

Faculty Council Meeting Minutes – October 25, 2012

Present: *FEC* - Ed Jernigan (Faculty President), Eddy Souffrant (President Elect), Judy Walker (Secretary), Michael Green (Past President), Chandra Subramaniam (Business), Mirsad Hadzikadic (Computing & Informatics), Susan Peters (Liberal Arts & Sciences), Alan Freitag (Liberal Arts & Sciences), Heather McCullough (Library)

Department Representatives - Veronica Hilliard (Africana Studies), Dennis Ogburn (Anthropology), Mary Tuma (Art & Art History), Ann Loraine (Bioinformatics & Genomics), Jian Zhang (Biology), Xiuli He (Business Info. Sys. & Oper. Mgmt.), Tom Schmedake (Chemistry), Jim Bowen (Civil & Environmental Engineering), Richard Leeman (Communication Studies), Kok-Mun Ng (Counseling), Joe Kuhns (Criminal Justice + Criminology), Ellen Sewell (Economics), Sandra Dika (Educational Leadership), Arindam Mukherjee (Electrical & Computer Engineering), Liz Miller (English, Alt.), Scott Frame (Finance, Alt.), John Diemer (Geography & Earth Sciences), Gregory Mixon (History), Roy Fielding (Kinesiology), Fumie Kato (Languages & Culture Studies, Alt.), Heather McCullough (Library, Alt.), Rick Conboy (Management), Lin Yang (Marketing, Alt.), Yuanan Diao (Mathematics & Statistics), Paul Fitchett (Middle, Secondary & K-12 Educ.), John Allemeier (Music), Eddy Souffrant (Philosophy), Charlie Reeve (Psychology), Beth Racine (Public Health Sciences), Julia Marie Robinson (Dr. Rob) (Religious Studies), Jeff Balmer (School of Architecture), Susan McCarter (Social Work), Stephanie Moller (Sociology), Heather Lipford (Software & Information Systems), JaneDiane Smith (Special Education & Child Dev.), Steven Stines (Theatre)

Ex officio - Phil Dubois (Chancellor), Joan Lorden (Provost), Tom Reynolds (Dean, Graduate School), Christie Amato (Associate Dean, Graduate Programs), Mary Lynne Calhoun (Dean, College of Education), Robert Johnson (Dean, College of Engineering), Nancy Fey-Yensan (Dean, College Health & Human Services), Nancy Gutierrez (Dean, College of Liberal Arts & Sciences), John Smail (Dean, University College)

Also attending - Leslie Zenk (Academic Affairs), Matthew Wyse (Academic Affairs), Jay Raja (Academic Affairs), Cindy Wolf Johnson (Academic Services), Claire Kirby (Admissions), Bruce Auerbach (Faculty Ombuds), Johnna Watson (Graduate Enrollment Management), Janet Daniel (OASES), Christopher Knauer (Registrar), Cathy Blat (University Center for Academic Excellence), Sharon Thorpe (University Career Center), Evelyn Wingate (Extended Academic Programs)

Absent: *FEC* - Chance Lewis (Education), Ed Stokes (Engineering), Jeff Shears (Health & Human Services), Margaret Morgan (Liberal Arts & Sciences)

Departmental Representatives - Casper Wiggins (Accounting), Kim Jones (Dance), Ahmad Sleiti (Engineering Technology & Construction Management), Nigel Zheng (Mechanical Engineering & Engr. Sci.), Vasily Astratov (Physics & Optical Science), Bob Kravchuk (Political Science & Public Admin.), Amy Good (Reading & Elementary Education), Lucille Travis (School of Nursing)

Ex Officio - Ken Lambla (Dean, College of Arts + Architecture), Yi Deng (Dean, College of Computing & Informatics), Stanley Wilder (University Librarian)

The meeting was called to order at 12:35 PM by President Jernigan.

1. **Approval of the Minutes of the September 27, 2012 meeting of the Faculty Council.**

- Robinson moved and Moller seconded a motions to approve the minutes of the September 27, 2012 Faculty Council meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Motion to Award Posthumous Degrees

- The Faculty Executive Committee forwarded a motion to award posthumous degrees to Jordan Slusher (Religious Studies & Psychology), Shannon E. Smith (Psychology) and Cameron Shelton (Finance). Kuhns seconded the motion. Robinson spoke briefly in support of Jordan Slusher commenting that he was an excellent student. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Discussion (Dr. John Smail)

- An overview of the QEP was distributed to members of the Faculty Council with the agenda for review prior to the meeting. Dean John Smail led a discussion of the QEP plan. Dean Smail provided a brief overview/update on the status of the program. His primary objective was to address questions that the faculty had about the QEP and associated activities. The following is a summary of the discussion that followed.
- The QEP was developed in response to a SACS requirement and the upcoming SACS accreditation visit. The plan focuses on student engagement, especially academic engagement, initially at the freshman level. The QEP will be embedded in the freshman curriculum. QEP implementation will take place at the college level. Several colleges are teaching the courses this semester as pilot project.
- There are three core student learning outcomes: 1) commitment to success (meaning students can identify goals, develop strategies to achieve them and complete the goal); 2) inquiry; and 3) self and cultural awareness. Assessment will be built around these outcomes.
- The final report to SACS on the QEP is in preparation to send to SACS preparation for the March 2013 visit. Faculty input is an important component of the QEP development process.
- *Questions/Discussion*
 - Palmer commented that as one of the members of the 16 UNC campuses, UNC Charlotte is on the low end of the retention. He wanted to know if it was fair that we are compared to UNC, which is like comparing apples to oranges. Our students don't come as prepared as those who attend UNC. Dean Smail indicated that this QEP is not really targeted to retention. Retention may be a program outcome but what we are trying to do is improve the quality of student's academic experience. The QEP will help with some of the lack of preparedness. The objective of the QEP is trying to get students more engaged in their own academic careers. The question is, "given our students what do we need to do to encourage them to be more engaged".
 - Palmer then asked specifically is retention the primary measure of the success of the QEP? Smail – No, there are multiple outcomes measures. Some are student-learning outcomes others are program related. Retention is only one of the program measures.
 - Lorden commented there are still under discussion at the state level ten performance metrics that will be used by campuses. Eight of them are around student success such as retention, 6-year graduation rate, etc. The campuses have negotiated with General Administration some targets for these goals. In principle, we are measured based on comparison with peer institutions approved by the General Administration and on the goals we set. With respect to those peer institutions we are in the top quarter for retention; 6-yr graduation rate is still around 50%. The measures are not really extreme. To really make a difference in our retention rate, we would have to change our admissions requirements drastically.
 - Bowen wanted to know what happens at the course level? What extra data will be provided to the faculty teaching the course and what will be the process to analyze that data? Dean

Smail indicated that they are trying to maintain a balance between the needs of the students in specific colleges and also having one QEP for the entire university. Assessment of students within the colleges will be done at the college level, but we also have to have a broader assessment across the entire curriculum/university. There needs to be some consistency across the curriculum for those students who move from one major to another. Colleges will be able to evaluate their own students. But faculty participating in the QEP will also discuss what's happening across campus. They can share best practices, which can then be implemented within a specific college.

- Bowen followed up by asking what should his expectations for his students be? How should he compare students to the rest of the campus? Smail indicated there will be a tension between the campus level and the college level.
- Chandra asked if there was any consideration to class size? Dean Smail indicated they tried to define what a QEP course should look like. One key component is small group discussion but colleges have flexibility in how they implement small group discussion. It can take a variety of forms. Some colleges are doing using a one-credit free-standing freshman seminar. Others are attaching a learning lab to an existing 3-credit course.
- McCarter asked: Are you collecting baseline data now for comparison later? Dean Smail no not really because it's difficult to get it right now. At the present there is no real context to get that data. They are using NSSE survey of student engagement to some extent.
- Bowen asked: Where do we get the resources to meet the curricular objectives of the QEP? The simple answer is yes there are resources. Part of the planning included creating a budget. Units have submitted what they plan to do and how much it will cost to do it. It all depends on how the unit has created their QEP, is it being built on top of an existing curriculum or brand new. We will phase in the QEP in over a period of 2-3 years so as the curriculum is phased in for the students the resources will be there.
- Dean Smail encouraged members to read the overview, share it with their faculties and provide feedback.

4. Faculty Ombuds Office (Mr. Bruce Auerbach)

- Auerbach has been the University Mediation Coordinator for three years. The position of ombuds became final over the summer and he was appointed to the position for one year.
- The office is completely up and running
- The key points from his presentation included:
 - Articulation of guiding principles – independence; neutrality & impartiality; confidentiality; and informality
 - Exceptions to confidentiality – imminent risk of serious harm and he can be subpoenaed.
 - He will work on both large and small issues
 - He IS NOT a legal representative
 - His services are only for faculty and administrators that hold faculty rank
 - The position does not provide legal advice or psychological counseling
 - He is not an advocate for any specific individual
 - He is not part of the university grievance process
- For detailed information about the position and its services go to ombuds.uncc.edu or email him at bauerbach@uncc.edu

- *Questions*
 - How busy are you? He is busy now that we are back in session. The word is getting out about his services. This position is only 50% of his job. Currently there is daily work.
 - Do we need to make an appointment? Yes, that is best to make an appointment via email or voicemail. Don't include any confidential information in the communication. His office hours are 9-12 MT and 12-3 WT. But he will meet with folks off campus and on weekends.
 - Will there be any feedback as to what you see as trends and issues? Yes, an important part of the job it to provide the Provost with an annual report which would include this type of information. They are still discussing whether the report will go onto the website. He keeps statistics on gender, rank, how many meetings; etc. but will not include names.

5. Report of the Chancellor (Dr. Philip Dubois)

- Governor Perdue was on campus earlier today. She was trying to close the loop on things she was involved in such as the EPIC building and football stadium. There was a lot of media attention and she met many students.
- Strategic Planning at the state level
 - In the past campuses created a 5-year plan that fed into the system plan that was revised every two years with the biennial budget plan but that went by the wayside.
 - The Board of Governors is reconstituting the process in order to provide a strategic plan to the new legislature in January. They want to be able to articulate to the legislature where the system is headed, what are the priorities, etc.
 - There is a two level structure. The working group includes the several General Administration staff, a member of the Board of Governors, Fred Eshelman, and four chancellors. He is one of the chancellors so he is part of the main working group. The second group is a system wide advisory group, which is largely composed of members of the Board of Governors, Trustees, and community and business leaders. They meet in an alternating fashion. Both groups have had several meetings already.
 - The major issue under discussion seems to be whether a university education is designed to prepare people for work or if it is broader in scope. It appears that the discussion is resolving itself with an understanding that education is important to employment but it goes beyond that. Also part of the discussion is what are the state's goals for the portion of the population that will have a baccalaureate degrees or better and even associate degrees. This discussion is taking place within a national context as to what should the goals of higher education be.
 - The goals guiding the strategic planning process:
 1. set degree attainment goals responsive to state needs
 2. strengthen academic quality
 3. serve the people of North Carolina (research, applied research and technology transfer)
 4. maximize efficiencies (both administrative and academic)
 5. ensure an accessible and financially stable university system
 - Each goal has additional bullets/objectives. The entire document can be found at http://www.northcarolina.edu/strategic_direction/meetings/index.php?mode=browse_premeeting&code=strategic&mid=3765
 - Other chancellors on the working group are from Fayetteville State, UNC Wilmington and NC State.

- We are in the beginning of planning for the campus' third funding raising campaign.
- We don't know how much yet, still planning and discussing with our deans and key constituencies in the external community as to what level to set the campaign goal. We want it to be achievable but also aspirational. The overall economy will have an impact on the planning.
- In most funding raising campaigns about 90% of the money is restricted, one time endowments. So you can't just take a big chunk of it and put it in the budget.
- He will be hitting the road again. We are working with legislators all the time, but we are now trying to broaden our base with the business community, media, K-12 partners and our alumni. His team will be traveling to Rowan, Cabarrus & Lincoln counties.
- For the second time in its six-year history one of our faculty, Harold Reiter from the Mathematics Department, has won the Board of Governor's Distinguished Service Award for his work in the community. There will be a formal reception in January.
- The Chancellor noted the passing of E. K. Fretwell. He was chancellor for ten years before Jim Woodward. The Chancellor commented that we would be surprised to know how much was accomplished under Dr. Fretwell's tenure. Over half of master's programs came into existence. He was responsible for the development of the campus core. He was national presence in the field of higher education, which brought a lot of recognition for university. The family has scheduled memorial services for Nov 14-15.
- *Questions/Discussion*
 - Moller provided some feedback to the Chancellor on the strategic plan. She feels that we are always trying to prove our worth. She did hear much about serving the community in the goals. The Chancellor agreed with her. He indicated that our goals are stronger in that area and he thinks we will see more that come out of the committee discussions. We saw more of that in UNC Tomorrow but since there has been 50-60% turnover on board; 100% change in the office; and the President is relatively new to the position. There is essentially no one that remembers UNC Tomorrow. We are going through a re-education process and trying to get them back to what we have already discussion and agreed to do.

6. Report of the Provost (Dr. Joan Lorden)

- Updates –
 - Launched the award for community engagement. Last month put out a call for nomination and now have a great pool of nominees.
 - Grades not reported. She got a list from the Office of the Registrar of courses which were not reported and/or reported late plus a list of repeat offenders, defined as those who have been delinquent three semesters in a row. She is going to give the names to department chairs to find out why these folks are having trouble getting the grades in. There may be some legitimate reasons for the problem such as the nature of the course. She doesn't want to presume these people who are simply careless about their work. We need to find out what the problem is and see if there are any solutions to the problem.
 - Academics First (Faculty Assembly)
 - Faculty Assembly has approved revised policies and regulations that have been designed to improve the graduation rates.
 - Nov 8th the revised policies for the system will go before the Board of Governors and will probably be approved

- The regulations do not specify the caps on Withdrawals and repeats, but they do instruct each institution to establish caps. This will result in a cultural change on this campus.
- Promotion & Tenure process review
 - She has put together a committee chaired by Dean Calhoun, which includes Deans, Department Chairs, Faculty, and others.
 - The committee will be looking at the processes not the criteria/qualifications for reappointment, promotion and/or tenure.
 - The Provost commented that she receives a number of procedural questions. Our documents are not as clear as we think they are.
 - Dr. Lorden commented that when processes are complicated we tend not to follow them. And when we don't follow them, we wind up in some awkward situations.
- Changes in course scheduling
 - An examination of the distribution of classes during a semester shows that classes are over-scheduled in the high priority time period of 9:30 AM – 3:30 PM. The review was conducted by a group led by Associate Dean Lee Gray (Arts and Architecture)
 - The analysis showed that we have exceeded our capacity during that time.
 - After receiving the report from Lee Gray's group last summer and discussing the issue the Deans the Provost decided to accept the committee's recommendations
 - Two key recommendations of the report -
 - 40% of classes are to be scheduled outside prime time by college
 - 20% of classes should include a Friday class meeting. We have the lowest utilization of classrooms on Friday of any institution in the system.
 - The Deans Council has approved the recommendations.
 - The Provost realizes this is a very complex endeavor but we really need to do this to accommodate the needs of the students.
 - The data indicate that this is not a major change. The changes are more incremental in nature.
 - The Chancellor noted that the UNC system strategic plan includes a consideration of space utilization. How well we utilize our space, may determine if we get new buildings.
 - *Discussion/Questions:*
 - Moller commented that she thought that we went to a 4-day schedule so that we could have Friday for meetings. But has since found out that was not one of the reasons. It would be nice if we could have one day a week for service; two days for research; two days for teaching. The Provost indicated that we do try to reserve time for meeting but can't do it for everything. We did have a group of people who surveyed how Fridays were used at our sister institutions and made the recommendations. We never in fact decided to have a MW – TTh schedule. It just became the de facto schedule. We will have to choose carefully to see which classes are better MWF than TTh, which can be scheduled at 8 AM, etc. We need to give it a try.
 - There are desirable times to teach and we try to distribute these equitably. Will there be any written policies governing the distribution of class times? The Provost indicated that these would be college level rules. Remember we are talking about a distribution at the college level not the department level.
 - Peters asked: Will the percentage be based on number of courses or hours of usage? In the sciences most lecture classes are taught early so that they can schedule labs. The

Provost responded that the way it's stated is by classes but there are provisions for flexibility and variability.

- Ogburn asked: Won't late Friday afternoon be the hardest to fill up? The Provost has no expectation that we will have any classes other than theater and maybe dance after 2 PM on Friday. Won't that make it hard to achieve? The Provost responded "No, we are not really that far off from that now."
- Ng asked : What about other alternatives such as more intensive courses? The Provost commented "Yes, those are a possibility. We also need to think about how we do our hybrid courses."

7. Report of the President Elect (Dr. Eddy Souffrant)

- O Max Gardener award: He thanked those who are willing to service on the selection committee. Nominations have been received and they are working through the process.
- Strategic Planning at state level
 - There is not much faculty representation on the working groups. They are pushing to have more faculty representation on the committees. An advisory group has been created to which he as been elected. He is also on the Faculty Assembly Executive Board.
 - Much of the concern/discussion is about the transactional (i.e. preparation for a job) model/nature being put forward by the working groups.
 - The role of the advisory group will be to the articulate why transactional model doesn't fit well in the 21st century and faculty do much more than prepare students for jobs.

8. Report of the President (Dr. Ed Jernigan)

- Jernigan commented that there has not been as much widespread discussion of Strategic Planning among Faculty on our campus as on other campuses in the system. It is important for the faculty voice to be heard in the process. If you have feedback, ideas, concerns, etc. let Souffrant or him know about them. Go to the website to educate yourself and submit comments.

9. New Business – none.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:59 PM.

Respectfully submitted by



Judy Walker, Faculty Secretary