Faculty and Institutional Affairs Committee
Meeting Agenda
Tuesday, January 24, 2017
UC 213

Members:
Dr. Jesse Peters, Senator and Chair
Dr. Polina Chemishanova, Senator
Dr. Dennis McCracken, Senator
Dr. Scott Hicks, Senator
Dr. Joe Sciulli, Senator
Dr. Mitu Ashraf, Senator
Mr. David Young, Senator
Dr. Scott Billingsley, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Mr. Steven Arndt, Vice Chancellor for Finance & Administration
Ms. Wendy Lowery, Vice Chancellor for Advancement
Dr. Bill Brandon, Chair of Faculty Development and Welfare Subcommittee
Dr. Elizabeth Denny, Chair of Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee
Dr. Jessica Abbott, Chair of Health, Safety, and Environment Subcommittee

Recording Secretary: Mr. David Young (Senator)

Order of Business

I.   Call to Order

II.   Approval of Minutes from meeting on November 22, 2016 (Appendix A)

III.   Approval of Agenda

IV.   Report from the Chair

V.   Reports from Administrators
        A. Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs – Dr. Scott Billingsley
        B. Vice Chancellor for Finance & Administration – Mr. Steven Arndt
        C. Vice Chancellor for Advancement – Ms. Wendy Lowery

VI.   Reports from Subcommittees
        A. Faculty Development and Welfare Subcommittee – Dr. Bill Brandon, Chair
        B. Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee – Dr. Elizabeth Denny, Chair
        C. Health, Safety, and Environment Subcommittee – Dr. Jessica Abbott, Chair

VII.   Old Business

VIII. New Business
A.Proposed Media Policy; Guest: Jodi Phelps (Appendix B)

IX.   Announcements

X.   Adjournment

The next meeting will be held on February 28, 2017.

Faculty and Institutional Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, November 22, 2016
UC 213

Members present: Dr. Jesse Peters (Senator and Chair), Dr. Polina Chemishanova (Senator), Dr. Dennis McCracken (Senator), Dr. Scott Hicks (Senator), Dr. Joe Sciulli (Senator), Dr. Mohammad Ashraf (Senator), Mr. David Young (Senator), Dr. Scott Billingsley, (Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs), Mr. Steven Arndt (Vice Chancellor for Finance & Administration), Ms. Brittany Sandefur (reporting for Ms. Wendy Lowery), Dr. Bill Brandon (Chair of Faculty Development and Welfare Subcommittee), Dr. Elizabeth Denny (Chair of Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee), Dr. Jessica Abbott (Chair of Health, Safety, and Environment Subcommittee

Members absent: Ms. Wendy Lowery

Recording Secretary: Mr. David Young (Senator)

I.   Call to Order

         The meeting was called to order by Chair Jesse Peters at 3:32 p.m.

II.   Approval of Minutes

         The minutes of the October 25, 2016 meeting of the Faculty and Institutional Affairs
         Committee were approved.

III.   Approval of Agenda

         Approved after the committee agreed to remove item A under Old Business: Guide for
         Administering Surveys at UNCP .

IV.   Report from the Chair

         Chair Peters reported that faculty received regarding how bonuses would be allocated.
         There has already been a half-percent across the board (one time) bonus to be sent to
         faculty. Additionally, as outlined in the letter, some faculty will receive a additional one-

time merit bonus in their November paycheck. The guidelines for determining those bonuses were not outlined in the letter.

There was an issue with the mission statement on the University website; the approved mission, vision, and core values statements had been removed. This issue was brought to the attention of the Executive Committee. The issue has been resolved through collaborative discussion with Academic Affairs.

V.   Reports from Administrators

A. Dr. Scott Billingsley (Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs) reported the following:

Associate Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management search is going well and rolling interviews are occurring.

Regarding the Provost Search, a job description will be posted soon.

Concerning student evaluations of faculty, there was lengthy discussion about why student evaluations are being reevaluated. There was some question about who has requested this change and why. Also, there was interest in improving the questions on the evaluations and delivery. Finally, there was some discussion as to the efficacy of student evaluations, as well as how the student evaluations could impede the pedagogical process.

At this point, Chair Peters suggested that we not focus solely on student evaluations, but reevaluate the nature of evaluations generally. Specifically, some of the questions raised included the following:

Why do we need student evaluations?
How do we do student evaluations?
How are student evaluations of instructors used?
Are student evaluations effective?

Scott closed his report by mentioning the SEP retreat for student success which will take place on December 12.

B. Mr. Steven Arndt (Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration) reported on the damage done on campus by Hurricane Matthew. The total cost of cleanup/repairs after the storm equaled one half million dollars. The Business Services Building was one of the hardest hit buildings on campus, and the repairs are ongoing. Finally, Mr. Arndt mentioned that he, Scott Billingsley, and Dr. Lisa Schaeffer led an effort to shepherd through a tuition increase request through General Administration.

C. Ms. Brittany Sandefur, reporting for Ms. Wendy Lowery (Vice Chancellor for Advancement) stated the following:

A "Hurricane Matthew" fund has been established with over $30,000 raised to this point. The money will go toward helping students, faculty, and staff impacted by the hurricane.

The annual mailer sent out to alumni & friends of the University requesting donations has been sent.

Upcoming events on campus include the lighting of Old Main (December 1), and the Alumni/Friends Holiday drop-in at Chancellor's Residence (December 3)

New Advancement staff include Caprice Langold and James Bass, GPAC Director. Also, a new Director of Museum of Southeast American Studies has been selected, but the name has not been announced as yet.

VI.   Reports from Subcommittees
A. Dr. Bill Brandon (Chair, Faculty Development and Welfare Subcommittee) reported that FDW would not meet again officially until February 9, but several discussion items had been received via email for the FDW to discuss in February. Those issues would include a 3 X 3 teaching load for teaching faculty (like the one used currently at Fayetteville State University), development of Lab Schools on the UNCP campus (Laura Staahl is looking into this possibility), and the ongoing discussion surrounding Academic Partnerships and its role in the development of online programs here at the University.

B. Dr. Elizabeth Denny (Chair, Faculty Evaluation and Review Subcommittee) reported on the ongoing discussion concerning student evaluation of instruction. Specifically, at the request of the Executive Committee, the Subcommittee examined changing the student evaluation instrument from strictly face-to-face to an online tool. Chair Denny distributed a sample spreadsheet to FIAC members showing the response rate to the SEI for online administration is quite low at UNCP. At this time FERS recommends retaining face-to-face administration. The other issue brought forward by FERS was the use of electronic portfolios. Dr. Denny shared some information on this topic, and further discussion ensued. Chair Peters suggested that Dr. Denny email a copy of the electronic portfolio information to him, and he would share the information with Provost Zoe Locklear (report available at the end of these minutes).

At this point, David Young made a motion to extend the meeting by 10 minutes. The motion was seconded by Dr. Joe Sciulli.

C. Dr. Jessica Abbott (Chair, Health, Safety, and Environment Subcommittee) reported that there are still discussions taking place on the Subcommittee about Live Safe App and how it is promoted on campus. Additional topics of discussion include the current UNCP smoking policy and the lack of enforcement, the use of skateboards on campus and the need for signage on campus, and the continuing existence of mold in the Dial Humanities Building.

VII.   Old Business

None.

VIII.   New Business

None.

IX.   Announcements

The next meeting will be held in UC 213 at 3:30 p.m. on January 24, 2017.

X.   Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Mr. David Young
Senator and Recording Secretary

Electronic Portfolios—Interim report

Adopting a requirement that portfolios for P&T be electronic may *seem* a simple matter. This question has been sent to FERS several times over the past 7-8 years and through extensive discussions, we have concluded it is anything but simple.

Here are some considerations from this year's work. We will continue to work diligently on the issue this year. However, I learned yesterday from an email thread sent to me by the Faculty Senate chair the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair has met with the Provost's office this month about implementing an electronic portfolio requirement. Given the apparent widespread interest in this matter, I thought I should provide a fairly detailed progress report to FIAC.

1.Two primary issues concern us the most—**Access and Security**

By <u>access</u>, we mean how will we ensure the proper people have access to the portfolio and have this access AT THE PROPER TIME? For example, the PEC should have access from no later than Sept 17 until around Nov 1. After the PEC report is signed by the candidate and the PEC chair and the TPR recommendation form is signed by the candidate, the PEC chair, and the PEC members, those reports become part of the portfolio. After that point, PEC members should no longer have access to the portfolio. The dean should have access to the portfolio (including the PEC and chair's reports, recommendations, as well as any optional rebuttals) from Nov 8 until Dec 1.

By <u>security</u>, we mean how will we ensure the portfolio is handled properly? Although paper portfolios are also subject to security issues, electronic portfolios can't be safeguarded quite like paper portfolios that are kept in a locked room. Of course, we do not want portfolio materials to be read by unauthorized persons. Nor do we want materials subject to being shared inappropriately by authorized persons. Finally, although it is troubling to think anyone associated with UNCP would act in such a nefarious manner, we do need to be able to ensure materials <u>within</u> the portfolio cannot be compromised, corrupted, or changed without authorization during the evaluation period. Even one such instance of behavior of that sort could call into question the integrity of our entire P&T process.

In addition, we want to *preserve the evaluation process we have adopted through proper channels* and not let the use of electronic tools *inadvertently* change this process without due consideration. (No dog being wagged by the tail, in other words.) For example, Chair reports and PEC reports are completed <u>independently</u>. The crucial need for such independence has been repeatedly emphasized by various Senate committees over the past 20+ years. The dept chair does not see the PEC report and PEC members do not see the Chair's report. How do we ensure once the chair report becomes part of the electronic portfolio, it isn't visible to the PEC? And vice versa? In addition, the faculty candidate has a right to write a rebuttal <u>to the dean</u> regarding the Chair and/or PEC reports. The rebuttal IS NOT seen by the party who is being rebutted. (The reasons for this have been discussed previously. I will be glad to provide more details if necessary.) How do we ensure chair and PEC access is cut off at the proper time (early Nov) so that rebuttals are not visible to those parties? Further, should the faculty candidate herself lose access once the deadline for portfolio submission has passed? (Aug 29 or next business day if the 29th falls on a weekend) This could be an important aspect of security as well as we do need to ensure ALL evaluators are judging the <u>same</u> set of candidate materials and that changes have not been made along the way. But if the faculty candidate no longer has access, how will she submit

a rebuttal to the dean? Would she submit a paper copy as is now done and would we require the dean to scan the report and upload it into the portfolio? Is that a realistic solution? What if a dean forgets to upload a rebuttal so the PTC doesn't see it?

Some faculty outside of FERS have suggested that all the reports and rebuttals should remain paper copies and be routed as the portfolio is now….that only the candidate materials should be available electronically. Admittedly that *would* solve some problems but it would also *completely change* the character of our process. As it stands now, the dean is supposed to evaluate all materials (candidate, PEC, chair, optional rebuttals) as a package. If the dean has access to the electronic portfolio weeks before he/she receives the reports, it seems highly unlikely the reports and portfolio will be considered "together." Similarly, the PTC is supposed to consider all materials (candidate, PEC, chair, dean, optional rebuttals) as a package. If the portfolio is separated from the reports, it is very unlikely the electronic portfolio and the set of reports locked up at AA will be considered "together" by the PTC. Please do keep in mind that dept reports (chair/PEC) provide the dean and PTC with necessary information about **disciplinary expectations**. Therefore, it seems risky to separate the materials. If we do wish to introduce a separation, we should be able to explain why that change will improve the process. Convenience for the PTC seems an inadequate rationale for such a change.

2.If we do adopt an electronic format, who will be "in charge" of ensuring the faculty are properly trained? As it is, there have been issues with training for P&T at UNCP. For example, far too often faculty are told things at training sessions or in conversations with dept chairs and deans that do not match the policies in the current *Faculty Handbook*. We do not want to make this situation worse.

Over the last several months, members of FERS have searched for literature on the topic of electronic portfolios (although we have NOT done an extensive lit review.) An FERS member reported to the group at our November meeting information gleaned from a published study put forth by a university that had converted to electronic portfolios. That study involved a six-year timetable for conversion so this kind of change cannot happen overnight. Points emphasized in the article included the need for faculty training and for buy-in from the faculty, and so on.

3.The study mentioned in #2 also emphasized the need for extensive support from the company providing the portfolio platform. In fact, an entire year of the six-year timetable was spent working with the company to customize the program for that university. If we do adopt an electronic format, who at UNCP will be "in charge" of serving as the interface with that company? In our opinion, there would have to be an identified "troubleshooter" as the P&T process is too important to be derailed by technology failures. However, confidentiality of faculty portfolio materials cannot be compromised by indiscriminate sharing during attempts to solve technology problems.

4.FERS looked at using the Bb portfolio option. It does not appear it will work for us, partly because of the issue of providing proper access <u>at the proper time and only at the proper time</u>. But even if Bb would work, Nancy Crouch has asked for a taskforce to be formed to examine our choice of course management software. (CAS chairs' mtg Nov 1) It would be irresponsible to recommend the use of a platform that may not continue to exist at UNCP.

5.Our examination of published research suggests that universities that choose to adopt an electronic portfolio format (certainly not all do) either A) purchase a program/site license for a program specifically designed for faculty portfolios or B) develop an in-house program.

So far as purchasing a program goes, some of you may remember our experience in Aug 2011 with Sedona. (The site license was purchased by Dr. Beverly King who at the time was in charge of the Office of Institutional Research. She felt it would simplify her required record-keeping.) Sedona did NOT work well for the purpose of record-keeping of faculty CVs. That program, developed for use in schools of business, had numerous quirks when used across different disciplines. For example, the kind of work typically considered scholarship in the Department of Mass Communication was labeled as a "non-intellectual activity" within the Sedona framework. In addition, Sedona pulled from the UNCP Banner database which has long been fraught with errors. It was not possible for a faculty member to override Banner data for her Sedona CV and so some faculty CVs contained the wrong names, wrong hire/promotion dates, and wrong years for degrees awarded. Not terribly useful for CVs! So far as I know, we never looked at that program with an eye towards using it to develop entire portfolios. But if a simple error-free CV cannot be developed within that program, it doesn't sound at all promising for full portfolio development.

Some of you may remember that due to faculty dissatisfaction with Sedona, FIAC was asked to provide a recommendation for a database system to Provost Kitts by April 2013. ActivityInsight, a product of Digital Measures was recommended. There were numerous conversations between then-FIAC chair Dr. Jonathan Maisonpierre and representatives from Digital Measures. The company presented a webinar to FIAC (which was open to the entire university community) in February 2013. FIAC spent an extraordinary amount of time on this issue during the 2012-2013 academic year and eventually did recommend ActivityInsight over Sedona. But again, it was not with an eye towards using it to develop entire portfolios; rather it was to be used for institutional record-keeping of faculty activities. In fact, in his report to the Senate Dr. Maisonpierre stated "let it be clear that FIAC is not endorsing the use of an electronic database, only that if the University chooses to purchase and use such a system, FIAC firmly believes that ActivityInsight is the superior product." Like Sedona, the program was QUITE expensive (or at least it was in 2013…I think the cost was in the neighborhood of $25,000 per year) and as you know it was never purchased. (Dr. King left the university and as I recall, she had been one of the main voices stating the need for the program.)

We have not yet begun to explore commercial "faculty portfolio" offerings that might meet our needs. It is pretty certain the program WILL be expensive. It is uncertain, however, if this sort of

expenditure would be supported at the present time. For example, it is hard to see what benefit STUDENTS would derive from their faculty having electronic P&T portfolios. It is also unclear how electronic portfolios would contribute to ENROLLMENT GROWTH, another institutional priority. Finally, it is also unclear how this expenditure would fit with other priorities already set in the Bravebook. Of course, it this is a high priority for faculty we should proceed, regardless of the Bravebook. But it will be an expensive undertaking. Further, as I recall with Sedona, faculty materials were stored "in the cloud" not on a UNCP server. That raised security issues. In addition, failure to renew the contract annually meant we would lose access to those stored materials so regardless of which program might be chosen, we likely will be a backup system (and paper copies.)

At our last meeting, a member reported she had spoken with a colleague at another school. That school had developed an in-house portfolio program. It consisted of varying "levels" of folders. Access was not bi-directional. In other words, someone at Level A could access only that level while Level B could access levels A and B but not C. If something like that could be developed here that fit with our rules, deadlines, cut-off dates and so on that might be workable.

Another member will talk with DoIt about developing a portfolio program in-house. I am not terribly hopeful we have the in-house expertise needed for such an endeavor but it is an avenue to explore. To that end, another member offered to develop a "flowchart" that might help to convey aspects of access to those unfamiliar with our Faculty Evaluation Model. (It is important to keep in mind that whoever we might work with at DoIT, it is pretty certain that person will not be familiar with our P&T processes.) The FERS member worked quite hard but eventually he recommended we abandon the flowchart (see last page) He concluded the flowchart looked like a wiring diagram and did nothing to clarify the process.

As you know, the Carter-Kitts P&T plan has been put on permanent hold. Next year (2017-2018) is the next date for the Chancellor to assemble a P&T 5-yr review group per GA requirements. It may be that no changes are recommended to our P&T system by that group. But over the years we HAVE made changes either from self-generated proposals within the Senate structure or as a result of mandatory 5-yr reviews. It is important to keep in mind a platform for faculty portfolios must be capable of changing and changing quickly if need be. This will require sufficient support from the commercial company or DoIt if the system is homegrown.

6.Not all materials (or even most materials) that are required to be submitted in the portfolio already exist in electronic format. For example, for obvious reasons, copies of annual chair evaluations signed by the faculty member and the dept chair are required to be submitted. Similarly various reports must be signed. In most departments, chairs and faculty don't have "electronic signature" options. We could acquire the ability for all chairs and faculty to sign electronically but this would add to the cost of converting to electronic portfolios.

Not all worthwhile scholarly publications faculty may complete are available electronically. Similarly, not all conference programs are available electronically, at least not immediately after

the conference. Student work is not always submitted to faculty electronically, especially in face-to-face classes. Finally, not all materials from community service work are available electronically. In those cases physical paper copies would have to be converted. Now that we have new "copy/scan" machines in each dept, conversion from paper to an electronic format could be done. Still, photocopying and then scanning into a pdf (as would be required for a book chapter, for example) or simply scanning likely will be more time-consuming than assembling paper copies of existing materials. It is also unclear just how much paper would be saved.

Authority: Issued by_____. Changes or exceptions to administrative regulations issued by the _____ may only be made by the _____.

History: First Issued: _____, 20___. Last Revised: _____.

Related Policies: POL 04.25.03 – UNC Pembroke Emergency Operations Policy

Additional References: [insert statutory references, website references, forms or other related information, with hyperlinks as appropriate]

Contact Info: Executive Director of University Communications and Marketing, 910.521.6533

Appendix B

PR 00.00.00

Media Policy

1. **INTRODUCTION**

   1.1 Effective communication with the media is critical to UNCP's ability to carry out its mission and promote continued public support for the university. Effective media relations best serve the university by

1.1.a. informing the region of our value;

1.1.b. promoting university achievements, activities and other events of significance; and

1.1.c. expanding the general visibility and brand reach of the university.

1.2 This policy is not intended for use in a punitive manner.

2. DEFINITIONS

2.1 Media: for the purposes of this policy, news media shall refer to representatives of newspapers, magazines, newsletters, online publications, television and radio.

2. **POLICY**

2.1 The Chancellor and/or executive director of University Communications and Marketing (UCM) serve as the official university spokespersons to convey statements and positions on behalf of the university.

2.2 The Chancellor or executive director of UCM may designate another university employee to serve as spokesperson on a particular issue.

2.3 UNCP recognizes faculty and staff have the right to speak with members of the media as individuals. No faculty or staff member may offer an official university position or statement unless authorized to do so.

3. GUIDELINES

3.1 During a crisis or emergency event interrupting operations, UCM shall handle all contacts with the media, and will coordinate the flow of information from the university to the public. In such situations, all campus departments should refer calls from the media to UCM. For more information on UNCP's Emergency Operations Plan, please see POL 04.25.03.

3.2 Members of the faculty and staff can and should respond to requests from the media in reference to their research, scholarship, teaching, expertise and professional and community

service. Faculty and staff contacted by the media should notify UCM immediately following such contact.

3.3 Because positive media solicitation is an integral element of the university's communications strategy, any ideas for articles or pieces that would positively portray the university, its work, and/or its community should also be directed to UCM. If a situation arises that may be newsworthy, please notify UCM as soon as possible to ensure a timely release of information.

3.4 To assist faculty and staff in preparation for effective interaction with media, professional media relations staff in UCM are available as a resource for requested interviews.

3.5 The associate athletic director for communications will serve as the sports information director and primary point of contact for athletics-related inquiries.

3.6 Faculty, staff and student organizations may select a spokesperson to speak on behalf of their organization. The organization spokesperson should speak on behalf of only the organization they represent, being careful not to provide official university positions or statements without authorization from the Chancellor or designee.

4. COMMUNICATING WITH MEDIA

4.1 Obtain the name of the person calling, the media organization and, if available, the anticipated time of release of information in print or broadcast. This information should be included when the notification is made to UCM.

4.2 Faculty and staff should refer media inquiries on the following topics to UCM:

4.2.a. legal issues;

4.2.b. requests about specific student or students;

4.2.c. personnel matters;

4.2.d. questions that would result in harm to others; and

4.2.e. a campus incident, crisis or emergency.