

Faculty Council Minutes

Minutes

September 29, 2011

Present: *Ex officio* - Michael Green (Faculty President), Ed Jernigan (President Elect), Judy Walker (Secretary), Charles Bodkin (Past President), Randy Haldeman (Arts & Architecture), Alice Tseng (Business), Heather Lipford (Computing & Informatics, Alternate), Bob Rickellman (Education, Alternate), Terry Xu (Engineering), Mary Nies (Health & Human Services), Susan Peters (Liberal Arts & Sciences), Robert Tyson (Liberal Arts & Sciences, Alternate), Barbara Tierney (Library), Joan Lorden (Provost), Tom Reynolds (Dean, Graduate School), Melba Spooner (Associate Dean, College of Education), Robert Johnson (Dean, College of Engineering), Nancy Gutierrez (Dean, College of Liberal Arts & Sciences), Henrietta Thomas (Director, University College), Christie Amato (Associate, Dean, College of Business), Yi Deng (Dean, College of Computing & Informatics);

Unit Representatives - Casper Wiggins (ACCT), Dennis Ogburn (ANTH), Jeff Balmer (ARCH), Janet Williams (ART), Jian Zhang (BIO), Dennis Livesay (BIOINF), Xiuli He (BISOM), Tom Schmedake (CHEM), Joe Kuhns (CJUS), Richard Leeman (COMM), Pam Lassiter (COUN), James Frazier (CS), Bharat Joshi (ECE), Ellen Sewell (ECON), Mark D'Amico (EDLD), Meg Morgan (ENGL, Alternate), Keener Hughen (FINN), Andy Bobyarchick (GEO/ES), Gregory Mixon (HIST), Roy Fielding (KNES), Mike Doyal (LCS), Mike Olsen (LIB, Alternate), Betty Ladner (LIB), Alan Dow (MATH), Greg Wiggan (MDSK, Alternate), Kent Curran (MGMT), Linda Swayne (MKTG), John Allemeier (MUSC), Eddy Souffrant (PHIL), Beth Racine (PHS), Yasin Raja (PHYS, Alternate), John Szmer (POLS), Jane Gaultney (PSYC), Amy Good (REEL), Julia Robinson-Harmon (RELS), Xintao Wu (SIS), Susan McCarter (SOC), Kelly Anderson (SPED), Jeanmarie Higgins (THTR, Alternate)

Also Attending - Clarence Greene (Academic Affairs), Jay Raja (Academic Affairs), Mary Pat Young (Academic Affairs), Leslie Zenk (Academic Affairs), Valorie McAlpin (Center for Teaching & Learning), Connie Martin (Extended Academic Programs), Susan Sell (Graduate School), Janet Daniel (OASES), Christopher Knauer (Registrar), Ted Elling (Student Affairs), Denise Dwight Smith (University Career Center)

Guests - Richard Lambert (Center for Educational Measurement and Evaluation), Eric Sauda (Faculty Information and Technology Services Advisory Committee), Heather McCullough (Chair, Faculty Information and Technology Services Advisory Committee)

Absent: *Ex officio* - Phil Dubois (Chancellor), Ken Lambla (Dean, College of Arts & Architecture), Nancy Fey-Yensan (Dean, College of Health & Human Services), Stanley Wilder (University Librarian); *Unit Representatives* - Veronica Hilliard (AFRS), Johnny Graham (CENG), Kim Jones (DANC), Ed Morse (MENG), Lucille Travis (NURS), Murray Webster (SOWK)

The meeting was called to order at 12:31, President Michael Green presiding. President Green introduced the new officers. He also informed the assembly that notes from the August 16th open faculty meeting following Convocation are available on the new Faculty Governance site (<http://facultygovernance.uncc.edu/faculty-council/agendas-minutes>).

- 1. A motion to approve the minutes of the April 21, 2011 meeting** of the faculty council with two minor typographical changes what made by Souffrant and seconded by Fielding. The motion passed unanimously.
- 2. Consent Calendar objection: Course and Curriculum proposal GRAD 10-15-10**

Last spring during the transition to his new position, President Green inadvertently missed an email objecting to a graduate course proposal that was on the consent calendar. When he discovered the error over the summer, he tried to stop a course that had already been implemented which was not very effective. Since then a very productive conversation with the Graduate School took place, which addressed the concerns and answered the questions in regard to the objections. So to close the loop we

have a motion to approve a course retroactively a graduate course that was on the consent calendar last spring. The motion brought forward was as follows:

Recognizing that the consent calendar procedures were not followed, and that the objection raised by the unit (MENG) has been resolved to their satisfaction, it is proposed that the item GRAD 10-15-10 from the May 26, 2011 consent calendar be approved *ex post facto*.

The motion was seconded by Dr. Xu. There was no discussion of the motion, which was approved unanimously.

3. Motion to change the name of the Department of Engineering Technology

Dr. Green has been informed that faculty are not empowered to change names of departments. What we will be voting to endorse the name change to the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor. So the motion that comes from the FEC was:

I (Robert Johnson) request that the Department of Engineering Technology be renamed the Department of Engineering Technology and Construction Management. This change is recommended so that the unit is more accurately described. Over the last few years we have added a BS in Construction Management and a MS in Construction and Facilities Management. It is important to have a name that better describes the unit for both student recruiting and public relations purposes.

The motion was seconded by Dr. Kuhns. There was no discussion of the motion, which was approved unanimously. Dr. Green will send forth the endorsement of the name change.

4. Elections and Appointments:

A. According to the Faculty Standing rules the Faculty Council is directed to elect two specific people (the President and Past-President) as alternates to the Faculty Assembly. Ed Jerigan moved that Charles Bodkin and Michael Green be elected alternates to the Faculty Assembly. The motion was seconded by Meg Morgan. Charles Bodkin would be the #1 alternate and Michael Green would be the #2 alternate. Faculty council approved the motion unanimously.

B. Appoint President's slate to Ad Hoc Committee on Adjunct Faculty Voice

President Green would like to appoint an ad hoc committee to study the voice of our adjunct faculty with the governance system at UNC Charlotte. He does not have any preconceived out for the committee but has tried to put together a committee of really good people. All of the names being forwarded for committee membership have come to him highly recommended as being very bright, highly motivated and have sufficient time to dedicate to the task.

The committee can work one of two ways. It can be a President's ad hoc committee, which he could appoint and they would be working for him. Or the Faculty Council can appoint the committee and if they decide to do so it would be a committee that represents the work of the Faculty Council and would report to them. President Green would prefer the Faculty Council appoint the committee. The charge and membership slate were distributed with the meeting agenda. The charge describes in detail what the committee is to do and there is a report date that begins sometime in December. They must hold public hearings with each of the colleges and their term ends with the last council meeting in the spring. At that time Dr. Jerigan, incoming Faculty President, could elect to continue the committee's work with the Faculty Council's approval or he could choose not to.

Motion to approve the charge and membership slate for the Ad Hoc Committee on Adjunct Faculty Voice was forwarded by Nancy Gutierrez and seconded by Ed Jerigan.

Discussion:

A member pointed out that Dr. Green did not appoint members by colleges or departments. She is concerned that colleges with a lot of adjuncts are not represented. The reason he did not was because he did not see this as a college-by-college issue but a campus wide issue. He just wanted to get the best people on campus to try and figure out how adjunct faculty can become a part of the faculty governance system. He also didn't want a overly large committee which might get bogged down.

“What does adjunct mean?” Dr. Green indicated that part of the committee’s charge is to find out if there is a common vernacular that can be used for the multiple classes we call adjunct (non-tenured, part-time faculty, lecturer, etc.). It would be very helpful if they could find nomenclature to be used across departments and college.

“Did you consider including someone who is not a PhD?” Dr. Green was asked this same question after he had put together the committee. He did consider but no one he talked with recommended anyone that fit that category. Faculty Council can add volunteers.

“Are there additional charges that you have given this committee?” Yes, they are laid out in the document that was distributed with the agenda. There is also a format for holding public meetings.

“Has everyone on the slate agreed to be part of the committee?” Dr. Green has not talked personally to everyone on the slate but he has been assured they would be willing to serve on the committee.

Motion was approved.

5. Discussion of Motion from FITSAC to FEC

- A. The final report from the Faculty Information and Technology Services Advisory Committee in regards to end of semester student evaluations recommends:

UNC Charlotte should consider the adoption of a university-wide, web-based course evaluation system for both formative and summative evaluations. Access to course evaluation data in a timely manner will allow faculty to make course revisions as needed for greater student success and improved learning. Additionally, administration of a centralized course evaluation system is encouraged to allow for greater comparison of data across colleges, departments, and disciplines, economies of scale, and increased access to reporting features.

The overall savings for the University would be \$175,000 per year.

- B. Heather McCullough, current chair of FITSAC gave a brief history of this project. Dr. Richard Lambert, Director of the Center for Educational Measurement and Evaluation, reviewed the results of the pilot study. Valerie McAlpin from Center for Teaching & Learning and Dr. Eric Sauda, chair of the FITSAC subcommittee were also present to answer questions. The complete report as well as the power points used can be found at (<http://studentcourseevals.uncc.edu>)

- C. *Discussion* (Dr. Lambert responded to most of the questions but Valerie McAlpin also responded. This was a very robust discussion, which was difficult to capture in minutes. An audio of the entire meeting is available at -----)

- What does web-based mean? Same content as the print based form but it was delivered via Student Voice, an online survey program.
- Is it possible to evaluate multiple faculty within the same course section? Yes, that can be done.
- Did you include large classes (200-300 students)? Not sure.
- Was there a method for policing for those taking online? No, there wasn’t and this does cause a problem. It may have caused the higher response rate in the face to face. But then we currently don’t police the administration and student still self-select.
- Was there any self-selecting? Yes, it was possible that some students completed both version of the evaluation. Developed very detailed instructions on how to oversee the process. We even offered to send graduate assistants to help the administer the evaluations. The data doesn’t indicate that there was a significant impact from this. There was not real bias with the electronic version.
- What are the big advantages other then financial? If you want to use the instrument for formative improvement, online is much more timely.
- What is the long term effect since the literature indicates that response rate are low? Response rate at another institutions dropped at first but then rose again because of a change in culture. It

became part of the accepted practice.

- How often were the open-ended questions used? The qualitative analysis in the distributed report hasn't really been completed and has been removed from the online report.
 - Dr. Lambert indicated there are bigger concerns about student evaluations that really need to be addressed. Such as how much weight is put on the ratings should be reviewed.
 - Is the instrument really any good? Is it worth moving a poor instrument to digital? Yes, immediate access to an online database will make it easier to improve the instrument.
 - What about the human effect? The move to digital evaluations seems to be inevitable, but the ones most affected will be the non-tenured faculty. We need multiple ways to measure teaching effectiveness. (Meg Morgan)
 - Will the measurement issue cause a problem? Is there anyway to measure that effect? We could ask students to fill out both online & paper to see if there is a difference.
 - What about using clickers, doing it class, have it go back to teaching center,
 - Does the literature address how to enhance response rate of online? Can we include that in our approval? (Greg Wiggan)
 - Do we know under what the conditions the students took the survey? Any research on how the conditions (such as time of day, location, etc.) effect the evaluation.
 - Can the instrument still be adapted to individual departmental needs? There are a couple of common questions but the rest can be adapted to the department. The use of the common questions varies greatly across campus so that issue needs to be addressed. (Sue Peters)
- D. In bringing the discussion to a close President Green asked Valeric McAlpin when a decision was needed so the Center for Teaching had enough time to implement the new delivery system. Do we need to have a decision made at the October Faculty Council meeting or can we wait until November? Ms. McAlpin indicated we could wait until November. Green then instructed the Faculty Council & Faculty Executive representatives to take this discussion to their departments and colleges in October in order for the council to make a decision at the November meeting.

6. Report of the Chancellor (Dr. Philip Dubois) - None

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

- A. New Institutional Peers – We have to have a Board of Governors approved list of institutional peers. Peers are important because they will be used in some way to performance funding. The old group of peers has already been used in this way. The system has ready used at freshmen retention, degree production efficiency and graduation rate as performance measures. A new committee has been formed to look at the performance funding model again so we are not sure how things will look in the future. But in the past we were going to be rewarded with a small amount of money in the enrollment increase formula if we met targets for these measures. The state also used those same measures to reduce the funding to institutions. We are not exactly sure how these peers are going to be use but where we rank with respect to our peer institutions will be a factor in performance funding, setting tuition and setting targets for faculty salaries. We have tried to identify a set of peers within the restrictions that general administration gave us – within our Carnegie group, distributed across the country, etc. Tried to come up with a list of institutions that look pretty much like us in an urban setting with the same types of students, similar programs, etc. Tried to find institutions we would compare with reasonably when it came to retention, graduation rates, tuition and salaries. There are 17 institutions in the peer group with three peers designated as aspirational.

University of North Carolina at Charlotte Peer Institutions

Total Peers – 17 *Carried over from 2006 – 10 New in 2011 – 7 Aspirational – 3 (in **bold**)

Institution	City/State
University of Colorado - Denver	Denver, CO
Florida Atlantic University	Boca Raton, FL
Florida International University	Miami, FL
*University of Louisville	Louisville, KY
*University of Massachusetts-Lowell	Lowell, MA
*Western Michigan University	Kalamazoo, MI
University of New Mexico - Main Campus	Albuquerque, NM
*University of Nevada - Las Vegas	Las Vegas, NV
*Kent State University - Kent Campus	Kent, OH
University of Toledo	Toledo, OH
*Portland State University	Portland, OR
*University of Rhode Island	Kingston, RI
*The University of Texas at Arlington	Arlington, TX
*The University of Texas at San Antonio	San Antonio, TX
Old Dominion University	Norfolk, VA
Virginia Commonwealth University	Richmond, VA
*University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	Milwaukee, WI

- C. General administration will be looking at faculty workloads, which is a big issue with the Board of Governors, and the program approval process. Chancellor Woodward was asked to review the inventory of programs looking for unnecessary duplication. He didn't find any real duplication of programs. What he did find and will pursue with the Board of Governors, was that it is difficult to move credits between institutions. So the focus will probably shift to that and the issue of program duplication has been put to rest for now.
- D. Mid-term unsatisfactory grade reporting. Faculty need to either report they have no unsatisfactory grades in their class or they submit the grades. The faculty should also provide guidance in their class by talking to the students about what a D or F means. Advise them on how they can improve their grade and tell them to talk to their advisor.
- E. There is a new post graduate scholarship/fellowship is Carnegie Endowment for Peace for seniors who are interested in international relations, energy and the environment and other issues related to international peace. It pays \$36,000 and they get to live in Washington, DC The university's liaison to the program is Susan Sells.

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

Dr. Jernigan is working on identifying a nominee for Max Award.

9. Report of the President (Dr. Michael Green)

- A. There is a new faculty governance web site – <http://facultygovernance.uncc.edu>
- B. Going to institute an email specifically for the president of the faculty – facultypresident@uncc.edu . The address will follow the position and will begin to set up an archive of documents that can be passed on easily from one president to the next.
- C. Campus Safety folks will be at the October meeting to speak to safety issues.
- D. FEC motion that was tabled last April about community engage will be brought off the table later this semester.

Meeting was adjourned at 1:49 PM.

Respectfully submitted



Judy Walker, Secretary