

Faculty Senate Meeting
April 15, 2016 3-6pm DSU Boardroom

Senators Attending: Bob Winder, Rachel Holland, Linda Waldron, Costa Gerousis, Lynn Shollen, Betsy Jelinek, Hussam Timani, Leon Cole, Jessica Thompson, Linda Manning, Chris Kennedy, Jana Adamitis, Harry Grau, John Nichols; **GUESTS:** Mary Sellen, Shannon Phillips, Baxter Vendrick, Sean Connable, and Brian Puaca

- I. **Call to Order** by Adamitis at 3pm
- II. **Presentation by Baxter Vendrick, Director of Alumni Relations:**
Vendrick outlined the purposes of Alumni Relations: to inspire alumni to be actively engaged in the life of the university; cultivate life-long relationships between alumni and the university. To that end, Alumni Relations aims to enlist alumni (who are represented in all fifty states) to help in the admission process, develop chapters, and provide career mentoring opportunities. The University will also offer travel abroad programs for alumni and reunion events. Specific programs could include: a Greek Alumni Council, which would invite alumni back to help with chapters on campus; Honoring our Past, collecting memorabilia that aids in telling the history of CNU; CNC and CNU class rings design committees; Alumni Travel – in partnership with Senior Class Council 2016 Young Alumni European Trip -- working with travel companies first and then will reach out to faculty senate and schools for more advice (Adamitis suggested that alumni might allocate 10% of their trip cost to support study abroad scholarships and/or related initiatives); *Class Notes*, a supplement to *Voyages* publication; a Speakers Bureau; Lifelong Learning that includes MOOCs, Webinars, and lectures by faculty; Professional Alumni Chapters arranged by school or industry; Career Service Center support. Jelinek asked how Alumni Relations would recruit faculty for lectures for online learning; Vendrick remarked that they would work with each school to identify topics or professors that might be of interest to stated alumni interest. The Senate thanks Baxter for providing such a thorough representation of the Alumni Relations' ongoing efforts.
- III. **Update on Copyright Policy** -- Shannon Phillips and Mary Sellen: Sellen and Phillips sought to clarify the origins and reason for the copyright policy that had initially been brought to the Senate as part of a handbook change, only to be held back for further review. In general, the impetus for a stated copyright policy and an educational piece to aid faculty was to provide staff and administrators tasked with maintaining the library and Scholar with a mechanism to talk with faculty about potential copyright violations arising through library or Scholar venues. A 2015 committee comprised of faculty, staff, and administration researched and put forth a detailed packet on the definition of fair use that included both policy and educational language; however, only the policy language had been proposed for the handbook prompting some pushback on the process. While the handbook statement as to copyright is reworked, both Sellen and Phillips urged faculty to contact them to describe particular education practices and their correspondence with copyright law. A Lib Guide online is available as well. Several Senators

expressed great interest and support in more information about how to maintain copyright integrity within the necessities of education. The Senate thanks both Sellen and Phillips for their ongoing work on this issue and look forward to additional clarity moving forward.

Adamitis moved for recess; Jelinek seconded. Unanimous approval for recess.

- IV. **Senate Executive Committee Elections for AY 16-17 – Slate:** President: Jana Adamitis; Vice President: Chris Kennedy; Secretary: Michael Mulryan; Handbook: Lynn Shollen; and Parliamentarian: Harry Grau. Linda Manning called for a vote; Kennedy seconded. Unanimous approval for this slate. SEC Election Meeting adjourned; Adamitis moved Senate Out of Recess.
- V. **Approval of March 11 and April 14 Minutes:** Grau moved, Manning seconded for March 11 minutes approval (with minor grammatical emendations) 13 yeas, 1 abstention – motion for approval passes. Adamitis moved, Jelinek seconded for approval of April 14th minutes; 11 yeas, 3 abstentions – motion for approval passes.
- VI. **New Business:** Linda Manning moved to close session; Jelinek, second. Unanimous approval.
 - a. **Vote on 23 Faculty Development Grant Applications:** Linda Manning moved, Holland seconded. Unanimously in favor.
 - b. **Vote on Faculty Excellence Awards:** Linda Manning moved, Linda Waldron seconded; Discussion: Senators urge electronic submission, better articulation of parameters, and use of evaluation rubrics for next year. Eleven in favor, three abstentions. Approved.
- VII. **Unfinished Business**
 - a. Discussion of feedback on the curricular proposal [**See Questions and Responses below**]
 - b. Discussion of subcommittee recommendations for the Six-Year Plan: drafts of subcommittee recommendations will be placed on Senate scholar site.
 - c. Handbook Updates: changes have been forward to the Office of the Provost awaiting response.
- VIII. Manning **moved to adjourn**; Jelinek seconded. At 6:19 adjourned.

Faculty Feedback: Curriculum Questions and Responses

1. **Were there issues or questions in addition to those presented at the April 14th Faculty Senate Meeting for All Faculty?** *Response:* PCSE had asked what if a proposal were approved by the EPC (including the Provost) and funding makes it not viable? The Senate will address this issue when discussing the role of the Provost (see 7c below).
2. **Do we agree with the following subcommittee recommendations? Why or why not?**
 - a. **Establish clear roles for each committee whose charge has a curricular component:** *Response:* Agree. *Rationale:* Currently, committees are not described clearly in the *Handbook*; consequently, the recommendation aims to provide more specific language as to committees' directives as a way to eliminate redundancies that do not aid in the thorough review of proposals. The *Handbook* should address this in both Section VI for the curricular process and Section XIX for committee charges.
 - b. **Articulate responsibilities for committee chairs and secretaries.** *Response:* Agree. *Rationale:* Currently, in the University Handbook such clarity is not provided. The *Handbook* should address this in Section XIX for each committee's specific section.
 - c. **Require all committees to record outcomes and justifications in writing.** *Response:* Agree. *Rationale:* (Kennedy): In order to promote conversation among committees, faculty and administrators, such minutes are necessary. Moreover, the EPC is designed to resolve any lingering questions that have arisen from previous committee review and will need this information in the form of explanatory minutes. Shollen: Do we want votes recorded per person and by name or are these not part of the record? Adamitis: The Deans preferred that their names and votes are clearly recorded for the EPC; they also suggested the same for faculty members of the EPC. We don't need individual faculty members recorded on lower committee decisions
 - d. **Ensure that all curricular committees are included in the Handbook.** *Response:* Agree. *Discussion:* The Senate will need to add the college curriculum committees to the *Handbook*, Section XIX, and include them in the narrative portion of Section VI.
 - e. **Clarify the weight of each review. Implement a new process for addressing denials, approvals with conditions, or revisions at any level of review.** *Response:* Agree. *Rationale:* The proposed process is: anything other than an approval, then there is a written justification that then goes to the originating department. The originating department could then pull the proposal, revise it, or refuse to make changes and provide written justification for its decisions. In cases of revision or refusal to review, the proposal then goes back for further review by the committee that sent it back to the department; afterward, it goes on to the next committee.

Departments can appeal all denials at the lower levels to the EPC. If the EPC sends something back for revision – lower committees are notified but the process is not started all over again; the Comment Board will allow committees to weigh in. Discussion: Winder: If the EPC denies it, then is it dead? Kennedy: then it should be dead. Winder: Are we talking about support or not support?; Kennedy: Essentially, that is the process now; all committees make recommendations of support or not support, but the Provost approves or denies. Winder: So the EPC can deny; and a college deny; but the EPC is the appealer? Kennedy: There is no appeal after the EPC. Manning and several other senators: We are moving toward faculty taking more responsibility and accountability rather than just support or not supporting a proposal.

- f. **Review and revise all forms so that each reviewing body receives the information required for decision-making.** *Response:* Agree.
- g. **Develop an effective tracking system.** *Response:* Agree. Discussion: we will need to work out the system.

3. Do we accept the following recommendations? Why or why not?

a. LLC

- i. **No steering committee.** *Response:* Agree. Discussion: Senators noted that the suggestion that the LLC have a steering committee was made in the spirit of aiding the LLC's yearly workload, but the Senate will concur with the LLC's preference to remain without it. The Senate looks forward to the LLC's yearly report and recommendations on the state of the curriculum via its assessment of the Core.
- ii. **Edits to description of duties in the EPC Proposal.** The LLC has reviewed and edited the language regarding assessment included in the description of their duties in the original curricular proposal. Their edits reflect their current actual practice of a cyclical review of the Core with a focus on resource allocation and assessment outcomes.

b. UCC

- i. **Keep current curricular system but require written justifications for recommendations.** *Response:* Agree to written justifications.
- ii. **Address feedback issue by**
 - 1. **giving all faculty access to the tracking document.** *Response:* Current practice will only show support or not, not the justification that would initiate an intra-committee conversation.
 - 2. **educating chairs about sharing feedback.** *Response:* Education does not seem to be the issue as Chairs are not getting the feedback

3. **requiring the Provost to provide justifications.**

Response: Agree.

4. **Add a BAC rep to UCC.** *Response:* Disagree. *Response:* While, this might address some questions about university resources that could affect the curriculum, it would also be information provided by the provost at the EPC. Moreover, it would not necessarily improve the communication issue between committees and administration.
5. **What role should the Faculty Senate play in the curricular process?**
Response: The Faculty Senate would continue to have a role with regard to curriculum that results in Handbook changes. The EPC reports to the Faculty Senate on policies and procedures and individual faculty and departments are welcome to voice concerns to the Senate. However, the Senate has trust in the Curricular Committees and does not wish to centralize its role with regard to the curriculum.
6. **Should we create an EPC or keep the UCC? Why or why not? What are the benefits?** *Discussion:* Senators acknowledged the UCC's point about how the curriculum process benefits from multiple perspectives, but felt that the EPC continued this practice and encouraged more back and forth among the invested players in the curricular process as the EPC will serve as a reconciling body while promoting transparency and efficiency. Some senators expressed concern that while great work might be accomplished on a particular curricular committee, it might not be acknowledged by other parties in the review process. Consequently, senators noted, the proposal aims to generating ongoing curricular conversations throughout all deciding bodies. Senators characterized the proposal as an example of the faculty willing to collaborate with the Deans and Provost and that the proposal is putting in a system that ensures institutional collaboration that extends beyond immediate circumstances. Other senators noted how this would create elections of consequence for people with experience and culture of collaboration.
7. **If we should create an EPC... (Why or why not? applies to all ...)**
- a. **Would the EPC violate state law or other external policies, e.g., SACSCOC, SCHEV?** *Response:* No. Other schools in the state system have this kind of committee.
 - b. **Will faculty voice opinions in front of the Provost and Deans?**
Response: Yes. *Discussion:* Senators acknowledged the power dynamics that exist between faculty and administrators, but that these dynamics would exist if both operated on separate curricular review committees or if both operate on the same curricular review committee. The EPC would offer the opportunity for faculty and administration to collectively review prior committees' assessments of curricular proposals and engage in a face-to-face conversation that drew from their unique and complementary perspectives on the rationale and resources necessary for a vibrant curriculum.
 - c. **Do we accept the Deans' recommendations?**

- i. **Provost is a non-voting member of the EPC with independent final vote.** *Response:* If the Provost has any independent vote, s/he should not be on the EPC; if the Provost is not on the EPC, the Vice-Provost will be there as a non-voting member to represent the Provost's Office.
 - 1. **Does the Provost vote on everything, or does the Provost have veto power?** *Response:* The Senate recommends that the Provost has veto power, but not the power of appeal. *Discussion:* Senators discussed the written public record that the Provost would leave via justifications of vetoes; whether "Veto" is the proper term; would the Provost only deal with major issues, not minor changes given that the deans will know about resources; how the Provost is still in charge of curricular revision, but it allows for more faculty buy-in by placing the EPC in the conversation; whether Provost could suggest revisions (no, was the consensus).
- ii. **Chairs consult with Deans before submitting proposals.** *Response:* Agree
- iii. **EPC records names for votes, records thorough minutes and submits both to Provost for consideration with his vote.** *Response:* Agree. Simple majority vote. Cole: Do we need a quorum? Adamitis: Excellent point. Yes. We also have to complete business by the end of the academic year.
- d. **Should we increase CSS membership to 3?** *Response:* Yes.
- e. **Should the EPC chair be a faculty member** *Response:* Yes
- f. **What should the EPC secretary do? The tracking administrator?** One should be in charge of maintaining minutes and communicating results to lower curricular committees and the other maintaining the records and flow of information
- g. **Do we need a student member on the EPC? If so, should the student vote? Should the student be from the MAT program?** *Response:* No. *Rationale:* It is unclear what perspective such a member would provide at this level of curricular review that would be crucial.
- h. **Should Honors course proposals go to the EPC?** *Response:* No. The Honors Program often needs to expedite the course approval process to accommodate last-minute changes to the schedule. The EPC will most likely not be able to work as quickly as needed. Therefore, course proposals will move directly from the Honors Council to the Provost or designee.
- i. **Should we have an EPC comment board?** *Response:* Tabled. *Discussion:* Senators spoke for the need for some filtering and comment process that would require moderating. Questions included: What about a comment just to the committee rather than a comment board? Would it bother anyone to have this part of the

minutes? Comment board anonymous or not? Some senators expressed some concerns about anonymity, because the committee might need clarification about a comment. Adamitis posited that perhaps proposals need to be made available to the faculty five business days prior to the meeting with communication of comments to an EPC member.

- j. **Junior faculty representation on EPC?** *Response:* Untenured faculty, lecturers and instructors can be involved in curriculum review at all other levels (department, college, LLC, UWC, ISAC) where they are more protected.

- 8. **Should we delay implementation of changes until AY 17-18? What would we gain? lose?** *Response:* No. *Rationale:* The Senate agreed that we should maintain momentum and, given the copious feedback we received and discussed, saw no advantage to additional delays.

- a. **If we have an EPC, what happens to the current UCC members? Do they automatically transfer to the EPC?** *Response:* The Senate decided that we should maintain momentum and move forward this fall, provided that the administration agrees with our proposal. If we do replace the UCC with an EPC for AY 16-17, we will hold a new election. It did not seem fair to move the current UCC members to the EPC for two reasons: (1) Not all faculty will feel comfortable serving on a committee with administrators, as the UCC pointed out. (2) The UCC did not support the creation of an EPC, so moving its members to a committee that they opposed would not be appropriate on any number of levels. We also thought that it would be unfair to exclude lecturers in AY 16-17. Even though senior and master lecturers can serve on the EPC, we will not have completed the promotion process by the time we need to populate the committee. So for the first EPC election we will allow lecturers who are eligible for promotion to senior lecturer to serve.

- 9. **At least one meeting per month during the fall and spring semester, along with a training session.** *Response:* Agree.

Manning moves that the Proposal be voted upon. Jelinek seconding. Vote to amend for presentation to the Provost: Unanimous approval.

[**Emendation/Update:** The proposal will be negotiated with the Provost over the summer and the resulting version will be presented at the August Faculty Senate/All Faculty meeting during Getting Started Week.]