

Faculty Senate Minutes
Dec. 8, 2015

President Meinhold presiding
Meeting called to order 2:02

Approval of the November meeting minutes was postponed to allow time for consideration: a link to the minutes was sent this morning, along with a link to Sharepoint for materials from relevant motions.

- I. Special order of the day – election of the Senate President for next year. Vice President Clements solicited nominations from the floor: nominations included Steve Meinhold and no others. Vote on the motion to re-elect Meinhold was unanimously in favor.
- II. President Meinhold: Thanks to the Provost for the administrative assistant allocated to the Faculty Senate (20 hr/week of support) and to Sarah Watstein for use of Library Room 1043 for Senate and Senate Committee use. Applause from the floor.
- III. Chancellor's report: Good afternoon. A press release from the Education Trust presented an analysis of 2001-3 and 2011-13 graduation rates for whites and minorities. UNCW was # 8 in the country (with NC State at # 10). We are closing the gaps, and this is a major accomplishment by our faculty -congratulations. The Watson College was #4 in on-line MA programs – another major kudo. We are now in a position to announce that we'll be providing almost \$1 million in salary increases to our faculty, which will recognize some of the hard work being done. Congratulations – faculty should be notified soon of the amounts and who will be receiving it. The hope is there should be twice as much for next year as long as things (e.g., enrollments) hold steady. Things also look positive for legislative increases. Questions from the floor: Is this for lecturers and full-time faculty? Response: Yes, with increases based on merit, and approved by the deans. Question from President Meinhold: Could you clarify the start date for the salary increases? Response: Dec. 1 – the increases will not be retroactive to July 1.
- IV. Provost's report: Today's report will focus on the enrollment increase money that came to AA, and how it's being allocated to units. (Link to Provost's slides.) Enrollment growth = 9.8%.
 - A. Rick Whitfield and I have met with George Schell and the Senate Budget Committee and will continue to do so.
 - B. Money from CITI funds was slotted into specific components by the CITI Committee last year, and Rick had to present to GA on exactly how the money would be spent. 38% was allocated to Excellence and Equity for faculty & staff, and faculty cluster hires aimed at certain programs were specified (3 or 4 hires). These were not things we were able to change.
 - C. GA calculates the money we get using the 12-cell matrix and its manual specifies how the money will be broken down – 42% to instructional salary costs, 19% to other Academic Support, 7% to the Library, and 33% to General Institutional Support (totaling about 67% for academic areas). In the past, UNCW hasn't gotten all of the money to academics that should have been.
 - D. Allocations are now out to the academic units. The RN-BSN program received 48% of the 11.2 million due to the large growth in that program, there were small slices to

other units based on that program's growth (e.g., departments providing other required courses), and then there were allocations to many other units. 28 faculty positions are going out, most to CHHS.

- E. One-time allocations (\$3.8 million) have just been completed; these include dollars from unfilled positions across the university. Previously the lapsed salary went to Academic Affairs, but now it's staying with the deans. One-time allocations included 15% for major scientific equipment, 12% for library facilities, 11% for faculty startup, 9% for Watson, 7% for DegreeWorks software, 5% for classroom repair, 4% for Adobe Creative Cloud, 3% for Cameron, 6% for Other.
- F. Comments:
 - 1. George Schell - we're starting to rely on enrollment growth as if it were a normal appropriation, but we need to be thinking about revenues in general. Enrollment growth is not a straightforward set of state appropriations. The more we understand this and are involved, the better.
 - 2. Mark Spaulding – We are having a better, more open process than has been the case since I've been here. It's a tribute to the Provost and the Chancellor that we're having these discussions. Applause.
 - 3. President Meinhold – We've received necessary information, but we also appreciate the sincerity and timeliness of the response.
 - 4. Provost Sheerer – We want the Senate Budget Committee to be more continuously involved throughout the entire process.

V. President's report:

- A. I've received questions about the appropriateness of Senators sending ideas, links, etc., to other faculty Senators. This is completely appropriate and doesn't need my filtering. I will be working with IT for a mechanism to allow this to happen.
- B. A Faculty Assembly report will be part of the agenda for future meetings – report today by Jeannie Pursuit – Our regular meeting on Dec 4 was recent meeting included a panel discussion about student success and after lunch, a refocus on the role of the Assembly. Hot button issues include salaries, assessment reporting, and PTR. The BOG is always interested in academic advising. Incoming President Spellings was given two books; FA Presidents Steve Leonard and Gabriel Lugo will meet with her soon, and she has indicated she'd like to do more listening than talking. Other issues include work on the Academic Affairs Fellows RFP, and policy research that would allow FA to be proactive rather than reactive. The NC Guaranteed Admission Program will be a topic of conversation with our administrators here so that they can represent our views. All campuses have concerns about this policy and how it will impact our students of color. We need to make sure that our Emeritus policies are clear. PTR continues to be an important issue; review of the on-line training program indicates that the BOG is not confident in our ability to do our own peer review. Please ask one of your representatives if you have any questions.

VI. Committee Reports:

- A. University Curriculum Committee – Nora Reber, Chair:
 - 1. Recommendation to reconsider a motion that was tabled last time. Objections to removing the table at this time? None
 - 2. UCC did reconsider the motion regarding the name change for GAG (Motion 2015-12-MO1). The Committee is still in support, after considering statements

from several parties. Statement from Doug Gamble - about 50 % of our department's faculty are involved in oceanography, and we have a healthy program in the area. Oceanography is an interdisciplinary field, which is true of our department's approach.

3. The motion was called after a request for any debate. The motion carried in support of changing the department name to the Department of Earth and Ocean Sciences.

B. University Studies Advisory Committee – Paul Townend, Chair

1. Motion 2015-12-MO1 – Encouraging departmental participation in the USAC Curriculum Review

a) The original University Studies Report emphasized the importance of ongoing review of the curriculum. There are many strong points about the curriculum as it stands, but concerns and questions have risen, including: the curriculum is complex and difficult to advise; choice is good but it may have become unwieldy; some US categories don't seem to be working well and may need revision; too many learning goals; some inconsistencies and delays in articulation of transfer credits; the current population of the categories may actually be reducing our student's exposure to different ideas. These are big picture issues, and there are some tensions/conflicts across the six concerns. The goal is to keep the US curriculum effective for everyone. As part of the review process, the USAC will be sending to all programs: a link with annotation to the data being considered by the Committee (survey results, OIR data, data from within the USAC, and senate motions); a map of how the program feeds into the curriculum; recommendations for individual categories of the curriculum and possible changes to them. The USAC is asking for reflection by the department through mid-Feb, and then feedback from departments will be requested. The plan is to collate this feedback and then discuss findings with the Senate in April. The USAC is going to propose some changes, and will then need time to implement. The motion here is asking for endorsement of the process.

b) Discussion from the floor:

- i. One of the deep conceptual changes responsible for the US revision was that this would be a living curriculum - not that a new static thing be put in place. The idea was that it would be ongoing. We should be talking about US all the time, with less stress levels because it's ongoing (vs. major changes).
- ii. Support for the point about the dynamic nature of the curriculum. Hope folks will approach this with the same spirit.
- iii. One major concern is that the dynamic seems to be in the growth direction.
- iv. A serious concern academic advising when there is a moving target.
- v. Rumors about changes to different categories are disconcerting – there is a feeling of vulnerability just when we thought we had some good ideas worked out. Will there be discussion on changes or will we just get a memo?

- vi. Any changes will have to be approved by this body, and proposals will only follow input from departments.
- vii. Change for change's sake is not the idea. Half the students on the senior survey said they had no idea about the purpose of the US curriculum. We have to do this.
- viii. Is there any possibility of moving in the direction of guiding principles vs all the specificity?
- ix. The basic model - categories with learning outcomes – will not change. It's more about which categories are working and which aren't.

c) President Meinhold - Would anyone like to speak against asking departments to take this seriously? This was all good discussion for the USAC to hear. All in favor of the motion – motion passes.

2. Motion 2015-12-MO2 – Course Recommendations for USAC

a) Thanks to the departments who held off on changes in this “pause” year. The USAC still reviewed about 100 proposals, many of which were submitted before we hit pause.

b) Discussion from the floor:

- i. I appreciate the work done. The pause is important to us. Then I have to wonder about the length of the list submitted. Why not really pause?
- ii. Every course reviewed was either submitted prior to announcing the pause, or submitted with some critical need. We tabled some that raised questions that we knew we would be reviewing, and we've let departments know about that. This is it though. We won't be reviewing more in the spring. Most of the courses are in the competencies. There are a couple of new clusters, and new courses for old clusters, but these seemed to address graduation issues. A decision to table all of these would be understandable, but we wanted to help departments.
- iii. Did you consider prerequisites? That's a common issue in advising.
- iv. That's a larger issue, but many of these were for competencies needed in the majors.
- v. How many of these courses are already existing? Two don't seem to have been approved – PBH 299 and ACT 490.
- vi. There's a parallel process between US and course approval. Courses are held until both are approved before they go into the catalogue. A few of these changes are to meet articulation requirements or other transfer needs.
- vii. How can I approve a course for which I haven't seen the course description? It's just a title. I could not find the materials. As of this moment, I have no information.
- viii. Part of this is procedural with something working its way through two systems. Would we want to recommend that one process must occur before the other?

- ix. That would mean some adjustment to deadlines for submission of materials.
 - x. I endorse the point that we can't approve for US courses or prefixes (like ACT) that don't yet exist.
 - xi. One could make a motion to remove those courses and prefixes that have not previously been approved by this body.
 - xii. Moved that Act 490 and PBH 299 should be removed from this motion, as well as any others that do not exist. Motion was seconded.
 - xiii. I understand the strategy to have two processes occur simultaneously. Could we conditionally approve?
 - xiv. Is this a substitute motion? Or are you arguing against the motion?
 - xv. The USAC would be happy to bring these particular classes forward again, after they have been approved.
 - xvi. The motion to amend by striking courses that do not exist from the list motion was called and approved.
 - xvii. Back to discussion of motion on the floor, to approve the rest of the list (as amended) -I do have some concerns that in a "pause" year, many of these courses have the same problems that are now being reviewed.
- c) The motion as amended was called and passed.

V. Business and announcements

- A. No old or new business
- B. Meetings of the Senate for the Spring happen on the 3rd Tuesday of each month, and Steering will meet 2 weeks ahead, to allow time for consideration of motions.
- C. Parliamentary procedure - We will be electing 3 Faculty Assembly delegates. Voting will be done via ballot. Nominations could take place in January, with Senate approval. We need at least 2 and no more than 4 nominations for each spot. No opposition.
- D. Motion to go into closed session for personnel discussion: Advising the Chancellor on Provost search.