

Faculty and Institutional Affairs Committee
Meeting Agenda

Tuesday, February 28, 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 January 24, 2017 ([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
 1. Report on Electronic Portfolio Use in Tenure and Promotion Procedures ([Appendix B](#))
 - C. Health, Safety, and Environment Subcommittee – Dr. Jessica Abbott, Chair
- VII. Old Business
 - A. Guide for Administering Surveys at UNCP; Guest: Chunmei Yao ([Appendix C](#))
- VIII. New Business
 - B. Discussion of Library (role, support, holdings, etc.); Guest: Dean Swanson

IX. Announcements

X. Adjournment

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

Appendix A

Faculty and Institutional Affairs Committee

Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, January 24, 2017

UC 213

Members present: Dr. Jesse Peters (Senator and Chair), Dr. Dennis McCracken (Senator), Dr. Joe Sciulli (Senator), Dr. Mitu Ashraf (Senator), Dr. Xinyan Shi (Senator), Mr. David Young (Senator), Mr. Carlton Spellman (reporting for Mr. Steven Arndt (Vice Chancellor for Finance & Administration), Ms. Brittany Sandefur (reporting for Ms. Wendy Lowery, Vice Chancellor for Advancement), Dr. Elizabeth Denny (Chair of Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee), Dr. Jessica Abbott (Chair of Health, Safety, and Environment Subcommittee)

Members absent: Dr. Scott Billingsley (Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs), Dr. Scott Hicks (Senator), Dr. Polina Chemishanova (Senator), Dr. Bill Brandon (Chair of Faculty Development and Welfare Subcommittee)

Also attending were: Ms. Jodi Phelps (Executive Director University Communication and Marketing), Ms. Nancy Crouch (Associate Vice Chancellor Information Resources Chief Information Officer)

Recording Secretary: Mr. David Young (Senator)

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Jesse Peters at 3:34 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes of November 22, 2016 meeting

The minutes of the November 22, 2016 meeting of the Faculty and Institutional Affairs Committee were approved.

III. Approval of Agenda

Approved without additions or corrections.

IV. Report from the Chair

Chair Peters reported the following:

*Attended retreat on Student Success & Enrollment at COMTECH (December 19, 2016). The focus of the retreat was to identify strategies to improve enrollment at UNC-Pembroke.

*The University has eliminated the men's soccer program

*Dr. Zoe Locklear is no longer Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Dr. Scott Billingsley is Interim Provost and Dr. Stuart Thomas will be the Associate Provost.

*Dr. Sara Simmons will retire as Faculty Senate Chair (and from the University) at the end of the academic year.

*The MBA program will be using Academic Partnerships.

*A Committee has been formed by the senate and met two times to study Blackboard, Moodle, and Brave Space. There seems to be a consensus that a new LMS may be needed.

*There has been no further word about e-portfolios. For now, physical/paper portfolios remain in use. Additionally, no further action on electronic student evaluations of faculty teaching.

*For the next FIAC meeting in February, Dr. Chunmei Yao, Director of Institutional Research, will provide updates on the policy for distributing surveys.

V. Reports from Administrators

A. Dr. Scott Billingsley (Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs)

No report.

B. Mr. Carlton Spellman (substituting for Mr. Steven Arndt, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration) reported the following:

*New Canon copier/printer machines have been installed in some campus buildings

*Printing concern emails/phone calls are directed to Business Services instead of the Division of Information Technology Help Desk.

*Copier fleet (for faculty & staff) switched carriers. Student fees pay for printing, toner, etc.

*Business Services is looking at how to change printing in certain areas.

*It was discovered that the Computer Lab in the Library was spending approximately \$1,100 per month just for toner. A Canon printer/copier is now located in the Library's Computer Lab.

*Business Services wants to get rid of laser printers. They are looking at what other campuses charge for printing. The Library and Business Services are partners in the project right now.

At this point, David Young was asked to speak about concerns about the printing issues going on at the Library. Specifically, the issues involve a lack of print cards (only \$3 or \$5 print cards offered, as \$1 print cards are not offered to students/patrons anymore), the long periods of time it takes to get replacement cards, and the current Canon copier/printer default printing settings. Currently, the defaults are set to color and double-sided. The defaults should be black and white and one-sided. Ms. Nancy Crouch listened to the concerns that were raised and would take them back to her Division. They're hoping to have Phase 1 (changing printing in residence halls) done soon.

Ms. Crouch stated that if patrons have any printing questions/concerns, they should contact either the DoIT Help Desk (x6260) or Joey Locklear in Business Services.

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

*Hurricane relief fund available now for both faculty/staff as well as students. For faculty and staff, approximately \$18,000 has been raised thus far. For students, about \$24,000 has been raised thus far.

*Ms. Caprice Lengle is the new Corporate and Foundations Manager at UNCP.

*For the Capital Campaign, a Business School Working Group has been assembled to help name the new Business School on campus. There is a \$13 million dollar goal by the end of the year.

VI. Reports from Subcommittees

- A. Dr. Bill Brandon (Chair, Faculty Development and Welfare Subcommittee)

No report.

- B. Dr. Elizabeth Denny (Chair, Faculty Evaluation and Review Subcommittee) reported that the Committee continues to look at the use of e-portfolios for faculty evaluation. Print portfolios continue to be used until further notice. FERS is looking at what other UNC System schools do on their campuses regarding portfolios. Western Carolina University still use paper portfolios. FERS is looking at advantages of paper versus electronic portfolios.

- C. Dr. Jessica Abbott (Chair, Health, Safety, and Environment Subcommittee) had no report other than to mention that their Subcommittee would meet next in early February.

VII. Old Business

None.

VIII. New Business

Ms. Jodi Phelps reported to the Faculty and Institutional Affairs Committee about the new Media Policy which is being implemented on the UNC Pembroke campus. Specifically, she reported the following developments regarding the proposed policy:

*Mr. Joshua Malcolm, University Counsel, sent out draft of policy for review by faculty and staff to comment.

*Jodi and her staff read changes and she met with University faculty and staff who suggested changes.

*There were some questions as to why the University needed a media policy.

*Jodi stated that there needs to be a specific distinction between official University positions (Chancellor Cummings and/or Jody) versus faculty and staff opinions. In other words, if asked to be interviewed by local broadcasters, faculty and staff should not speak for the University in an official capacity. If approached by broadcasters wishing to do a story, it would be advisable to contact Jodi or officials in her office for advice.

*Jodi indicated that one of the Brave Book initiatives was to look at all University policies and see if we have all the information that we need.

* The committee members discussed the issue and provided further suggestions for revisions to the policy.

IX. Announcement

The next meeting of FIAC will take place on February 28, 2017 at 3:30 p.m. in UC 213. Additionally, Sara Simmons and Chair Peters will be presenting to the Faculty Senate membership a seminar on teaching and service, and they want to see how attendees will respond. The event will occur at COMTECT on February 8, 2017.

X. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

David Young
Senator and Recording Secretary

[Return To Agenda](#)

Appendix B

FINAL REPORT FROM THE 2016-2017 FACULTY EVALUATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE (FERS) REGARDING ADOPTION OF ELECTRONIC REVIEW FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

At the present time FERS recommends retaining paper portfolios for promotion and tenure evaluation.

The reasons for our decision are as follows.

1. On behalf of the full subcommittee one of our members met over winter break with Ms. Nancy Crouch, Associate Vice Chancellor for Technology Resources and Chief Information Officer for the Division of Information Technology (DoIT). The main purpose of the meeting was to investigate the possibility of developing a “homegrown” electronic system to manage the tenure and promotion process as we thought a homegrown system would be significantly less costly than purchasing specialized commercial software. Ms. Crouch discouraged the development of a homegrown system and cited many of the same security concerns FERS had previously discussed in our Interim Report presented at the November 22, 2016 FIAC meeting. FIAC members will recall security concerns were also mentioned at the January 24, 2017 FIAC meeting that Associate Vice Chancellor Crouch attended. At the very minimum, Ms. Crouch recommended that any system include Shibboleth login.
2. A member of FIAC sent a draft proposal outlining a possible homegrown system to FERS for consideration at our January meeting. Because the meeting with Ms. Crouch had already occurred before the draft was received by FERS, we did not seek her input on it although we did discuss the draft at our meeting. In essence, the draft proposed placing the password-protected portfolio and evaluation materials for each candidate on the shared faculty drive and distributing a common password among each set of evaluators assigned to review each candidate. FERS was unable to endorse the draft although we did appreciate the lower cost aspects of the proposed system. As discussed in the FERS November Interim Report, security AND access for each evaluator at the proper time per the *Faculty Handbook* Calendar of Events are priorities for us. While lower cost is certainly appealing, in our view nothing should trump those priorities.
3. Dr. Scott Billingsley, Interim Provost, reports there is no funding available to purchase faculty evaluation software at the present time. Based on our preliminary investigation, it certainly appears purchased software will be expensive. And, of course, if we choose to go that route, it will not be a one-time expense but will be an annual expense.
4. The university is obtaining a software package produced by DigitalMeasures called Activity Insight to track faculty activity for accreditation and other reporting purposes. According to Dr. Elizabeth Normandy, Associate Vice Chancellor of Planning and Accreditation, the cost of the software license will be grant-funded (at least for the immediate future) and we will not obtain the module related to faculty evaluation. It seems prudent to first examine how well this software works for recording UNCP faculty activities before proposing additional spending for electronic tools related to faculty evaluation. This system should go live

sometime this summer according to Dr. Normandy. If, after a sufficient trial period it appears this software works well for all of our disciplines, it *may* be reasonable to consider purchasing additional modules from this company (assuming there is strong support across the faculty for adopting an electronic system for T&P review.)

5. The university is in the midst of making a decision about which LMS to use. The investigation FERS undertook of Blackboard during the fall semester suggested it was not suitable for use in T&P evaluation. It *may* be the case that a different LMS could be employed for this purpose (although it is important to keep in mind those tools are designed primarily for *student* use.) Although we are unsure if the discouragement by Ms. Crouch related to the development of a homegrown system will stand with a new LMS, it seems reasonable to allow the choice of LMS to be determined before proceeding.
6. At the January 24, 2017 FIAC meeting, it was suggested electronic promotion and tenure review might be able to be conducted within the PeopleAdmin software UNCP's Office of Human Resources uses. The FERS chair contacted HR and was referred to Ms. Joanne McMillan, HR Consultant, who is assigned responsibility for the Online Employment System. Ms. McMillan referred the chair to Mr. Benjamin Simmons, Director of Employee Relations and Workforce Development. Mr. Simmons asked for a workflow diagram of the promotion and tenure process. Because the flow diagram a member of FERS had developed in the fall was a bit confusing (confusing even according to the member who developed it!) the FERS chair also developed a narrative description of the process. This description included dates of access for various evaluators. After studying these documents, Mr. Simmons determined it would be "awfully difficult" to use the PeopleAdmin software for this purpose. In addition, even if it could work, he indicated the new workflow system we would require would have to be designed by the software company and that would come at a cost.
7. As part of our work we sought information about the use of electronic portfolio review at a number of UNC-system schools (N=11) Out of the 11 schools we investigated, only 3 are using electronic systems for promotion and tenure review although a number do use specialized software to record faculty activities. All three institutions that use electronic review for T&P are using "homegrown" systems. (NCSU, UNCC, and UNCW; UNCW implemented its system this year and has not yet completed one review cycle.) For more information, please see the table entitled, "Information Gathered by FERS Members from a Sample of UNC-System Schools." As can be seen in that table, individuals we spoke to at the three schools using electronic systems cautioned that developing a homegrown system is very time-consuming. The individuals at NCSU and UNCC (the two schools with the most experience in this area) further cautioned that there WILL be a need for ongoing troubleshooting---weekly meetings are held at NCSU. Although it isn't possible to log into the NCSU system, the FAQs and other links under HELP on this site may be instructive to those who wish to know more. <https://rptonline.ncsu.edu/help> At the very least, examining materials from this link may help to underscore the complexity of this issue.
8. Two faculty members serving on FIAC have suggested to FERS that all the reports and rebuttals should remain as paper and be routed as the candidates' portfolios are now, and that

only portfolio materials submitted by the candidates should be available electronically. As discussed in our November Interim Report that would solve some problems but it would also completely change the character of our T&P process. Evaluators above the level of the department are expected to consider the departmental reports (chair, PEC), any optional rebuttals, and candidate-submitted portfolio materials as a package. So, for example, if candidate-submitted materials are available electronically to the PTC but reading those other reports requires a trip to the Office of Academic Affairs in Lumbee Hall, it is possible weeks or even months could separate the reading of the portfolio and the reading of the reports. We do not believe encouraging such practice is consistent with approved T&P policies. For example, page 85 of the *2016-2017 Faculty Handbook* provides the following description of the Promotion and Tenure Committee's work:

The Promotion and Tenure Committee receives the Chair's Evaluation Report, the Peer Evaluation Report, the Dean's Report, (plus any rebuttals of these), and the candidate's portfolio from the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The Committee may request any additional information that it deems necessary. It examines all facets of the application, reaches an equitable final decision in accordance with the provisions of the Faculty Evaluation Model, prepares a report on the candidate, and completes a Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form.

A candidate's record should be evaluated in terms of documents submitted to the Committee and using the area weights given on the Self-Evaluation Report (as completed for tenure and/or promotion). The Committee may consult with the candidate, the Department Chair, the chair of the Peer Evaluation Committee, and administrators to obtain additional information about a candidate, as it deems appropriate.

The Committee's final recommendation, as indicated on the Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form, should be an independent judgment based on a synthesis of the overall record.... the Committee should give very strong consideration to a set of consistently favorable annual evaluations from the Department Chair during the years prior to the tenure decision. In such cases, the Committee should have very compelling countervailing evidence to justify a recommendation against tenure and/or promotion. The Committee should also give strong consideration to norms in the candidate's discipline as represented in the Peer Evaluation Report, the Department Chair's Report, and any optional external reviews.

Taken as a whole, we believe this excerpt makes clear the need to consider all materials together; thus, separating the reports from the portfolios seems unwise. If we do wish to institute a separation, we should be able to explain why that change will improve the validity and fairness of the decision-making process. As noted in our November Interim Report, convenience for the PTC seems an inadequate rationale for such a change.

FERS is sympathetic to the demands placed on members of the university-wide Promotion and Tenure Committee. We are aware the chair and current members of the PTC believe portfolios ought to be available electronically. We also understand the

Calendar of Events for Tenure and/or Promotion in the *Faculty Handbook* sets aside the period from December 15 to April 1 for the PTC to review portfolios, to reach consensus on each application for T&P, and to write individual evaluation reports. While it has been reported there are only 10 faculty members going up for tenure and promotion consideration this year (source: Faculty Governance Committee minutes, January 17), we are aware that some years there are a great many portfolios for the PTC to consider. We do understand under the current system the five members must physically go to the Office of the Provost and Academic Affairs to review all portfolios. We also understand portfolios can be reviewed only on Monday through Friday from 8AM-5PM (and only on days when the university is open which likely limits review time in December and January). Nevertheless, FERS is not convinced that there is a pressing need to “go electronic” *right now* especially as current budget issues would likely mean funding this initiative would take funding away from other faculty-supported priorities. Using paper portfolios does not seem to pose an undue burden on Department Chairs or on Peer Evaluation Committee members. Deans are likely not unduly inconvenienced by the use of paper either. Finally, the majority of UNC-system schools use paper. Thus, while we are sympathetic to the heavy demands of PTC service at UNCP, we believe retaining paper portfolios for the present time is most prudent. After the many moving parts are in place (LMS, Digital Measures/Activity Insight, budget stability re: NC Promise and other legislative mandates) FERS will be happy to re-examine this issue.

INFORMATION GATHERED BY FERS MEMBERS FROM A SAMPLE OF UNC-SYSTEM SCHOOLS

Institution	Electronic portfolio for P&T?	Comments
AppState	No	Electronic components (e.g. flash drive, DVD) allowed in documentation as artifacts. All forms of documentation stay in dept and are not circulated

		among evaluators outside the dept. Only the narrative paper “dossier” is circulated.
ECU	No	Uses a paper-based system.
FSU	No	Paper system very similar to ours used
NCCU	No	DigitalMeasures/ Activity Insight used to record faculty activities in the School of Business only but all colleges and schools use paper portfolio for P&T review.
NCSU	Yes	Homegrown system (WolfTech) developed and maintained by the Information Technology division of the Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering. According to Katherine Stewart, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, the system requires ongoing attention from IT. Weekly mtgs are held. Shibboleth login used as was also recommended by our DoIt. Although it isn’t possible to log into their system, the FAQs and other links on this site may be instructive to those who wish to know more. https://rptonline.ncsu.edu/help
UNC-C	Yes	Each college/school (C/S) has developed its own electronic system. (Each C/S has its own IT team) According to Alex Chapin, Office of Academic Technologies for the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, developing their system (eRPT) was quite labor-intensive. Version #2 is working better than V#1 but still requires attention from IT. System uses Shibboleth login as was also recommended by our DoIt.

UNC-CH	No	PeopleSoft used for evaluations EXCEPT major evaluations like P&T, which are required to be done in paper.
UNC-G	No	According to Dean Kiss, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, UNC-G has talked about going electronic but no decision has been made. Discussions continue.
UNC-W	Yes, starting this year	Developed its own homegrown system using Share Point. Carol Ellis, Assistant to the Provost will be happy to provide information on the success of the online review system at the end of the semester. Only pdf documents allowed.
WCU	No	Some colleges/schools use a faculty activity database (FAD) for minor evals. But all C/S still use a paper portfolio (dossier) for P&T. Even if FAD is used, the resulting report is printed out for P&T review. Supporting materials (SEI data, for example) are placed in in a in a “two-inch, three-ring binder” while the FAD report is attached in a “manila envelope.”
WSSU	No	Paper documentation placed in 3 ring binder, no more than 2” thick

[Return to Agenda](#)

Appendix C Guide for Administrating Surveys at UNCP

Authority: Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

History:

- First Issued: [September 1, 2016]

Additional References:

- [UNC Pembroke Institutional Review Board](#)
- [Qualtrics: Additional Information](#)

Contact Information: Director, Office of Institutional Research – 910.521.6295

1. PURPOSE

1.1 Campus-wide surveys target the members of students, faculty, staff, and alumni at UNCP. The routine surveys provide essential feedback of our students' learning experience, quality of academic supporting programs and services, and work experience of our faculty and staff. The results are reviewed by department chairs/deans, and central administrators and used for further improvement.

1.2 The purpose of the survey policy is to provide guidelines and central clearinghouse for campus-wide survey administration to help minimize the occurrence of survey fatigue, reduce oversampling of students and employees, increase survey response rates, and finally improve the quality of surveys.

2. SURVEY ADMINISTRATION

2.1 Campus-wide surveys usually target a class of students, faculty, staff and/or alumni. Some of these surveys are required by UNC General Administration (e.g., GA Graduating senior survey) and UNCP central administration (e.g., seniors' future plan); some are involved with national consortium/associations (e.g., National Survey of Student Engagement); others may be administered by individual committee, department/program or school/college.

2.2 Campus-wide surveys which are mandatory by UNC GA system or UNCP central administration should be led by the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) for survey design, preparation, administration, analysis and report. The results can be used for improvement in institutional planning, program and services, assessment and Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) at UNCP.

2.3 Campus-wide surveys which target a class of students, employees, or alumni should be approved in advance by OIR unless they meet one of the following **exceptions**:

2.3.a. A locally developed survey which targets a group of people who have used a given service or attended a specific program/event and for which the survey owner already has the contact information.

2.3.b. Surveys are conducted by faculty, staff or students as a part of their research/projects, or course assignments. The survey administrator may contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for further approval if it is necessary. More information about the IRB can be found at <http://www.uncp.edu/academics/research/institutional-review-board>.

2.3.c. Institutional elections.

3. SURVEY REVIEW AND APPROVAL

3.1 Survey review should focus on whether the survey design, description, questionnaires, and administrative procedure follow the sound practice. The review of survey requests may take up to two weeks once all materials are received. Materials listed below include:

3.1.a. The purpose of the survey.

3.1.b. Description of the targeted population and sampling procedure.

3.1.c. Schedule for administration of the survey.

3.1.d. Survey questionnaires.

3.1.e. The contents of emails including one invitation and three reminders to be used.

3.2 If an anonymous survey is conducted, the survey administrator needs to clearly address the anonymous issue in the invitation letter; meanwhile, personal information (e.g. name, ID, department/office and email address) should not be identified and tracked through the survey contents and procedure.

3.3 If a survey needs to collect personal information (e.g. ID, program/department), in the invitation letter, a confidential agreement should be addressed and the results should **not** be reports at individual level.

4. SURVEY SOFTWARE

4.1 UNCP offers an online-survey tool for faculty, staff and students through [Qualtrics](https://www.qualtrics.com) (<https://www.qualtrics.com>). This software allows for creation, distribution, tracking, and summary of online surveys. It has the capability to build surveys with several question types (including single choice, multiple choice, yes/no, rating scales, skip logic, and open ended questions). The survey links are then emailed to targeted groups or placed on a website (e.g., student portal or student learning management system) for completion. Data are conveniently stored in spreadsheet/PDF format and reports are automatically generated.

4.2 Technical support and survey consultation are provided by Qualtrics team and OIR staff. After approval by OIR, each individual should be able to create their own online surveys and administer the surveys themselves.

4.3 Other types of survey tools, such as Survey Monkey are allowed to use for campus-wide surveys. However, the survey consultation and technical support may not be available from OIR.

[Return to Agenda](#)