statement #4 is stricken from the motion.

- The question was called on the amendment to remove Whereas statement #5 from the motion. There were 17 votes in favor, and 39 votes against. Whereas statement #5 remains as part of the motion.

2. The question was called on MO4 (with amendments as noted). There were 49 votes in favor, and 9 votes against. Amended MO4 passes.

   - The Academic Standards Committee offers MO5 and MO6.

     - MO5 presents a revision to the Student Honor Code that originated from the Dean of Students Office. The changes are intended to clear up wording, based on issues in cases from last year. The changes focus on the statute of limitations for charges of academic dishonesty and the need to include all procedures relevant to academic dishonesty in one document. The question was called following some clarifications. There were 51 votes in favor, and 5 votes against. MO5 passes.

     - MO6 involves some needed clarification following from the restructuring of University College. UC provides an important voice and insights relevant to the issues that come before the Academic Standards, and so should be represented on the Committee. Clarification was added that the Director of UC would be a non-voting ex-officio member of Academic Standards. The question was called. There were 54 votes in favor, and 1 vote against. MO6 passes.

III. Announcements – Dylan Shelton and Mary Carney, students working with Dr. Brubaker, invited Senators to encourage their students to participate in upcoming events promoting the 2014 Transportation Bond. The bond will support infrastructure, round-abouts, and beautification projects in Wilmington. Events to students from participating will include
civic engagement and fun(!). There will be a run and walk, games, prizes, and food.

IV. For the Good of the Order – Senators are invited to address the group on issues related to the upcoming Chancellor Search. The discussion is intended to help inform faculty members of the Search Committee about faculty concerns and wishes.

a. Summary of main discussion points by Senators:

- We should emphasize the importance of the Chancellor participating in public events held by departments. We need a frank assessment of the relation between athletics and the privileged position athletes seem to be given on an academic level.
- The Search Committee should attend to whether an applicant has been turned down multiple times by other schools. Not allowing faculty to have access to candidate materials was a problem the last time.
- We want a Chancellor who wants to be involved in the campus internally – not just someone focused on relating to the outside world. We don’t want a Chancellor whose resume and pitch relates only to external interests.
- We had a Chancellor intent on creating a legacy, but it was his legacy, rather than ours. We need to move forward along the paths that we have created, and it should be our legacy that gets communicated (in keeping with the resolutions that we passed today).
- We need at least part of the process to be open. We should be very concerned about bringing in anyone who is unwilling to let their colleagues know that they are looking. Having an open process sets someone up for success.
- An open search would give faculty buy-in. Past searches here have been more open (e.g., forums, talks). This helps faculty buy in to the agenda for the Chancellor.
- Candidates should be able to tell us what is it about UNCW that attracted them to apply here. We need to know if the person wants to come to UNCW because of what UNCW does.
- We need to be as open as possible. We don’t get the best candidates with secret searches. We get people who operate secretly. We’re proud of what we do here and those things don’t always happen at other places. It’s due to the fact that we work across the table when needed. We need someone who realizes our values, because that’s what got us where we are today.
- Our next Chancellor should care about students.
- From President Lugo – There is strong pressure from BOG and GA that we conduct a closed search, or at best a hybrid search, where candidates are brought in at the very end to meet with select faculty. How many would like to have last 3 candidates/finalists visit with all on campus? Search firms agree that search should be private. The question was called. There were 50 votes in favor of finalists visiting with the campus community, and 0 votes against. President Lugo will make this point as strongly as possible, to present as the voice of the faculty. Success can’t be guaranteed, but he will make the argument.
- From Mark Lanier – There is a continuum of styles of searches, from completely open to completely closed, to various hybrids. Leutze’s search was closed until the end, with the finalists made public. Rosemary’s search was closed throughout, but at the end she was brought to campus as were other candidates to meet with specific faculty groups.
- There was faculty input. Faculty reps met with Chancellor DePaolo away from campus, and were asked for input and representation.
- From Mark Lanier – An open search means that the names are out there from the start – not just the final candidates. This causes candidates to lose confidence at their home institutions. We’re probably looking at some variant of a hybrid rather than totally open or totally closed.
- No confidentiality agreements were required in Chancellor DePaolo’s search.
- From Mark Lanier – The last search was also in the middle. Four candidates came to campus to meet with various groups. On a continuum, Leutze’s was most open.
In a lot of searches, contacts go to the home institutions of each finalist to get information “on the ground.” Has that ever been done here? It should be done here – to show due diligence, to see how individual is perceived on their home campus.

- From Mark Lanier - I’m not speaking on behalf of the search committee, and there was discussion among the Search Committee on a number of these issues, to be decided later. It will be the Search Committee who will have those conversations, and they will probably come down somewhere in the middle.
- We often hear that credibility will be destroyed. Are there data on this point? Do data support the conclusion?
- A good Chancellor should inspire us to do a better job, despite the fact that we already do a good job.
- Characteristics that make a good principle and are probably relevant here include: someone who is consistently visible, who seeks feedback from all stakeholders, repairs community between AA and faculty, cares about issues that families care about, cares about their students, and s/he must know the tenor of current faculty and students.
- For the first time since I’ve been here, I’m in the situation where I cannot call up the provost and chancellor and get a meeting. That’s always been the case here until now. Departments have sometimes avoided really bad hires only by making contacts beyond the list of references. That part of the search must be open or we could get someone who is inappropriate. As many chairs should be involved as possible, because they know what is going on. We need someone whose MO is talking to people.
- We want someone to join in our culture, inspire it and embrace it, to be present with us as we celebrate our gains, walk the walk with us, and understand the mission of this university. The Chancellor should be someone who espouses our best values rather than telling us what our values are, a team player.
- What has not been said is just as important as what has been said. No one has mentioned wanting someone focused on making money, generating finances, all about the business.
- An important quality in the Chancellor is intellectual alertness, aliveness. We want someone who misses their discipline; we want them to feel like their office is a cage.
- We shoulder all the risk if the search is closed. If a candidate wants the job, s/he should be willing to take on risk too.

Motion to adjourn – 3:52
Oct. 28, 2014
Special Meeting of the Faculty Senate
EB 162
Meeting called to order: 2:04
President Lugo presiding
Quorum confirmed

Special order of the day: to complete consideration of the revisions to the Policies of Academic Freedom and Tenure (hereafter, the Policies) suggested by AA

I. There is a good chance that our work can be completed today, after which there will be an opportunity to review motions from our last meeting on the Policies according to Robert’s Rules. A past decision can be reviewed only if a motion for reconsideration is made by someone who voted originally in the majority. The honor system is in place on this issue. The final package will be voted at the next regular meeting of the Faculty Senate in November.

II. Elections for Senate President will be held in December. Individuals interested and willing to be considered should contact President Lugo.

III. (From page 8, Article IV, C, iv, last paragraph) MO8: Accept change as edited. The vote will be with respect to the text shown in red, regarding consideration of unsolicited information about an applicant’s candidacy for RPT.

A. Summary of discussion:
   1. Move to accept the revisions, as per General Counsel
   2. Necessity of the final statement was questioned, given that the first sentence of the paragraph requires that unsolicited information be disregarded
   3. John Scherer explained that we have had problems with individuals receiving information outside of the dossier process, which has then been used to evaluate the candidate. The statement means that no one should gather or accept information outside of the process. However, if information is learned about violations of University policy (e.g., fabrication of dossier information, violation of research integrity issues), individuals still have an obligation to follow University policies regarding those violations. This is separate from evaluation of the dossier. There is language in the Faculty Handbook on such issues, but it never hurts to repeat it.
   4. Motion to accept the revisions was seconded.

B. The vote is called. A vote “Yes” would mean that we’re accepting the revised language from General Counsel. The vote is 47 in favor, 2 against. The revisions are accepted.

IV. (From page 8, Article IV, C, vi and vii) MO 9: Accept changes in wording from “recommends” to “decides” throughout this section.

A. Summary of discussion:
   1. Main points by AA:
      a. Provost Battles – We went through and analyzed the steps, changing the language to “decides” whenever the individual is the final authority. Whenever the individual would be passing things along, we specified “recommend.”
      b. Provost Battles – the current wording in the same section of the Faculty Handbook now says that if the Provost recommends reappointment, this is forwarded to the Chancellor, but if the Provost recommends nonreappointment, that is reported and is final. So it seems that “decide” is appropriate, reflecting the final word/final authority. I invite you all to look and check us on this, but that was the protocol in changing the phrasing from “recommend.”
      c. John Scherer – the appeal process is triggered by the final authority.
   2. Main points by Senators:
      a. The revision includes no caveats and so implies that the Provost can decide an outcome regardless of
previous votes of the department, Chair, and Dean. The BOT actually decides. Everything else is a recommendation.

b. When the RPT Committee drafted this document, it was based on advice from Counsel that these are always recommendations. Did we get this wrong?

c. Whatever is decided on this issue, we’ll need to consider Article VI as well, because of reference to decisions at various levels. This section will need to be consistent with the Hearings Procedures, as currently written.

d. If the Provost’s Office says “No” to a reappointment, is that a decision that materially changes the chances of success? Junior faculty need to understand what happens as their consideration advances.

e. Three different scenarios are described in this section. It feels unclear.

f. We do need an answer to this. The probationary period is prior to tenure. If the Provost says “No”, the individual needs to explore the appeal process as explained in the Code.

g. A nonreappointment decision can be appealed only under very specific conditions. It’s not the case that if the Provost says “No,” an appeal can necessarily go to Hearings. Very specific documentation would be required (e.g., showing irregularity in process). So this statement doesn’t handle everything. It’s not clear why the process should ever stop with the Provost. The language doesn’t specify that the process stops only after two strikes. It says the Provost decides.

h. We also have earlier language about the Dean deciding, referring to the Dean’s decision as final. This would trigger the ability of the individual to go to Hearings.

i. A series of questions followed regarding intent, whether the wording change represents a change in process, and whether the language applied to reappointment only, or also to tenure and promotion.

B. President Lugo suggested that a reconsideration would be necessary to straighten out these questions, and that a subcommittee be appointed to take a careful look at the language. There were no objections, and it was suggested that the subcommittee consider adding a flow chart (somewhere – e.g., Faculty Handbook or the web site), to help clarify the exact steps in the process.

V. (From page 11, Article VI) MO 10: Motion: Change reference to “Non-Reappointment” throughout Article VI to “Negative decisions regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion.” Note: Passing this motion would require changes to the charge of the Hearings Committee.

A. Summary of discussion:

1. Main points by AA:

   a. Provost Battles – The worry here is that faculty with negative outcomes in tenure or promotion can’t find language on how to appeal. We’d like the pathway to be clear. Right now the language specifies only nonreappointment.

   b. John Scherer – In a legal context, the bases for permissible grounds of appeal would be the same for reappointment (as for tenure and promotion; e.g., discrimination, personal malice, material procedural irregularities). If we expand the bases, we’d have to be sure to consistent with the UNC Code. At Charlotte, nonreappointment has been considered under the same umbrella as non-tenure.

   c. Provost Battles – It’s been suggested to me that folks could use the grievance process. We’d like to have a committee other than the grievance committee that could act on this, because grievance has a negative connotation, and our grievance policy doesn’t speak to nontenure or nonpromotion directly.

2. Main points by Senators:

   d. Denial of promotion may not be the same as denial of reappointment. Voting from this change might not cover all of our bases.

   e. Don’t we have a Section VII, a separate section for denials of promotion?

   f. Could it be a step forward to accept this because it provides a way for faculty to appeal? Decisions about bases for appeal could be decided later. Currently there is no visible recourse.

B. The vote is called, with the understanding that additional refinements will be needed. The vote is 43 in favor, 5
against, so the motion to amend passes.

VI. (From page 15, Article VII, c) MO 11: To include post-tenure review decisions in the RPT Committee.
A. Summary of discussion:
   1. Main points by AA:
      a. Provost Battles – The language here is what’s currently written. We were posing the question about which committee should consider appeals.
   2. Main points by Senators:
      a. The current procedure is to work through the Professional Relations Committee if the faculty member and the Chair/Dean can’t reach a resolution in steps to remediating deficiencies. If the deficiencies are corrected, then the appeal of dismissal goes to the Hearings Committee. I think the current system is wise, and appropriately handles issues at two different levels.
      b. A vote will answer the question. Yes – we should; no- we shouldn’t.
      c. If there is a lack of process, we do need to reconsider. But there isn’t – if dismissed, it’s the Hearings Committee. A vote “No” means that we’re happy with the current process in place.
B. The vote is called. There were 13 votes in favor, 33 against. The current language remains.

VII. (From page 21, Article XII, iv) MO 12: Remove reference to “normal retirement age” and refer instead to Policy 300.7 of the UNC Policy Manual.
A. Summary of discussion - There is no such thing as “normal retirement age.”
B. The vote is called. There were 45 votes in favor of the motion, and 0 votes against. The motion to amend passes.

Final announcements:
1. From President Lugo: There will be an appeal to the Search Committee to listen to the voice of the faculty, and have a hybrid search for the final three candidates for Chancellor. President Lugo requests that at least 50 faculty members attend the BOT meeting to show our presence and indicate that this is what we want. There will be repercussions from events in Chapel Hill, and the BOG is beginning to question why they don’t have a larger say in the selection of Chancellors. They want further influence. We need to try to pull in the other direction, and can have authority by our presence. The appeal is for men to wear a tie, to show respect. The BOT doesn’t make the decision about the search process, but they are influential.
2. From Diana Ashe – Our Faculty Assembly Representatives will be sharing updates on what is happening with the faculty at the UNC system level in this room, tomorrow (10/29) from 1-2 p.m. It’s important to know what’s going on more broadly.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:17.
I. Individual Reports
   A. Chancellor Sederburg –
      a. The Chancellor search is proceeding nicely. Chancellor Sederburg has been contacted directly by three or four very good candidates.
      b. Decisions are being considered now regarding tuition and fees. We should expect UNCW to forward a request for about a 4% increase in tuition and a 4.5% increase in fees. This is a conservative amount with respect to our needs, but we don’t want to price ourselves out of the market.
      c. Chancellor Sederburg is focused on maintaining momentum at UNCW, and will emphasize human capital in terms of excellence and equity. He would like to bring SPA employees up to 85%, and to recognize excellent faculty.
      d. There is also a priority to strengthen the academic core. There will probably be 10 positions added to certain departments. We also need to build up and provide for maintenance of our wifi systems.
      e. Regarding athletics, we don’t want to go backwards. There will likely be a combination of some cuts as well as focus on new revenue and fund raising.
      f. Our budget processes on campus are fragmented, so a new task force has been formed to look at integration of planning and budget.
      g. Another new task force will focus on regional engagement, to find a way to help the next Chancellor understand how we do applied learning and regional engagement in the context of our selectivity.
      h. We have a new Trustee – Ken Cameron, from Charlotte. He is interested in learning more about our campus.
      i. Issues of current interest for the BOG include focus on centers and institutes, and state appropriations to these units. Our three centers are all on very solid ground. There will be interesting political issues if funding for these institutes is opposed.
      j. GA emails daily with requests for information of various sorts. Most recently we’ve had to provide information on money spent at Trask for basketball.
      k. Chancellor Sederburg acknowledged faculty interest in shared governance on campus. He will be happy to meet with faculty or Senate Steering on this matter.
   B. President Lugo –
      a. President Lugo continues to voice the views of the Senate with respect to organization of the search process. Compromises will be necessary but he is pushing especially for review of the three finalists to be open. Other UNC campuses are making the same arguments, so this fight will continue at a higher level, and must involve President Ross. One argument that’s been made against involving more people in the search is that information is more likely to be leaked. This reportedly happened in a search at Winston-Salem, with a candidate withdrawing as a result. In President Lugo’s opinion, if the candidate had been interested in the position, s/he would likely have remained in the pool.
      b. Elections for a new Senate President will be held at our December meeting. President Lugo would like this to be an election with a choice.
      c. Provost Battles provided a written response (circulated with the meeting agenda) to the Senate Resolution of Oct. 7 (Motion MO 4) on the critical importance of shared governance, as requested in
the resolution. The written response basically says that she already responded verbally (see Senate minutes from 10/7).

d. The PTR Committee report is in, and has been posted. There will be no action on that report today. Senators should read the report carefully. There is an aggressive timeline for moving forward, with responses needed by Dec. 1. The Senate will consider the report at our next meeting. Compliance is needed with BOG policy 400.3.3.1.

e. There is a new NC Senate policy on prior learning assessment for military. This is a done deal, so we must respond. The Faculty Assembly is working on the issue. There are possible threats to our University Studies requirements.

f. There is also a GA committee focused on competencies assessment, probably in the form of a common test/assessment to be completed by all students. There is no evidence that such an assessment is workable, and we will have to continue to emphasize that our continuous assessments in the classroom are the ones that matter. Jennifer Horan is representing UNCW on this committee.

g. GA is also focusing on minimum admissions requirements. There is pilot program on HMI campuses with a sliding scale on admission with lower SAT offset by higher GPA’s scores. This will not be much of an issue for UNCW. We continue to attract the students we need to attract.

h. An important BOT meeting will take place on Nov. 20-21. President Lugo would like to have at least 30 faculty there. He will address the value of UNCW, why it is important to us to have a good chancellor, and what it takes for a faculty member to be tenured. He would like to be able to point to wonderful faculty in the room.

i. Regarding athletics, things will probably become more restrictive in terms of what we can do.

j. Prior to our discussion of the Academic Freedom document, President Lugo will explain some changes.

II. Committee Reports

A. The USAC offers Motion MO 1.

a. President Lugo offered his concern about the rapid growth of courses that are now being included in University Studies. The Committee currently has about 200 additional course proposals. We risk seeming to have insufficient focus in our curriculum. The proposal is on the floor.

b. Senator McCaffrey brought a motion (forwarded ahead of time, as required), as follows:

   • that the Senate postpone action on CLA 211 and ask the USAC to clarify and communicate to the Senate its understanding of how one university studies course can satisfy all the student learning outcomes for two different methodology-based perspectives or approaches simultaneously. (The two diversity categories of Approaches & Perspectives are excluded from this question.) An additional statement was read in support of the motion.

c. The motion to postpone, etc. was seconded.

d. Dr. McCaffrey read a statement in support of the motion.

e. It was clarified that the intent was to consider the original motion as soon as possible, hopefully at our next meeting, but that the USAC should communicate to the Senate about the logic of the motion.

f. It was further clarified that the motion is not just about a particular course (CLA 211), but rather about the broader issue of whether a single course can address multiple SLOs sufficiently.

g. The question was called. A vote “Yes” would mean that the original motion is postponed. The vote was 48 in favor, 4 against.

h. The question on the remainder of MO 1 was then called. A vote “Yes” would indicate that all courses other than CLA 211 would be added to the catalogue for University Studies. The vote was 48 in favor, and 2 against.

B. The USAC also offers MO 2 calling for a review of University Studies courses in 2015/16.

a. Dean Posey explained that this motion is in response to a GA requirement that institutions show that they
review general education courses regularly, to ensure that they continue to address the intent. We need to have a policy in place by Jan.

b. President Lugo expressed a general objection, because we do a careful job with our US review, and SACS has confirmed this.
c. In response to a question about the need for this step in addition to regular SACS review, Dean Posey commented that SACS doesn’t require a review of individual courses, but rather an overall assessment of the general education program, in terms of our seven learning objectives (and not in terms of our specific categories of US).
d. President Lugo clarified that this review is separate from the issue of state-level competencies, which will involve an instrument used for assessment purposes.
e. Concern was expressed about a possible cynical approach to the task of providing a syllabus that includes “what’s needed.” There was also a question of whether this collection of syllabi isn’t already being done. Posey clarified that the rationale for requesting a syllabus was to make the re-review process as similar as possible to the original consideration of materials (where a syllabus is required), and that we do not currently have a policy specifying that this regular review takes place.
f. Further clarifications from Senators included the points that the original University Studies proposal specified the need for periodic review, that having a policy is a GA mandate, and that the review will be done by us (rather than by GA). A vote “No” on the motion would mean we would need to craft a different mechanism for compliance with the mandate. The USAC has put a lot of time into considering this motion already.
g. The question was called. A vote “Yes” would indicate support for the proposed review process. The vote was 48 in favor, 5 against. Lugo described the vote as an expression of thanks to the USAC.

C. The Steering Committee offers **MO 3, to approve the revised policies on Academic Freedom**.
   a. President Lugo reviewed revisions, including the addition of a flow chart to indicate the “decider” at each step of consideration in the RPT process, and associated text. The intent was to clarify a “two strikes” policy for reappointment, tenure, and promotion.
   b. Discussion of the flow chart included the following questions and clarifications:
      1. Regarding whether the faculty/department have a vote, currently, the senior department members are advisory to the Chair and have no separate authority on their own. The Chair is the responsible administrator in passing on the decision.
      2. Regarding whether the faculty vote can serve as “one strike,” a change to the policies would be required.
      3. Dean Berkeley clarified that in current practice, a “split decision” (i.e., a difference between the majority vote of the senior members and the Chair) goes forward to the Dean. The senior members have the option of adding a letter to the dossier.
      4. President Lugo pointed out that our current language does not include a description of this, and that a clear resolution from the Senate would be needed.
      5. Provost Battles commented that final steps in the RPT process are not included in the flow chart. The Chancellor has the option to say yes or no; if no, the BOT can say no as well. Those options are not included.
      6. Vice President Reeves indicated that the flow chart could be amended to reflect those steps. A motion to that end was seconded.
      7. Regarding whether a degree of freedom was lost (in relation to a no vote by the BOT), Lugo clarified that the BOT can always say no. Chancellor Sederburg added that the BOT is the final conferring body, but not typically the “decider.”
      8. One option for the flow chart would take it only as far as the Chancellor, going forward or not after the Chancellor’s determination, with the understanding that the BOT is the final
confirmation in RPT. In counterpoint, it was argued that a junior faculty member should understand that the BOT has the final authority.

9. Regarding whether the flow chart confirms the language from AA about the “decider/recommender” distinction, the intent of the chart (i.e., to reflect a parallel “two strikes” process for reappointment, tenure, and promotion) was emphasized.

10. In response to Provost Battle’s mention that the original language makes the Provost’s recommendation of nonreappointment final (i.e., one strike), Lugo clarified that the change in the flow chart and in the wording of section vii was intentional. The intent is that there be “two strikes” for everyone.

11. The question was called to amend the flow chart to reflect the final steps (i.e., involving the Chancellor and BOT) in the process for all RPT considerations. The vote was 51 in favor, 0 against.

C. Returning to the entire Academic Freedom and Tenure document, a question was raised about Section D on Continuing Evaluation of Faculty. Section D specifies that a full evaluation for RPT will be completed every four years, which is not current practice.

D. Discussion of Section D included the following points:
   1. Section D is not in reference to post-tenure review.
   2. Section D was not changed during the review of the RPT document.
   3. Section D may have been a hold-over policy from prior to PTR. At that time, everyone had to be considered for promotion at least every four years, so that possible advancement would not be ignored. Our current PTR does not require a review for promotion.
   4. Section D may also be a hold-over from when tenure for assistant professors was an option. This was a safety valve for tenured assistants, as well as tenured associates. It served a different function from PTR, but may be unnecessary now.
   5. A motion to strike Section D was seconded.
   6. In support, it was argued that annual evaluations, with comments on progress toward promotion, make Section D superfluous. We might consider adding a statement that continuing evaluations are done via annual evaluations and PTR.
   7. As a friendly amendment to the motion, a recommendation to have Steering review Section D more carefully, with an eye toward reflecting the language discussed, was accepted and seconded.
   8. The question was called on the amended motion – to trust Steering to revise the Section in keeping with the spirit of the discussion. The vote was 48 in favor, 1 against.
   9. Senator Kaminish was commended for finding the issue. Here, here.

E. The entire Academic Freedom and Tenure document is again on the floor. When the document goes before the BOT, President Lugo will be present as a faculty advocate.

F. Senator Meinhold offered a motion for an additional revision – that a split decision between the majority of senior faculty members and the department chair go forward for further consideration, as with a “Yes.” The motion was seconded.

G. Discussion of the motion included the following points:
   1. This motion would change the Chair’s authority, and the Faculty Senate does have the authority to make this change in RPT.
   2. The intent is that the Chair, alone, cannot give a “strike.”
   3. The Chair already has to record the vote of the senior members in her/his recommendation, and the senior members have the opportunity to add a letter for consideration as the dossier goes forward. If there is a split decision, it’s not a “No” and not a “Yes.” Two additional
“No’s” would be required.
4. We should check for discrepancies between the language of this document and the Faculty Handbook, but this document has authority.
5. Concerns were expressed by one or two Chairs.
6. It was emphasized that if the majority of senior members say “Yes,” the dossier at least gets to RPT, where faculty review the decision. Currently, if the Chair and Dean say “No,” the RPT Committee never sees the dossier. We want the faculty to review it one more time.
7. In regard to whether this change would impact the Chair’s responsibility in writing her/his own recommendation, it was emphasized that the Chair’s opinion is still needed. The senior members can then write a letter too, and both letters go forward with the dossier. Both sides should make their case. In a decision that is contentious, this helps to balance the Chair’s power with the faculty’s, and the faculty can review again.
8. It was noted that such cases often involve a split among senior members too, despite a majority vote, and that there is a distinction between moving forward “as if it were a yes” and an actual “yes” decision. A split decision can still move forward, but it’s not a “yes.” It was also clarified that the senior members are not required to include a letter.
9. The question was called on the motion to send forward a split decision “as if it were a yes.” The vote was 42 in favor, 6 against.

H. The entire Academic Freedom and Tenure document is again on the floor. The question is called with amendments as indicated. As a change to our governing document, passing the motion would require 44 votes (2/3’s of the Senate body). The vote was 48 in favor, 1 against.

Motion to adjourn: 3:54
Meeting called to order: 2:05
Quorum was confirmed shortly thereafter.

Special order of the day: To discuss and provide feedback to the PRT ad hoc committee on the draft revision of the PTR policies forwarded to the Senate.

I. President Lugo began the discussion with some background. The BOG decided that the system PTR policies need to be rewritten. They don’t think that we’re firing enough people post-tenure. The Faculty Assembly indicated previously that the new BOG policies were not supported, but to no avail. At this point, we don’t have a choice – we have to be in compliance. In response, we need to show that we have a rigorous process. Our PTR Committee has been working hard to polish up our policies, and to make sure that we comply where needed. President Lugo presented on screen the draft policy submitted by the Committee and the previous policy document for comparison. He asked that committee Chairs, Charlie Hardy (Dean, CHHS) and James Hunt (CSB), review the requirements from BOG and how they were addressed.

II. Hardy began by acknowledging the ad hoc committee - Hardy, Hunt, Aswani Voley (Dean, CAS), Paul Townend (Chair, CAS), Dave Glew (Chair, CSB), Danyell Roseboro (Chair, WCE), Patricia Kelly (CAS), Tracy Hargrove (WCE), and Reggie York (CHHS). The process started with a memo from GA dated July 7, outlining new policy requirements. Essentially this was a revision of Policy 400.3.3. Individual institutions have been requested to comply with the new requirements by May 29, 2015. The Committee had two basic tasks; first, to complete a compliance audit by Sept 30; second, to submit a revised policy for UNCW by Dec. 19. These tasks were accomplished. The audit of existing policies at UNCW found us to be in compliance with 20 of the 31 issues specified, and out of compliance with 11.

III. Hardy described guiding principles adopted by the committee as they set about revising the UNCW policies. We have a strong policy to begin with, so the committee used our existing policies and worked in the new criteria, with an eye to opportunities for improvements to the 20 issues on which we were already compliant. Policies from AACU and from other institutions were also reviewed for good ideas we might want to incorporate. Committee editing then ensued, with wisdom from folks who have been here for some time, as well as perspective from some new folks. At this point, the draft is ready for fresh eyes. The intent was to ensure that our already effective policy became compliant, to celebrate excellent faculty and not make this a punitive process, and to respect what has already been done. A process map was provided as a handout, along with several other handouts. Some of the changes needed include: evaluation nomenclature (to “meets, exceeds, and does not meet expectations” and involvement of the Dean in the review process. The issue that hung the committee up involved cases in which there might be a split decision between the Chair/department and the Dean, so three scenarios were developed in the process map. Scenarios 2 and 3 involve situations with one or two findings of “Does not meet expectations.”
IV. Summary of key discussion points and questions:

a. If the Dean must review every individual (vs a designee or committee), the load could be quite large for some units like CAS. This might be operationalized at the unit level, as a function of scope. It was noted that the BOG was not concerned with this issue when the Faculty Assembly expressed similar concerns.

b. Much of the Committee time was spend considering what to do if there was a disagreement between the Department and the Dean. They elected to have split decisions go to our current RPT Committee for resolution via peer review, and then on to the Provost. There was real struggle with this issue, and the decision may not be optimal, but it’s where the Committee ended up. There was no guidance on this issue in the BOG requirements. The PTR Committee feeling was that they didn’t want to create a new committee, and that the current RPT is already constituted to consider similar issues. There would probably be only a few cases a year, so not too much extra work. The attempt was to use the processes already in place for RPT.

c. GA requires a 10-year review of the PTR process. Only 217 or 2.8% of individuals considered for PTR were found deficient in the last 10 years for the system. UNCW has had only 2 faculty found deficient. The Committee thinking was that Scenario 3 (i.e., a split decision) would be rare for us.

d. There were questions about involving the Provost at two different points in the process – first as a decision on PRT, and then as a decision on an appeal. Is this double jeopardy? The Committee thinking was that appeals are not about the substantive content of the performance, but rather about the process for review. The Provost’s decision on the appeal is about problematic process, rather than about the performance. What if the improper process involved the Provost? Perhaps the Chancellor or someone else would be involved. There needs to be a mechanism in the appeal process to address this. Faculty could also go to the Faculty Professional Relations Committee, where the appeal could go to the Chancellor next.

e. What if the departmental peer-review committee and the Chair don’t agree? This was just changed for RPT. There is only one recommendation, which is informed by the Faculty.

f. Is it intended in the revision that the Dean makes an independent review, uninformed by department/chair evaluations? No. The evaluation is done by the chair, communicated to the faculty, and the entire package moves forward. The Dean’s recommendation should be informed by the previous evaluation.

g. In the situation where the Dean and senior faculty disagree, some emphasis on arbitration would be a good idea, especially if a faculty member is about to be fired. Response was that there is a developmental plan, with a timeline, and regular meetings at the unit level if an individual is found to not meet expectations. The Dean is copied in case there are resource issues, etc. Then the Chair and the Dean decide if the faculty member fails to meet the plan.

h. It was then suggested that CTE/CFL could be involved in arbitration. The response was that arbitration might not make sense because all decisions have been carefully made – not arbitrary or capricious. A reversal of decision due to arbitration is then unlikely. It was clarified that arbitration often happens at an earlier point, when the developmental plan is being determined. It was further argued that some intervention should take place after the plan is in place, but before an individual is dismissed. We want to make sure that all options have been explored before sanctions are imposed. It was noted...
that if progress isn’t being made, that would be pointed out along the way, so there should be no surprise at the end.

i. Regarding the role of the RPT Committee in the process, this would represent a 180 degree reversal from the thinking behind the original PTR design. It was meant to be a separate process, and standards for PTR are different from those for RPT. We should also consider when RPT members should recuse themselves. Perhaps RPT members should be out for the year in which they are being considered for PTR. This would be approximately 1/5 of the RPT members in any given year, which would be a large recusal rate, and may call into question whether a different committee should be involved.

j. A table showing the 11 items on which our policies are currently out of compliance was considered next. Hardy reviewed each of the 11 items. It was determined that our focus for today was just to review and discuss the revisions, rather than to vote on them, so that the Committee has Senate feedback to take into consideration for its final draft, which will come back to the Senate. Further discussion of the final draft in December, with a vote in January, should still allow us to meet our deadlines.

k. Do the mandates specify how each requirement must be met, or just that it must be met? It depends on the item.

l. For compliance issue #1, does the mandate say what the developmental plan needs to look like? Response – this should be consistent with the expectations of the department/college/school, and could be modified on an annual basis. Some of this will require that department “policy up,” to clarify what expectations really involve, so there should be a heads-up to department chairs. GA also says that they will be providing training modules. The CFL Chairs Policy Camp could also target this issue.

m. For compliance issue #9, what unit will provide the additional training? Response – the BOG document says that the provost will certify that we’ve done this. Provost Battles recommended a broad statement on this issue, so that any change would not require all levels of review. She commented further that the Provost in consultation with Human Resources would ensure that training is done.

n. What is the relation between this new policy and the 3R Committee recommendations? Response – faculty workload issues are critical here. Chairs of the 3R Committee were unable to attend today.

o. Item #7 is imprecise because some departments elect members of the peer-review committee for PTR. Response – elections should be OK. It’s just that the faculty member cannot select the 3 tenured colleagues to serve on their committee.

p. The revised PTR document has also gone to the Provost and the Deans to get input.

q. It was suggested that the division of the vote of the department committee become part of the package. Response – some departments give strengths/weaknesses of the faculty member, and the Committee did not wish to dictate what departments have to do.

r. There may be some inconsistencies in wording – one statement holds that a faculty member can’t be forced to be considered early, and another holds that a faculty member can be reviewed at any time.

V. President Lugo requested that all Senators now do their homework. We should inform our chairs and departments to review the revised document. The PTR Committee will consider modifications based on today’s discussion. Early in January, we should be prepared to go
through the proposal again. Lugo will annotate the document for the January meeting, as he did for the RPT document.

Meeting adjourned at 3:28
Senate Minutes  
Dec. 9, 2014  
EB 162  
President Lugo Presiding

Meeting called to order:  2:07  
Quorum confirmed.

Minutes of Nov 11 and Nov 25 approved.

I. Special order of the day – election of the 2015/16 Senate President.  Steve Meinhold and Russ Herman are nominated from the floor. Each is invited to come to the front and say a few words about his vision.

a. Summary of statements:
   
i. Meinhold – I love UNCW. I appreciate what Gabriel and all Senators do, and would do my best to involve all in support of our core values. I would be honored to serve.
   
ii. Herman - The President’s role is to listen to concerns of all faculty, act as an advocate for the faculty, and for shared governance. Gabriel has been a role model. Things are changing almost daily around here – if elected, I would seek to find out what faculty need and want.

b. Rules of order call for paper ballots for the election, and the candidates were asked to step out of the room. Steve Meinhold was elected as the new President for 2015/16.

II. Chancellor’s report

a. The Chancellor shared a [PowerPoint presentation](#) delivered previously to the BOT, on the rationale for recommendations regarding tuition and fees (and also related to the recent controversy over the track team). The UNC system has a difficult budget system, with eight different calls for budget components. November is about tuition and fees, and this is the first year of a 2-year recommendation. The BOG will not allow more than a 5% increase per year, and we are required to be in the lower quartile of peer institutions nationwide.

b. The Cabinet established four priorities as the basis for our tuition and fees recommendations. These were to: 1) maintain human capital, 2) strengthen the academic core, 3) respond to technology needs, and 4) build a solvent athletic program.

c. The recommendation was for a 4.02% increase in tuition for 2016, and a 4% increase for 2017, with a 4.9% increase in fees for 2016 and a 4.6% increase in 2017. As evidence of the conservative nature of this recommendation, tuition and fees for each of our peer institutions were presented, and UNCW is at the bottom, $1434 away from the institution that would put us in the lowest quartile.

d. Goals targeted by these recommendations will include bringing SPA employees to an 85% equity level. Tuition increases are insufficient to cover across-the-board pay increases for all faculty, so pots of money will be set aside for retention purposes. Ten new faculty positions have been identified in key departments, and there will be funding for applied learning and for research grant development ($150 thousand). Efforts will be undertaken to upgrade and maintain our campus wi-fi systems (the average student brings five wi-fi devices).

e. Regarding athletics (Strategic Priority #4), UNCW has not had sound athletic operations over the years. Chancellor Miller sought to get back on the right foot. Athletics requested another increase in fees for support but this could not be approved without “rightsizing”. We carry too many athletes for the amount of money we have. The rightsizing is what hit the papers just now. It is needed to get on the right footing. (The recommended increase in fees includes $28 and $42 per student for the next 2 years respectively). The announcement about team cuts had to happen now because students were finding out, so waiting until after finals, as we had wished, was not possible. The cuts are a response to my challenge to put athletics back on sound ground instead of continuing to ask our students to pay more.
f. We are trying to restore key areas, but our tasks are limited compared to total needs. Congratulations to Steve – political science rules!

g. Summary of questions/discussion:
   i. How many empty faculty lines are being cannibalized for other purposes? Response: hundreds. Chancellor Sederburg – this is something we need to take a look at. We need a more transparent process.
   ii. In most places the chair has a budget and gets to make the decisions on how to use the money - to hire faculty, TAs, etc. It’s important that the decisions get made at the department and dean level, with the faculty and chair involved. The money being set aside to retain faculty should be determined by departments. Chancellor Sederburg - I want it to be decentralized too. We need a better budgeting system from the bottom up that aligns needs with budgeting. This is more difficult than I thought given the history of top-down decision making. I want to set the stage in my time here to move away from top-down. Senator comment – the tradition has not been top-down for very long.
   iii. Will the faculty retention money follow the same “if you want to get a raise, you have to go out and get a job somewhere else” approach? Chancellor Sederburg - Ideally, we need to be able to reward outstanding performance. Money isn’t the only factor – environment and opportunity are important too. I can’t say the other doesn’t work. If you do have that letter, we can work with that too. Senator comment – That profoundly affects morale.
   iv. We’d like to know the exact number of faculty lines lost; we’re carrying that on our backs. Chancellor Sederburg – We need to be careful about presenting our needs. I want to say that we’re asking for increases for faculty.
   v. There seems to be a big difference between the recommendation and what the students wanted. How did that happen? Chancellor Sederburg – I interceded. Committee recommended a 4% increase with nothing for athletics. Two years from now the school would have been very disappointed that we didn’t act to meet needs. The Committee is advisory, and not everyone was happy with the decision, but the students were understanding. I couldn’t see not having any resources for a new Chancellor coming in.
   vi. Concerns were expressed about the athletics decisions. The Track and Field athletes are very visible, incredible ambassadors, and the programs are successful. Who was involved in the decision, is this going before BOT or is it done, how do you justify getting rid of a successful program over ones that have not been successful? Chancellor Sederburg – An advisory committee was put together by Miller. It included one faculty member and they came up with a more draconian plan. Several programs stepped up and raised money. We’d need $600,000 for the Track & Field athletes, and a million to take care of the track. Financially we just can’t sustain it. The AD came up with this plan. Some of the intangibles are visibility and many of the athletes are minorities, but we shouldn’t define sports as black or white. I support the AD’s decision, but I’m open to input. Bottom line is that Athletics has huge problems. The big guys have driven up the costs, and fees or private funds are the only resource. How much are the students here able and willing to support athletics? $500 per student is already going to athletics from student fees. I asked the AD to give me a plan, and this is what we received.
   vii. Chancellor Sederburg - I’m excited to work on faculty retention. A new book out called Drive by Daniel Pink discusses factors other than salaries – creativity, faculty development.

III. President’s Report
   a. President Lugo - shared an anecdote illustrating the deterioration of support for athletics for faculty over the years. He described a conversation with Coach Sprecher who was dismissed from his job with zero notice, and Lugo reported having separation date on 48 people who have left athletics over the past two years. We are bleeding talent from all areas. I welcome the Chancellor’s challenge to find ways to retain. We have to talk to people. We have to do better. I have issues with the ways things are handled. There was budgeting for the
track at one point, but decisions were made for the money to go elsewhere. I am also concerned about the process. The previous committee met every week, and had every data point. This time the process was silent. At the same time we are hiring a head Diversity Officer, we are losing enormous ground in our ability to retain African American students. This will be viewed by some as doing away with a sport that attracts black students and bringing in a sport that attracts white students.

b. Dean Hardy was asked to update us on PTR. No actions will be taken today. We’ll learn about changes since the previous Senate feedback. Dean Hardy – The posted version of the document includes our initial thoughts. The major issue continues to be what to do when there is a mixed recommendation. We recommended previously that the Provost would make a decision on such cases after consideration by the RPT Committee, but some weren’t comfortable with that. The other issue involves what happens if the development plan isn’t executed, and it was suggested that we might name an arbitrator. In the posted revised policy, we have included an introduction that shows where each of the compliance criteria is addressed, and we tried to make the document more readable. We have mapped the 11 criteria we must address and provided an anchor to where the changes are made for each. We still need to hear from Senators on the two key issues. The next PRT Committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday at 8, we’d like to have your voice represented in the final revisions so we can vote in January. President Lugo - This is how shared governance should be.

c. President Lugo - There is a mandate from BOG on giving credit for experience to military students. We’re trying to assure that these decisions are made by faculty delegates from appropriate disciplines. There should not be credit unless it’s deserved. This is likely to raise issues regarding competencies for US.

d. Terry Curran was invited to provide an update on working with Kings College to increase international students on this campus. UNCW hasn’t made much progress in breaking into the market on its own despite good effort from faculty and OIP. We’re in the bottom quartile in the UNC system with respect to number of international students. The Direct Pathways program does direct marketing for us abroad, and recruits only students who meet our requirements. A preparation program focuses on ESL on this campus. Once students reach a TOEFL score of 71, they would be admitted. A summer program that brings about 100 students to campus would involve our faculty here. This will help us get our name out, and bring benefits to our grad programs. It is hard to compete with the big guys in NC and would take a lot of organization across campus to help make this work, including a business arrangement with Kings. Doing so should provide lots of opportunities to build our international population, to be a high quality academic institution.

e. President Lugo - Note that any distance courses now must be ADA compliant. This requirement applies to any materials put on-line for your students. Right now the courses directly affected are distance courses, but all courses may be impacted at some point.

IV. Committee Reports: Lugo - Thanks to the Chairs of UCC and USAC for working overtime on curricular items.

a. UCC brings Motion 2014-12-MO1.
   i. Motion on program revisions and additions presented by Stuart Borrett; lots of vetting has already taken place.
   ii. Vote was 47 in favor, 2 against.

b. USAC brings Motion 2014-12-MO2, adding course options to multiple US categories.
   i. The committee is still considering the Senate’s question regarding having one course fall in more than one Approaches & Perspectives category. This has raised lots of issues for the Committee, and needs time for full consideration.
   ii. Vote was 48 votes in favor, 1 against.

c. USAC brings Motion 2014-12-MO3, regarding residency requirements for Explorations Beyond the Classroom.
   i. The proposal is to allow some credit-bearing experiences completed away from UNCW to be considered as satisfying the requirement, with standards and guidelines that USAC will set up.
   ii. Discussion revealed some confusion in the wording of the motion, regarding a seeming conflict between reaffirmation of residency requirement vs a change to allow for appeals.
iii. The Motion is sent back to the Committee, for wording clarification.

d. Budget Committee report – Laurie Messinger.

i. Updates – You have Budget Committee representatives on lots of campus committees. Different members of the Committee serve on these. A full Committee Report is posted on the SharePoint site.

ii. We are happy about the task force that’s looking to integrate our budget processes. Currently the process seems rushed and without a lot of data; the pieces aren’t connected so we can’t see ultimate impact.

iii. Regarding tuition and fees, we might consider presenting the pitch for needs before the student committee comes to their conclusion, because that group did not really understand what it might mean not to raise fees.

iv. The Committee recommends that one of the three Faculty Assembly members should be from Budget Committee, and that a Budget Committee member should also sit on the Senate Steering Committee, even if ex officio.

V. President Lugo – We need to return our attention to the Faculty Handbook. Our homework over break is to review the Handbook, so we can complete the document in January. We stopped previously with Recommendation 38 (MO6). Particular attention is needed for the section on documentation to be submitted for RPT – should documentation cover the entirety of your work, or the work since tenure? Either way, the language must be crystal clear. We will also need to consider the section on processes for PTR of tenured library staff. The goal is to finish the Handbook, in the same manner as for Policies of Academic Freedom.

a. Question from the floor - Should Senators anticipate meeting twice per month in the spring?

b. Lugo – I don’t think we’ll need to do this much. In February, we should be able to vote on the whole enchilada.

There were no Announcements

Motion to adjourn at 3:39.
I. Chancellor’s report –
   a. There is distress about the news of Ross’ replacement by the BOG. The real agenda is not clear, and may well involve wanting someone with a particular ideology. The BOG is increasingly active and wanting to play a role. The replacement for Ross is unknown at this time.
   b. In the process of identifying an interim Provost is in progress. The individual will be from outside of UNCW. Turnover has been too great in our top administrators, and someone from outside may be best to address why that turnover has taken place. This is a huge problem that needs attention. A great external candidate has been identified, and an announcement should be forthcoming soon.
   c. The pool for the chancellor position is strong, and Chancellor Sederburg has heard from a number of personal acquaintances. There is a mix of traditional and nontraditional candidates, and the Chancellor is optimistic.
   d. News – UNCW was recognized again by Carnegee as an Engaged University. We’ve hired a new diversity officer, Dr. Kent Gown now head of diversity at GA Regents University. He will be here full time in April.

II. President’s report –
   a. Update on the Chancellor search: A briefing was sent previously on the composition of the pool. There are 56 files, with 23% of the candidates from the corporate world. The faculty have sent a strong message of concern about this high percentage, which has been voiced to the search committee. Faculty members on the committee will be vigilant about relevant characteristics. All academic disciplines are represented in the pool, which includes 10 women, 7 minority candidates, 7 sitting chancellors/presidents, 11 provosts, 14 deans from big schools, and 9 other academic administrators. The search firm expresses no real concerns for the search with respect to the vacated provost position. After reviewing 1,000’s of pages of documents, each committee member will submit 10 names. The plan is to choose 10 candidates at the Feb. meeting, for airport interviews. Confidentiality agreements are now in effect. Minutes of the meetings will be posted. There is an expectation that a new Chancellor would serve at least 5 years.
   b. Faculty Assembly Update – There has been lively discussion on PTR, with input from all campuses, and from VP of AA for system. The intent is that the instrument is developmental rather than punitive. A common theme is that the policy to go to BOG should be as flexible as possible, with respect to procedures. We need to define the process for the dean’s review of candidates. Some schools are considering sending the 5 annual reviews to the dean, others the 1 page instrument. It’s important to consider our document carefully; we will need to pass some version of if in February. All should do their homework.
   c. We have just hired a new head of HR, who has been assigned the task of working on retention of faculty and staff. It is an important time to start work on this issue.
   d. The President’s job is to ask hard questions. Recent questions have focused on the budget (e.g., expenditures on athletics, source of extra funding for the S&B renovation, conversion of locker room to TV room).
   e. In discussion from the floor: The BOG doesn’t have much background with respect to how universities work, but they have received good answers to their questions. It is likely that they will be inspecting what we do more closely.
   f. For at least the past year, there has been a big push for BOG to act differently. They have wanted to add an Executive Director position, and Art Pope’s name has been suggested. Rumors and the press have also covered the possibility of his consideration for President of the system. This all seems related to the change of political environment; they want someone with similar leanings. The Faculty Assembly has been quite active on these issues, and plan to decide on the best course of action once everyone has calmed down. Folks might want to check out the Pope Institute website, to see the essence of the philosophy.
III. Committee reports - 

a. USAC –
1. Motion to introduce more courses to US categories (2015 01 MO1). These will likely be the last for this year’s cycle.
   - Called the question – 52 in favor; 2 against. Motion passes.
2. QRL pilots motion (2015 01 MO2) was withdrawn. Some concerns were expressed after the motion was posted.
3. Motion to modify the Residency requirement for EBC (2015 01 MO3): Portfolios may be reviewed to see if prior experience will qualify to satisfy the EBC requirement.
   - Discussion clarified that the number of students to take advantage of this option will likely be small, that the portfolio will focus specifically on the activities completed for the EBC, and that a rubric will be used by the USAC to review the portfolio.
   - Called the question – 49 in favor, 8 against. Motion passes.
4. MOU on submission of new courses (2015 01 MO4): Summary – based on Senate discussion about individual courses proposed in multiple areas of perspectives, the USAC believes that the criteria need to be clarified. The request is that faculty submitting such proposals carefully consider the disciplinary issues. If passed, this motion would just become part of the guidelines for the committee, and could appear on the US website, to add clarify for submitters.
   - This specification (to add the guideline to the website) was accepted as an amendment to the motion, and seconded.
   - Discussion clarified that if passed, the understanding would be that proposals to include a course in more than one category of Approaches and Perspectives could still be considered, but the USAC would scrutinize such proposals carefully with respect to disciplinary areas. It would stand as a public warning that a strong argument for such inclusion would be expected.
   - Called the question – 48 in favor, 7 against. MOU motion passes.
5. Gabriel presents the Juan Valdez Award for hardest working faculty member to Mahnaz Moallem for chairing USAC.

b. Motion from Academic Standards (2015 01 MO5): This motion undoes our actions last year that added a grade of WE, to distinguish withdrawals due to extenuating circumstances. GA rejected this strategy. The present proposal removes the option of the WE grade. Instead, there is a page on Seanet that tracks all such withdrawals, for students and advisors.
   - Called the question – 52 in favor, 4 against. Motion passes.

c. Faculty Welfare Committee motion – 2015-01-06: This motion provides clarifications regarding internal promotions of Library faculty.
   - Called the question – 55 in favor; 2 against. Motion passes.

d. Report from the IT/LIB Committee – Lynn Mollenauer, Committee Chair
1. The Committee charge was to inquire into the IT report prepared in March, 2014 by Strate Information Group.
2. Findings: A copy of the report was presented to Senate in August 2014, and many of the findings of that report had already been implemented. Feedback was not solicited from many members of the University Committee. A new hire was made based on the report, and a reorganization was implemented. Bill and Rick would be happy to meet with departments or others to discuss the report and changes.
3. The Committee has several recommendations that primarily target communication. Faculty, staff, and students should be involved in decisions about a permanent CIO. More timely communication with university community and with faculty liaisons is requested. ITS is encouraged to solicit feedback about current issues.
4. Questions/comments/discussion from the floor:
   - This is an oft-repeated pattern – people in the trenches are not consulted about major decisions that impact us. It may be that the report and findings were correct, but the foot soldiers don’t feel they
were heard. Recommendations must include feedback from the staff that work for the CIO – this doesn’t seem to have been the case. Response: Input has now been gathered. IT is now reaching out to each of the deans and liaisons, to open communication channels and develop short-term and long-term plans. A broad-band upgrade is a major issue right now – BOG heard our request but did not decide on any requests. IT is also working on improving synergies; there are now 3 directors vs. 8. IT understood concerns about lack of consultation at the time the actions were taken.

- From President Lugo- whenever it is claimed that there is faculty representation, those representatives need to be decided by the faculty and not by the administration.
- This process has been demoralizing for IT staff, and has angered faculty – it was badly handled. Folks were consulted only after the big reorganization. Once you’ve hurt something, you don’t undo it that way. A lot of damage has accrued. Part of this could be helped by having faculty select their own representative. If we don’t even bother to talk, we’ll see more problems.
- Rick Whitfield has agreed to meet with any groups that would like to meet.

e. Final draft of the PTR policy (2015 01 M07): Discussion led by Dean Hardy.

1. This is our 3rd opportunity for open discussion and input. The Committee has tried to address all issues that have been raised, and has consulted with the Deans’ Council, which provided additional support for the work done. Suggested edits have just been made. An editing map was presented, to show the changes made and where those changes appear in the document. Changes suggested by the Deans’ Council were also presented, along with a map for the PTR process.

2. Scenario 3, regarding split decisions, was the sticking point (i.e., when 2 initial findings differ from each other and one of these is “does not meet expectations”). The previous plan had been to have the split move to the Provost to resolve, and attempts were made to find an entity to make recommendations to the Provost. The catch was that if a due process appeal should occur, the appeal would ultimately also go to the Provost, which seemed like a dual role. We were uncomfortable with that. The Deans suggested that in Scenario 3, all appeals would be decided on by the Chancellor. Thus, there would be content review by Provost, and appeal review by the Chancellor. The process would be reinitiated if the appeal was upheld. All members of the review committee must be tenured faculty members.

3. Questions/comments/discussion from the floor:
   - The intent of the policy is to help faculty succeed.
   - It was suggested that the visual process map be included with the policy.
   - Do the revisions from the deans include specification of the documents the dean will review, and if not, couldn’t that be the basis for a grievance? Response: At each phase, any documentation becomes part of the package to be passed on and considered, but there is no specification of exactly what the package must include. The materials might vary by unit. More work will be done on this issue this spring semester, to determine the degree of variance allowed. The Faculty Assembly recommends as much flexibility as possible.
   - Support and training – GA is going to create training modules (to be completed in spring, 2015), and we’ll see what works for us. The Provost has to certify that everyone involved as been trained on a yearly basis. Not clear yet how this will all be operationalized. Concerns were raised about the costs of such training. The FA also voiced objections, to no avail. It was clarified that only the individuals involved in the review process need to be trained in any given year.
   - PTR differs from RPT in that senior faculty are advisory only in PTR. This is not a change from the previous PTR policy, but it was noted that the new policy has more teeth.
   - The workload plan involves faculty working with the chair to reach a mutual agreement on criteria consistent with unit goals. It is important that there be flexibility at the department level.
   - All relevant documents for the PTR motion are posted at the Senate Sharepoint site. The plan is that we will finish up at the next regular Senate meeting.
   - Thanks to the committee and congratulations.

Announcement: An interim Senate meeting will be held, to return to the Faculty Handbook. The Policies on Academic Freedom & Tenure have been sent to the Provost. We’ll go through the Handbook, the entire document all at once. The next Senate
meeting is 2 weeks from now – Feb. 3.
Motion to adjourn: 3:39
I. President’s opening: Thanks to all for the quick response to the survey regarding President Ross. Our responses have been forwarded. Lugo read a statement outlining the pressing reasons for our need to respond to the news about President Ross, entitled “Higher Education and NC under Attack.” His statement emphasized the university system as a public good, denounced the defunding pattern for higher education in NC as an attack on our ability to educate all citizens, as per the state constitution, and delineated the losses to shared governance that have ensued in recent years, which Ross helped to combat. “It is time to speak.” Enthusiastic applause followed this statement. The petition with 400 signatures was also forwarded to the BOG. There has been no response as yet. The moderate proposal already considered by UNCW faculty is being circulated now at other campuses. After allowing some time for response, we’ll speak more loudly if needed.

II. Special order of the day - continuing review of the Faculty Handbook. The Policies of Academic Freedom & Tenure, recently approved by the Senate, have been forwarded o Academic Affairs. A few points may need further clarification, but the hope is that we’re close to finalizing that document. We will vote on the PTR Committee’s recommendations at the next regular Senate meeting. If passed, those recommendations will be added to the Policies document. These are our primary governing policies and will have been explicitly approved, so any discrepancies in the Faculty Handbook must be corrected.

a. Taking up where we left off, the first action needed is page 93. The subheadings of IDEA categories to be reported need to be revised, to match current IDEA report categories (i.e., Summary Evaluation., Progress on Objectives, and Overall Rating). A motion to substitute the new headings was made and seconded. Discussion included the points that the new categories are believed to be stable, and that our reported comparisons should be with respect to the national data set (vs internal comparisons only). The question was called; there were 42 votes in favor, and 2 against. (It was noted that a few votes were missing, but a quorum was confirmed. It was also noted that all references to OIR should be removed with respect to IDEA; the Office of Undergraduate Studies now handles IDEA matters, and has hired a new staff member to help.

b. Regarding the issue of external evaluations, it was noted that the text should include reference to Associate Professors who were hired without tenure. It was further noted that text should clarify that any external reviews solicited would be utilized (and not discarded). There were no objections to moving forward, with the understanding that the text would be modified for consistency.

c. Regarding Guidelines for Chair’s Recommendations: the Dean will recommend when the individual being considered is a chair. There were small changes to the required subcategories for the Chair’s recommendations, and a suggestion that the wording under 3A be altered, to remove the implication that FMLA involves a variation from our standards (which it does not). The suggested alternative was that chairs describe “any special circumstances that are relevant to the candidate’s application for reappointment, tenure, or promotion.” Special circumstances could include factors such as FMLA or hiring expectations to design a new program. There were no objections to these changes.

d. Regarding Certification, the evaluating officer shall report votes, including the number of votes for and against
the candidate’s reappointment, tenure, or promotion. The understanding is that senior faculty must vote for or against; there should be no abstentions. This was voted on previously; there were no objections.

e. The Application Format was considered next (a proposed format was attached with the meeting agenda). We will eventually be moving to paperless submissions, but paper versions should not be rejected at this point. Suggestions on limiting the materials submitted have been included.

i. To clarify, faculty are not required to include a CV as part of the dossier.

ii. Content for the Candidate’s Statement has been clarified – the statement should target the relationship between teaching, service, and scholarship rather than repeat information from other sections.

iii. The Chair’s annual evaluations from each year since the last UNCW personnel action are to be included. IT has indicated that a secure RTP website is doable. The issue of who will have access needs attention, as the composition of senior faculty varies across departments.

iv. Language regarding OIR needs to be changed under #3 of teaching materials.

v. For now, engagement is to be included under Optional subcategory. This may need to be revisited, depending on outcomes from the current Task Force on Engagement. We may decide to highlight this category in some other way.

vi. Concerns were expressed over the direction to include a given activity only once. DIS, for example, can include teaching and engagement. It was pointed out that the narrative was intended as the place to highlight such synergies and that many concerns have been expressed regarding the length of RPT dossiers, and the degree of overlap within them. Workshops for chairs and junior faculty could address appropriate placement of each kind of activity. A motion was made and seconded to delete the sentence advising that something be included in only one place. The question was called: Votes were 26 in favor, 20 against. The motion passed and the sentence will be deleted.

vii. There were no objections under Service.

viii. Chairs responsibilities – replicated from the Policies. Reference to OIR should be removed from #1 and 2, and the language on “2 years” should be aligned with previous decisions.

ix. A quorum was called at 3:15: with 39 responses, the quorum was lost. Polls rather than votes were taken from this point on, with poll results to serve advisory function.

x. There was discussion over the issue of instruction that results of the RPT deliberation be emailed to the candidate, given the sensitive nature of the information. Legal counsel suggested that as long as the email involved all due confidentiality and just a yes/no statement, without elaboration, there would be no problem. The intent was to make communication clear and timely for the candidate, and email is an official mode of university communication. A motion was made and seconded to substitute, “communicate in writing,” and remove explicit reference to email. A poll on the motion showed 18 votes for, and 18 against. This recommendation is not binding and will be discussed further.

xi. Under Chairperson’s evaluation of candidates, the wording on “variations in standards” should be amended to reflect earlier discussion on the same.

xii. Under Certification, there was discussion of the meaning of “virtual presence.” –For example, email would not be sufficient, as it does not provide for equal participation. There was hesitance to specify any particular medium (e.g., Skype), and it was noted that the current wording specifies “being present.” “Virtual presence with synchronous communication” was suggested as an alternative. Senators were asked to consider the best wording for our next meeting. The issue of whether to allow proxy votes was also postponed to our next meeting, given the sensitivity of the issue and the lack of a quorum.

xiii. President Lugo thanked Senators for meeting twice a month and for their important service.
Motion to adjourn: 3:40
I. President’s Report:
   a. Today’s report will focus on a Faculty Assembly update. Some current problems were communicated at the last Senate Meeting. Almost 400 votes were collected from UNCW on the resolution regarding Tom Ross. The outcome of our vote was sent to BOG, with Ross cc’d. Ten other campuses have done the same. There has been no response or confirmation of receipt as of yet. The FA is working on strategies to bring more pressure to bear – our voices need to be heard. The FA is also at compiling a comprehensive list of detrimental actions that have transpired over the past 3 years that impact our daily lives. The list will be discussed at the next FA meeting, and steps for moving forward will be decided. FA authority lies only in our ability to come together and voice our opinion.
   b. Points made during discussion from the floor:
      i. Other universities are also acting with intensity. We need to restore confidence in education in NC. The dialog must remain professional, but we need to help the BOG understand that by damaging education, the state is being damaged.
      ii. The only role of the FA is to advise the President, and to advise campuses of issues. Individual campuses can then take action, which is where the leverage lies. We can communicate with our own administrator and our BOT, where the FA cannot. It may be important to go to Chapel Hill for discussion.
      iii. We need to make our case in terms of damaging the state and damaging the students. No one will care about damaging the faculty. UNC students are also organizing.
   c. Faculty and staff retention continues to be an important focus at UNCW. Rosalynn Martin, our new HR Direction was introduced. She looks forward to working with faculty, especially on issues of retention. Lugo has presented Martin with a document on retention problems, including names of individuals who have left UNCW. We need to restore the policies and environment that promote retention and hiring of faculty and staff. Our new Diversity Officer will be starting in April.
   d. Lugo encouraged 100% response from the Senate to the COACHE survey. Our responses are particularly important to providing an accurate picture of faculty workload. Currently, GA relies primarily on data from the Delaware Study, which has many flaws and gives incorrect information on what faculty actually do. GA realizes this and wants better information, which the COACHE instrument can help to provide. The survey has been updated, and now includes a section on shared governance – what is working and what is not. It takes about 40 min. to complete.

II. Chancellor’s report:
   a. Congratulations to Gabriel and Senates across the state on speaking up about Tom Ross. Important transitions are in progress right now, made more frightening because we don’t know the real agenda that is driving the changes. Centers are coming under attack, which will heighten concerns about the agenda. The Chancellor has written an op-ed to circulate. He feels it is the duty of Chancellors to speak up.
   b. Marilyn Scheerer will be our interim provost – she brings great talent to the office, and will be getting engaged this spring. The Chancellor is working with Provost Battles to help ensure a smooth transition for Scherer.
   c. Work with the Task Forces on budget and on engagement is ongoing. The task force reports will be provided to the 5 finalists for the Chancellor position.
   d. Our campus will be going through great changes over the next few months, and there are lots of anxieties on campus as a result. The Chancellor is committed to developing a transition plan, so that
everyone will know what’s going to happen and when. We should expect notification about the next Chancellor in mid-April, which will begin the official transition. There will be opportunities for faculty and staff to get involved and to get to know the new Chancellor as soon as possible. Uncertainties about the roles of President, Chancellor, Provost, and Deans in two units will have many employees nervous about what’s happening. Chancellor Sederburg understands that times are trying and he is working to help with that transition.

e. The Search Committee has narrowed the list of Chancellor candidates to 10 finalists, and plans to narrow the list to 5 or 6 individuals to bring to campus in March. The candidates will meet with selected individuals during their visit. The BOT will recommend the top 3 candidates to Ross, who will make the decision, but even that is a bit unclear as the BOG wants to be more involved. We should know the outcome of the search by mid-April.

f. In response to a Senator comment that the Governor of WI has attempted to change the state constitution to define the universities mission as job training, Sederburg noted that governors have 3 resources for advancing their states – natural resources from the land, strategies for decreasing costs of labor & business, and the intellectual basis of the state. Pursing a well-educated population has been the most successful strategy. The core strength of the state cannot be dismantled.

g. Points of discussion from the floor:
   i. President Lugo noted that while Ross is expected to make the decision on the Chancellor search, the BOG is currently trying to rewrite the policies by which new Presidents are chosen, such that the entire process could be decided by 3 individuals (given the current odd phrasing). If the BOG ignores the strong input against this change, we expect serious push back from the faculty.
   ii. The faculty members to meet with the Chancellor candidates have not yet been determined. The Search Committee will make the decisions, and it is hoped that at least the Senate Steering Committee would be involved. The faculty will be sworn to secrecy.
   iii. We will have no way of knowing if the BOG respects the Chancellor recommendation made by Ross, nor will we know how many BOG members will be working with Ross in making the recommendation. Chancellor Sederburg noted that, if the Search Committee does their job, all 3 names forwarded to Ross should be individuals acceptable to the campus. Ross needs to have some flexibility in deciding, as each candidate will have different strengths and weaknesses. The Committee is generally pleased with the pool of candidates.

III. Committee Reports:

a. From the University Curriculum Committee:
   i. Motion 2015-02-MO1 – to adopt COML as a prefix (Communication Studies Laboratory) for the catalogue. The question was called. Votes were 47 in favor; 0 against. The motion passed.

b. From the Academic Standards Committee:
   i. Motion 2015-02-MO2: Regarding out-of-state instructional opportunities. Our vote will be postponed to the next meeting, but an explanation was provided by Nathan Grove. The issue involves students earning credit for internships or other courses while living in other states; these arrangements require prior authorization from the other state. The problem is that this authorization is not always being checked prior to enrolling students in such coursework. One motivation for the authorization seems to involve wanting to place limits on what can be done by for-profit institutions. A complication for any UNCW policy is that some departments offer courses that are similar to internships (e.g., practicums), but which are not formally designated as internships. These may be implicated too, if students are living and working in another state.
   ii. Points from discussion by the floor:
      1. The specific requirements and processes for authorization vary widely by state, and can involve fees up to $10,000.
      2. The authorizations are required for other states in the US, but experiences abroad are not impacted.
      3. The policy would hold for any course for credit where the student lives in a different state, so this would include DIS credits too, if the student lives and works in a different
state. If we don’t have permission, we can’t offer course credit in that state for a significant period of time. Significant is undefined, but if the student is living elsewhere, it’s best to be safe and make sure that the opportunity is approved.

4. Cecil Willis reiterated that we must be authorized to offer credit in other states, for any type of course. Failing to do so could result in consequences for the student and for UNCW. It is critical to check to make sure authorization (which takes some time to complete) is in place before enrolling students in such arrangements. Our distance-ed website provides a listing of states for which we have authorization to offer courses and internships. Every attempt is made to keep the website updated, but please consult with External Programs, who can verify authorizations.

5. We should consider adding “within the US” to the motion, for clarity.

6. External Programs will try to help with the process if authorization isn’t already in place, but this takes time and isn’t always practical.

7. The Provost noted that this is a national issue, not specific to UNCW, and that it is not discretionary. We cannot proceed with course credit unless authorization is in place. There are a handful of states where we just cannot go, but not many.

8. The appropriateness of the course of study is not being judged here – the issue is relevant authorizations from the other state. Faculty should be in touch with External Programs as soon as the need for a student’s placement out of state is known.

9. The current wording of the motion is too broad; it seems to be inclusive of courses with a time-limited field component, in addition to those with term-length placements.

10. Motion – to send MO 2015-02- back to the Committee, with the request that an open forum be planned for further discussion of the issues. The question was called, and the votes were 41 in favor, 4 against. The motion was sent back to the Committee.

c. From the Steering Committee: Further consideration of the proposed PTR policies (2015-02-MO3).

i. The final document from the PTR Committee was presented. If approved by the Senate, the document will be forwarded to AA, and then to the BOT. This is not the time for wordsmithing; we will concentrate on the main policies. Committee Chairs Charlie Hardy and James Hunt were invited to come forward to answer any questions. Appreciation was expressed for the Committee’s hard work.

ii. Summary of discussion from the floor:

1. Unlike the RPT policies, the proposed policies for PTR do not include direct faculty input into the process, except that a faculty PRT review committee writes a recommendation to the department chair. A motion was made to amend the language such that the advisory recommendation generated by the faculty review committee becomes part of the candidate’s package. The intent is to have the faculty recommendation go forward, along with the Chair’s summary letter. On page 5, the phrase “nonadvisory” could be replaced with “including faculty advisory recommendations.” (A request to leave this decision up to the candidate was not supported as a friendly amendment.) The question was called. Votes were 42 in favor, 6 against. The motion to amend the wording was passed.

2. Department policies allowing the candidate to select some members of the review committee would no longer be possible. This was specified by the GA requirements.

3. The proposed policy does not specify that the Chair’s summary recommendation will be shared with the faculty review committee. Some felt this to be important, even when the recommendations are in agreement. Legal counsel verified that even though the letter is part of the candidate’s personnel file, and thus confidential, an oral report of the Chair’s overall decision is OK. It was noted further that the candidate can always choose to share information from their own file. A motion was made to amend the document, to include the requirement that the Chair will inform the faculty PTR advisory committee of her/his recommendation. The question was called: votes were 43 in favor, 5 against. The motion to include the requirement passed.

4. With the faculty advisory recommendation now included as part of the candidate’s
package, clarification is needed that the faculty comments will be shared with the candidate. It was noted that as part of the personnel file, the candidate always has access to the information. A motion was made to include the requirement that the reviewer’s report be shared with the candidate at the time the chair’s letter goes forward. The question was called; votes were 43 in favor, 5 against. The motion to include the requirement passed.

5. Consideration of allowing the candidate to choose whether to include the advisory recommendation was ruled out of order.

6. A vote on the entire PTR document is now on the floor. Our policies must be submitted to GA by May 29, but must first be approved by our BOT at their April 16/17 meeting, at the latest, and they will need access to the document prior to the meeting. Submitting PRT to the BOT prior to submitting our revised RPT may be useful in showing that our ongoing reviews are substantive. The question was called; votes were 43 in favor, 4 against. The PRT document is approved by the Senate.

Announcements:

Please support the UNCW Staff Senate food drive. Donation should be made at the Bookstore by Feb. 27.

As of today, there is a 26% completion rate for the COACHE survey. Another follow-up link will be sent. Please respond!

Motion to adjourn: 3:30
Senate Minutes  
March 3, 2015  
EB 162  
President Lugo Presiding  

Call to order: 2:03  
Quorum confirmed.  

Previous minutes will be voted on in our next regular session.  

I: President’s report:  

A. Update on Chancellor Search – No information can be disclosed at this point, but candidates are visiting campus and meeting with a limited number of faculty. Lugo will call a meeting with those faculty who met the candidates, to solicit their direct input.  

B. An important email was sent today regarding the UNC BOG, who are taking big steps that are deleterious to the University, and without listening to input from faculty. It is time for faculty to become more audible. A recent article in News & Observer marks the beginning of more sustained media activity to present the faculty position. The present course of action by the BOG will cause lasting damage that cannot be sustained. We may be looking at a vote of no confidence for the BOG. If needed, faculty will be called on to participate. To help keep faculty informed, Lugo sent his previous Senate statement by email, and a list of more recent assaults may be distributed soon. Work is continuing with colleagues from other campuses. Only a few members of the Faculty Assembly (FA) get to meet with the BOG. A main issue at this juncture involves infringement of academic freedom by closing centers with no justification (this action is now in the Chronicle, Inside Higher Ed, AAUP, etc). This is an egregious action that violates UNC regulations, which stipulate that institutes and centers are the purview of the individual institutions. The BOG has also voted to insert themselves in Chancellors searches. A BOG member will join each search. There will now be three BOG committees involved in every Chancellor Search; the composition of each is to include three members of the BOG Steering Committee and “up to 15 others.” The “up to” phrasing is problematic, as it could translate into no additional members, leaving the process in the hands of only three individuals. The upcoming round of appointments to BOG will bring this administration’s appointees to 32 of 32 BOG members. The BOG is a very homogenous group, with little diversity of any kind represented.  

C. Summary of discussion from the floor:  

1. What about our BOT? We have some great trustees but two were appointed directly by BOG and they have caused problems. We have some good members, but this could change, as they are all appointed from above.  

2. Has FA made any inroads with the legislature? The FA (formed by former President Friday) is advisory only to the UNC President. We have no other purview, and the president could choose to get rid of the FA. FA meets at the BOG building, so there is a visible presence, and FA is often sought out for input on faculty positions. It seems unlikely that the FA will go away, but if we bug them, that could happen. Any power really comes from Faculty Senate at each individual University. Still, the FA network is strong, and communication between the campuses is critical. We must stand together as 17 campuses when we speak as faculty. There is also a need to connect with the students, who are becoming aware of the issues. The next FA president is likely to take a lot of heat, given current issues. President Lugo would be happy to speak more fully in private about BOG problems.  

II. The main agenda for today’s meeting – completion of review of the Faculty Handbook.  

A. We’re almost to the end. It should be understood that our RPT and PTR policies always take precedence over the Handbook, and the Handbook must be consistent with those documents. We’ll take a final vote on the completed Handbook at the next regular meeting. While our other policies are being reviewed by AA and BOT, the Handbook Committee will also review the Handbook for consistencies. It will still be good to approve all Handbook changes,
subject to possible modifications next year as required to remain consistent with the final RPT and PTR policies.
B. Beginning where we left off, the Handbook section on PTR will be replaced by our new policies.
C. The section on Benefits was sent to HR, whose policies are in effect here. This section will be handled with a link to HR.
D. In Chapter 5, under “Responsibilities of Faculty,” there is need to update the section on required office hours, as many interactions take place electronically now. The current policy states that faculty must hold office hours for 2 hours per day during the regular academic term.
   1. Discussion from the floor revealed a range of practices across departments. A motion to amend the requirement to state that departments can set their own policies regarding office hours was seconded.
   2. An amendment to the motion, to state that hours should be posted, was also seconded.
   3. A further amendment, to state that office hours should be posted on or near the office door was also seconded and approved by voice vote.
   4. To be consistent with SACS requirements, it was recommended that we include a statement in this section of the Handbook to the effect that “faculty will be available to answer student questions,” even if specific policies are left up to departments. For SACS purposes, modality is not critical, so email interactions are fine.
   5. Question from the floor – is “office hours” now just a metaphor? Are we OK with departments saying that in-person office hours are not necessary? Response – yes, departments could decide that. This is the default case for some on-line courses now.
   6. Suggested wording for the motion: to keep “each member of the faculty...available to students and advisees during office hours determined by departments and posted on office doors.”
      a. Do we need to mention email? That will be up to the department.
      b. The Handbook section on syllabi includes relevant information as well.
      c. Argument against the motion – there is value in being in the physical presence of an instructor. It would be a shame to lose that. Also, many on-line classes include on-campus students who want to have physical office hours.
   7. Vote on the main motion (in f) – 43 in favor, 4 against. The motion passed.
E. The section on Graduate advising is not our charge. A link to the Graduate Handbook will be included, to replace this section.
F. UNCW policies on patents are also on the university site and the recent revisions on copyrights and patents, will be linked.
G. The section on IRB policies will be linked to the University Policies site, to replace the current verbiage.
H. The remainder of the Handbook lies outside of the realm of Senate authority.
I. In terms of implementation, some of these changes to the Handbook will be implemented right away, while others will need to wait. For example, we may decide to move forward with electronic submission of RPT materials right away – this step would not need to be approved by BOT. Similarly, the items reported for IDEA do not need BOT approval. PTR does need to be approved up the levels, but this is being expedited and may move quickly. Once approved, the new PTR policies will go into effect immediately. Revisions to the Policies for Academic Freedom & Tenure cannot be implemented until they are approved all the way up the line. We don’t have a good feel for how long that process might take.
J. Senators should take time to look over the entire Handbook. We will vote on the entirety of the Handbook revisions at the next regular meeting, subject to approval of our other policies. The Handbook Committee will take care of reformatting, following from our changes, and will take care of all clean up.

III. Announcements:
A. The RPT document has not been approved by AA. There were some discrepancies in wording, but not intent, on the issue of split votes. A group is working on a rewrite to ensure that all wording is consistent, and complete document will be available after the March 27 retreat meeting. Once in final form, the document will come back to the Senate for final approval (again).
B. The Senate evaluation committee will have a new report soon on IDEA.
C. This is the last of the Senate double meetings!
Meeting adjourned: 2:58
Senate Minutes  
March 17, 2015 
EB 162  
Meeting called to order: 2:09  
Quorum confirmed 

Minutes from last 2 meetings (2/17 & 3/3) approved with no corrections or objections.

I. Chancellor’s Report:
   a. Updates on the Chancellor search – The official announcement will come on April 10. This Thursday, our BOT will forward 3 names to President Ross. He will review the candidates with 3 individuals, and forward 1 name to the BOG. The announcement will be made after the BOG meeting at ECU on 4/10, and then the individual will be brought here for receptions, etc. The final candidates included five accomplished individuals, none of whom have served previously as a university president or chancellor. Chancellor Sederburg has never seen such a diversity of candidates, nor less certainty with respect to where they line up on the future directions of the institution. Transition plans for the new Chancellor are in progress full speed.
   b. Congratulations to Max Allen, who is leaving to go to Clemson. Discussion is in progress internally about filling the Chief of Staff vacancy. A search process should be in place by April or May, and the new Chancellor will make the choice.
   c. The last BOG meeting was fascinating with respect to the recent closing of centers and institutes. Chancellor Sederburg has recommended a strong agenda to guide the review, and to decide on a new President of the system. Our requested increases in tuition and fees were approved, including funds for 10 new faculty hires and for support for applied/engaged learning. A 2-year plan was forwarded; the revenue looks in reasonable shape for institutional priorities. The Governor has released his budget; together with tuition increases, our total budget would increase about 8%, but the Governor’s budget may not pass. Increases in fees will be used to help support campus police and supervision with respect to Title IX.

II. President’s Report:
   a. In news from the Faculty Assembly, a new process has been put in place by the BOG for selection of the new UNC President. The FA was successful in arranging for faculty input to be included; 3 faculty members will be involved in the search, and one of those will be our own Stuart Borrett.
   b. Regarding the Chancellor search, 20 faculty were involved in lunch interviews with the final five candidates. They supplied input to President Lugo, who compile and forward faculty responses to Max Allen and the Search Committee Chairs. An unspecified process will be used to select the final three names. When asked if there was faculty consensus on one or more candidates, Chancellor Sederburg offered that there was a broad sense that 3 of the 5 would be preferred, that those 3 were a bit stronger, and would likely be the ones going forward.
   c. Turn-over in our FA delegates will happen soon. One position is open for the FA – Senators are encouraged to consider this role. The FA is an important venue for our voices to be heard. The next Faculty Senate President will automatically be a member of FA.
   d. A final vote on the Faculty Handbook will be taken at our next and final regular Senate meeting; however, the Handbook will not be finalized until the Policies of Academic Freedom and Tenure are approved by the BOT. We are close to having agreement with AA on the final version to go forward. Once these policies are approved, the Faculty Handbook Committee will review the Handbook again for any inconsistencies. President Lugo proposed that we change the name of the Committee to the Governance Committee, as they will have oversight over all of our governance documents. Some aspects of the Handbook – such as PTR - will need to be implemented right away once approved by the BOT and BOG, which should happen quickly. It is President Lugo’s hope that by next year, RTP documents will be submitted electronically, rather than in the binders.
e. Regarding RPT and the CRTP Committee, one unresolved problem involves the wording that specifies a “tangible record” of scholarship and research as a requirement for promotion. President Lugo proposed a change to “sustained” pattern of scholarship and research. Senators should consider this; a vote on the wording modification will be taken at the next meeting.

f. One other RPT issue that has continued to generate discussion concerns leaving the composition of senior faculty up to a departmental decision. If any additions regarding exceptions for departments with few senior faculty are desired, there would need to be a motion to this effect and an approval by the Senate. (It was noted that if this is to be a stand-alone policy, it would need a 2/3 majority approval.)

III. Committee Reports:

a. USAC –
   i. Motion 2015-03-M01 and 2015-03-M02 – to adopt new US course listings. A vote was called on both motions simultaneously. The vote was 46 in favor, 1 against. The motions passed.
   ii. 2015-03-M03 – Moratorium on new submissions to US for one year (including a possibility of exceptions given a strong need). One concern voiced about the motion was that there are few course options at the 100 and 200 levels for some US categories, with many of the options aimed at specific majors. The vote was called: there were 39 votes in favor, 9 against. The motion passed.

b. Academic Standards –
   i. Motion 2015-03-M04 - on out-of-state instructional opportunities. A forum on the issue was held as requested; one person attended.
   ii. Summary of discussion from the floor:
      1. The motion is intended to ensure that all state and federal requirements are met.
      2. The current phrasing (“a portion of a course”) is too broad; it would include even ½ day field trips. Policies targeted federal and state laws would be appropriately handled by our legal counsel, not by faculty. It has been argued that the relevant administrators are sympathetic to our concerns, but this policy wording will remain after the administrators change. Submitting a form for every field trip will be cumbersome. It would be nice to hear from legal on this. Rewording of Section O is requested.
      3. Across the 49 states and DC, there is a wide range of requirements on compliance. Those conducting field experiences should check to see that we have authorization. It does add to our workload. A matrix is being designed to indicate the authorizations we have in place. The authorization requirement could impact the possibility of a student receiving credit for a particular piece of coursework.
      4. Any fees required would be paid by the university rather than by the department (although a large fee where few students are involved could be problematic). Many states have no fees. The issue of what defines “physical presence in a state” varies by state. For most states, the definition would cover only internship arrangements, but this is not the case for all.
      5. Regarding forms, for internships, the current form will be routed through the Office for External Programs, as needed. For other experiences, no form will be needed – just a phone call or email to doublecheck on authorization. The requirement for authorization is already in place. Any deadline would depend on when the credit-bearing experience will occur.
      6. It is the case that states cannot prevent inter-state travel, but it is each state’s right to enact policy relative to educational experiences within the state. This requirement is specifically with respect to earning course credit.
      7. Questions – Should this be university policy (rather than Senate policy)? What would happen if we voted no on this? Responses: Faculty involvement is desired; students may not receive credit for an experience after completing it if there is no authorization. Including this policy in the Handbook would be consistent with level of detail on other university-wide academic
processes.

8. Are the authorizations standing, or is a check required for every experience? State regulations can change, and the time period for any given authorization varies by state. External Programs monitors changes on a regular basis.

9. The vote was called: there were 31 votes in favor, 15 against. The motion passed.

IV. There was no old or new business.

V. For the good of the order –
   a. This discussion will be an open conversation on trends and attacks on higher education. A number of documents have been forwarded on the topic. There has been increased intrusion of the BOG into business that has traditionally been the purview of faculty, including harmful defunding and motivated by politics. Having just one BOG member on the chancellor search committee has had a tremendous impact on the nature of the conversation. There has been a trend toward homogeneity of political position of BOG members. In whole, the situation is serious. There are certain steps on our part that will be effective, and ones that will not. The political reality is that the legislature won’t be swayed by anything except votes. Faculty must send messages that can impact how folks vote, folks from all areas. The recent message from President Ross (forwarded by Lugo) is significant. We need to try to understand all that’s being said in his message, reading between the lines. There is a small number of faculty who want to precipitate a vote of no confidence in the BOG. Others believe that this will not be effective. We’ll be cast as hoodlums and the public is likely to buy that. We need to be smart. Or, we can be silent and they will walk all over us.
   b. Summary of discussion from the floor:
      i. I’ve been speaking with my students about their need to be more involved with decisions being made in Raleigh. I don’t give my opinion specifically, but students are interested and see the point. We might incorporate messages from Ross in our lessons – not to indoctrinate students, but to expose them to ideas so that they’ll go home and continue to discuss them.
      ii. A massive educational process is needed, including with the faculty, many of whom are unaware.
      iii. Data are available to show the budget cuts to higher ed since 2008. The inverse relation between state appropriations and tuition is clear and well documented. We’re now education 60% more students with only 2% more support. Mark Lanier has the data. The current ratio is about 1:1 appropriations to tuition. Laying out this information to others is important.
      iv. National trends are much like local ones. There is emboldened legislative discussion in support of cuts to universities. Gov. Walker from WI received a standing ovation at the Governors’ Conference for describing cuts.
      v. Chancellor Sederburg’s previous comments about the resources a state has to offer can be useful to cite, and contacts with community members about the value of an education population is important.
      vi. It’s a media war. Closing centers in NC is a big news item all over. But discontent at UNC on this is presented as an attack on academic freedom, which doesn’t resonate with the community. We argue for the importance of the centers in their own right. It’s a question of how we deliver the message, to impress others in the community.
      vii. The pattern in NC seems the opposite of that in WI, where Madison is being left unscathed while other institutions bear the brunt. Here, Chapel Hill seems to be the target, so this attack may bring us closer as an institution. They’re going to go after the HBC’s – this is racism, pure and simple. This, along with poverty, may be the appropriate target for our support.
      viii. We must speak with others, community members, about the importance and value of education. If we don’t, constituents won’t support us.
      ix. Statements made at BOG about closing HBC’s came from the Chair of the Finance Committee, and Chancellor Sederburg raised the issue with the Chair of the Board, who does not agree with the Finance Committee Chair. The Chancellor voiced concerns about the impact of the Finance Chair’s statements.
      x. There is a national conversation about education as a public vs private good. The challenge is to remind folks what the public good is. We have failed to make that argument understandable to those outside of the university. Folks don’t understand how they benefit from having a university here. We must do this at an individual level as well as at the university level. The message needs to be put in understandable terms – the value of education is not just short-range and getting jobs after graduation.
xi. Emphasizing accessibility, and using personal examples can be useful. There is a myth that there is no educational value to having a degree, when all the data show otherwise.

xii. We need to create an action plan that is deliberate and long range. We must reach out; we cannot solve this ourselves internally. Students and staff should also be engaged.

xiii. There is an upcoming AAUP conference on “Changing the Narrative.” It’s free, you just have to let them know you’re coming and they’ll give you lunch.

xiv. There is a Facebook group called United for UNC, where lots of info is available. Some faculty have suggested starting a blog.

xv. We should work with public teachers as well – we’re often viewed as the elite of the problem teachers.

xvi. It would be useful to have a repository of materials, to serve as a resource for data, updates, etc.

xvii. Mark Lanier offered his support for this important conversation, and a reminder about restrictions on the use of state recourses for political activities. (No mass emails, please.)

xviii. Chancellor Sederburg noted that there is an important line between conversation and advocacy. He suggested a small delegation of UNCW faculty to meet with BOG members and legislators, to help them understand possible consequences of recent actions in a serious face-to-face discussion. These are not bad individuals, and there is a basic support for higher ed, but they get swept along with the tides. He invited faculty to work with his office and Mark’s to coordinate. We need to bring the university to life.

xix. Faculty can also visit legislators during their office hours when they’re home. We can work to empower them, to feel that they’re helping education. They believe they’re doing the right thing for the institution.

xx. We also need to help the broader community understand in order to have a broader impact.

xxi. This conversation will continue.

Meeting adjourned 3:45
Senate Minutes
April 21, 2015
EB 162
President Lugo presiding
Call to order: 2:07
Quorum confirmed - 47

March 1 minutes approved with no objections or corrections.

I. President Lugo announced a change in the agenda to allow for a Special Order of the Day – nominations for Faculty Assembly delegates. The Faculty Assembly is an advisory board to the UNC system President. The FA meets 6 times during the academic year and provides the opportunity to meet with colleagues from across the system, learn about different institutions, and discuss our common challenges. The FA helps to make the system as good as it can be. With the upcoming change in the system President, exciting times are ahead. The UNCW Senate President is also a member of the FA delegation, and Stuart Borrett is continuing as one of our delegates. There are two openings for new delegates; the terms are for 3 years. The floor was opened to nominations. Nancy Ahern, Jeanie Pursuit, and Candace Thompson were nominated, with all in favor and no objections to the slate.

II. Chancellor’s Report –
Congratulations to the delegates, and to Gabriel, who will be serving as President-elect of the Faculty Assembly. Chancellor Sederburg expressed his thanks for the past year. The legislative session is going well, with good support for the enrollment growth dollars, a big ticket item for UNCW. There has also been support for giving campuses more flexibility with carry-over monies. The new bonding issue has not fared as well, although the Governor was in favor. UNCW is not on the list, but there is hope that a new Allied Health building will be added. One issue is that the bond vote may do better on a presidential election year. Max Allen will be leaving May 12, to take a position at Clemson to be Chief of Staff. A search committee is being formed now, with the aim of providing the new Chancellor with a couple of options. The same holds for our legal counsel. Ongoing searches for Dean positions have yielded four finalists in Education, and three in Business. The recommendation is that the new Chancellor should interview the finalists, and the selection should be his choice. These actions will probably take place over the next two weeks. There will be other administrative changes, but these can’t be announced yet. Chancellor Sederburg then introduced the new interim Provost, Dr. Marilyn Sheerer, and expressed his support for her.

Comments from Provost Sheerer – ECU’s Faculty Senate is much more formal in operations. Provost Sheerer has been spending time meeting folks on campus and in town. Her grandchildren go to Friends School, and she has met folks there. She reports hearing several messages in these discussions. People are still very positive about UNCW and what we do. We’re not broken – just in transition. Provost Sheerer applied for a position at UNCW once before. The timing wasn’t right then, but she likes this institution and what’s going on here, and she’s excited to be here. The trick is to determine what the problems are and can be done about them. She understands there are concerns that faculty haven’t been as involved in decision making as they should be, that certain units have been isolated, and that there has been a lack of transparency, especially with respect to budget. She spoke of sense-making, and the need to understand where each perspective is coming from. She anticipates that she and the Faculty Senate President may not always agree about how things are working, but promised to always be at the table. Her perspective will likely be different when she returns to the faculty. She will serve at UNCW from June 15 to next Aug, and looks forward to it, and to working with Faculty Senate. At ECU, she and the Chancellor there met with the Senate leadership prior to each meeting, which helped in making progress.

III. President’s Report –
Senators should keep an eye on the process for selection of the new UNC President and on BOG inserting themselves in searches for new Chancellors. The main focus for today will be on final policy approvals, some of which can be implemented right away and some of which will have to wait for implementation. There are still a few changes to the Faculty Handbook that will need faculty approval.

IV. Committee Reports –
A. From the UCC
   a. 2015-04-MO1 – department name change from FLL to World Languages and Cultures. Motion passed by voice vote.
   b. Catalogue and curricular change to the History minor. Vote was 49 in favor, 1 against. The motion passed.

B. From the Steering Committee
   a. MO 2015-04-MO2 – Final version of the Policies on Academic Freedom and Tenure. A faculty committee met with individuals from AA to work out final details in the document. Some changes were made in the language but not in the structure of the document.
      i. There was some push back on Senate decision (by a large majority) that the definition of senior faculty would be decided at the department level. The Senate previously voted down the suggestion that the Dean would decide. There were concerns about departments that have very few full professors, with worries about “take-over” by associates. The current wording now includes “decided in consultation with the Dean.”
      ii. With respect to the probationary period for tenure, the Senate originally voted on 2 years. This has now been qualified, given concerns on the part of the Chancellor and others. The current wording now specifies that a 2-year approval window would be a true exception and would require truly exemplary performance.
      iii. A statement was added to clarify that when a Hearings Committee member is excluded from considerations, s/he will not be included in the count to determine the quorum. Any objections to including this statement? No objections raised.
      iv. Some obsolete wording about the appointment of instructors was removed. We no longer have the rank or instructor. There were no objections to these deletions.
      v. It was noted that Senators should report back to their departments that when there is disagreement between the senior faculty and the chair regarding an RPT decision, both the senior faculty and the chair must write letters to go forward with the portfolio, explaining their decisions. This is now codified in the PAFT document.
      vi. It was noted that language is still needed to clarify steps in the appeal procedure to be taken when the CRPT Committee makes a negative RPT decision. This is an important issue.
      vii. A final vote on the document was called. The vote was 43 in favor, and 7 against, so the PAFT motion passed. The PAFT will go next to AA (who has indicated their approval), then to the Board of Trustees, and then on to the President’s office.
      viii. President Lugo thanked everyone for the time spent in extra meetings, all who spent so much time looking at the details, two super editors, the deans, provost, and special committee. This is an accomplishment for us, and it is important that these policies don’t become stagnant. A round of applause followed.

b. MO 2015-04-MO3 - Final version of the Faculty Handbook. President Lugo reviewed changes from the previous version of the Handbook.
   i. The new Policies on Academic Freedom & Tenure will be included once approved.
   ii. Wording for promotion to Professor (either regular rank of Professor or rank of Research Professor) – changed “tangible” to “sustained” to address situations in which a faculty member did lots of work early in her/his career, had an inactive period, and then was considered for promotion. The wording change was moved and seconded. The motion passed by voice vote.
   iii. Motion from the Research Committee – that the timetable and policies for promotion of Research Faculty will be established by the department with which the individual is affiliated. An amendment was offered – that “department” be changed to “appropriate academic unit,” because some faculty (e.g., CMS) do not have home departments. The amendment was approved by voice vote. The motion thus amended was then approved, also by voice vote.
   iv. Many other minor changes were reviewed.
   v. In reference to the CRPT disregarding information received outside of the applicant’s dossier, it was recommended that the word “additional” be changed to “unsolicited,” for clarification.
vi. Questions were raised about the wording with respect to a tie vote by senior faculty on an RPT decision. There was sentiment to remove the statement regarding a tie vote. A voice vote approved the deletion of the parenthetical statement about tie votes by senior faculty.

vii. RPT applications can now be done electronically, but this will be grandfathered in to avoid major shock. No portfolios will be rejected for now.

viii. With respect to reporting IDEA scores, it was noted that the response rates for each course really need to be included, or the scores are meaningless. A motion was made and seconded to include these data for each course. The vote was called – votes were 45 in favor, 2 against. Motion passed.

ix. A question has been raised about Handbook policy specifying that internship programs are limited to 6 hours. This policy has been in place since 1999, but starting in 2000 a number of departments increased their internships to allow from 1-12 hours. There should have been a concomitant change in the Handbook policy, but there’s no record of this happening. The policy has never appeared in the Catalogue. A Motion was made to change the language to specify that “internship credits awarded shall not exceed 12 hours”. It was noted that the Academic Standards Committee and the UCC should review the matter, and suggested (with a second) that the motion be referred back to ASC. However, doing so would leave the Registrar with no choice but to cancel courses already being offered, which would mean that some students would not graduate. It was noted that approving the motion wouldn’t prevent the issue from receiving further consideration later. The motion to forward to ASC was withdrawn. Motion on the floor is to change 6 to 12. An amendment to the motion was moved and seconded – to remove #1 in the present wording (where number of hours is specified) completely, which would give ASC time to consider. There were no objections to this amendment. A voice vote called – the motion passed as amended.

x. A vote on the entire Handbook was called. If approved, President Lugo will review all changes and align the Handbook with other documents. We should be sure to keep the Handbook updated, and work to have ongoing review of our policies. The vote was 44 in favor, 1 against. Motion passed.

xi. Thanks were expressed to all, for all the work. This is another big achievement.

C. From Academic Standards –

i. MO 2015-04-M04, and 04-05 – change in antiquated language. Both motions passed by voice vote.

ii. MO 2015-04-M06 – The BOG requires that we now look at SAPS. Starting this academic year, students with SAP difficulties were limited to 14 hours of registration. This impacted 155 students for the spring semester, many of whom had solid GPAs. This motion would create a new category for students with SAP issues, and not subject them to the 14 hour credit limit. The vote was called – 44 votes in favor, 0 against. The motion passed.

V. Senate President-elect Meinhold presented a plague to outgoing President Lugo, thanking him on behalf of all faculty for extraordinary service, leadership, and defense of shared governance. There was a standing ovation. President Lugo bequeathed President-elect Meinhold a copy of Robert’s Rules of Order.

Meeting adjourned 3:55.