

**Faculty Development & Welfare Subcommittee**  
Thursday, April 13, 2017 at 3:30 PM  
233 Chavis University Center

**AGENDA**

**Membership:**

Bill Brandon, NSM (to 2017), Chair  
Terrence Dollard, ARTS (to 2018)  
Doug McBroom, NSM (to 2018)  
Claudia Nickolson, EDUC (to 2017)  
Angela Revels, Asst. VC for Human Resources  
James Robinson, SBS (to 2017)  
Robin Snead, LETT (to 2018), Secretary  
Laura Staal, EDUC (to 2018)  
Tracy Thomas, ARTS (to 2017)

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes of the February, 2017 Meeting (Appendix A)
- III. Adoption of the Agenda
- IV. Report from the Chair
- V. Old Business
  - Academic Partnerships (AP)
  - Online Course Offerings
  - Lab Schools
  - NC Promise
  - *Changing Lives Through Administration*
- VI. New Business
  - Hubbard Award
  - BraveBook
- VII. Announcements
- VIII. Adjournment

## Appendix A

### Faculty Development and Welfare Subcommittee

February 9, 2017, 3:30 pm

UC 233

### Minutes

#### Members in attendance:

Bill Brandon, NSM (to 2017), Chair  
Terence Dollard, ARTS (to 2018)  
Doug McBroom, NSM (to 2018)  
Claudia Nickolson, EDUC (to 2017)  
James Robinson, SBS (to 2017)  
Robin Snead, LETT (to 2018), Secretary  
Laura Staal, EDUC (to 2018)

#### Members not in attendance:

Tracy Thomas, ARTS (to 2017)  
Angela Revels, Asst. VC for Human Resources (ex-officio)

#### Guests in attendance:

Joy Fuqua, Office of Distance Education  
Carole Graham, Chair of Campus Hearing Board

- I. The meeting was called to order at 3:31 pm.
- II. The minutes of the November 10, 2016 meeting were approved.
- III. The agenda was adopted with changes: the addition of the discussion of James F. Hubbard faculty award to new business, and the striking of 1) the discussion of student fees, financing athletic programs, and SGA influence which is not in the purview of this committee, and 2) the discussion of unnecessary emails.
- IV. Report from the Chair  
There was no report from the chair.
- V. Report on the Status of Lab Schools  
Dr. Laura Staal reported on her November 28 meeting with Drs. Alfred Bryant and Scott Billingsley. Dr. Bryant shared that lab schools would be funded through the state per pupil allotment just like a charter school. Dr Bryant was not sure where the lab school would be housed. The likely scenario is to have a “school within a school” in an existing building, using space in a Robeson County School. One suggestion is work with Pembroke Elementary, with UNCP taking over a few classes in kindergarten and first grade. The intention is to begin small with just a few classrooms. Teachers would be employees of UNCP, and the students would be pupils of the UNCP lab school rather

than the school in which the lab school is housed. This would begin in the fall of 2018. Dr. Claudia Nickolson reported that Dr. Lisa Mitchell, Dr. Angela McDonald, and Dr. Alfred Bryant are to have a meeting with someone at the state level next week. Many unanswered questions remain. Dr. Staal agreed to take additional questions to Dr. Bryant. Committee members are encouraged to send any questions to her. Two questions shared during the meeting: 1) How many students are we talking about? 2) What about the buildings that are still damaged from Hurricane Matthew?

## VI. Old Business

**3x3 teaching load**—Dr. Brandon indicated that if we continue to have initiatives such as lab schools pushed on us, we need to push for the 3x3 teaching load. As a point of information, James Robinson reported that the School of Business faculty currently have 3x3 loads, a limit of 25 advisees per person, and are paid approximately \$20,000 more than faculty in the Humanities. Terence Dollard suggested that the 3x3 load is a part of the accreditation for the School of Business. Dr. Robinson reported that the way Fayetteville State achieved the 3x3 was to decrease the number of course sections offered, and to increase the course caps for all remaining sections, with a net effect that faculty members were teaching more students than in the 4x4 scenario. Dr. Robinson noted that we do not have enough faculty lines shift to a 3x3 model without this happening at UNCP, as well, and questioned why this would be attractive to faculty. Doug McBroom pointed out that while a 3x3 “looks nice,” the “devil is in the details.” He noted that something like this would take a complete revamp of the organization of the university. The committee voted to strike this issue from action items.

**Academic Partnerships (AP)**—Joy Fuqua reported that the work with AP is currently at the graduate level only, in the School of Business MBA program. The team will be coming from AP to design the courses as the faculty wish, and to set up instructional support. She noted that the Business MBA faculty has bought into this idea and voted to move forward. Carole Graham, Chair of the Campus Hearing Board, asked about how AP and the academic support personnel are compensated, whether the compensation is per student, and how that compensation works. Are they paid only for students who successfully complete a class, only for students who successfully complete the program, or for any student who enrolls? If the program balloons and there are, say, 100 students per class, what is the onus on the academic support partners working with the classes to monitor academic integrity, and to report, for example, instances of plagiarism? If the compensation of the program is per student who successfully completes the class or the program, there is no impetus for those involved with AP to report violations. Dr. Nickolson noted that the academic partners and support personnel may be “incentivized” to allow students to pass the class regardless of the quality and integrity of their work. Dr. Graham also asked about requirements for the academic support partners to report Title IX issues. What are their responsibilities? Given that there are many questions related to the contract with AP, Dr. Brandon will request a copy of that contract from Cammie Hunt. This discussion will be resumed at the next meeting.

**Administration/Faculty Relations**—Brief discussion centered on a seemingly systemic issue with “work creep”; faculty are continuously asked to do more and more. Although we are not adding faculty numbers in any significant way, the number of administrative positions continues to grow. Should we address the “bureaucratic bloat” in some way?

## VII. New Business

Both items listed on the agenda as new business were struck from the agenda when it was approved. However, several committee members had items to bring to the committee for discussion:

Dr. Staal expressed concern with the methods used by departments to determine what courses would be taught online, and who would teach those courses. She reported that over the winter break, colleagues in her department decided that a course she offers as a face-to-face course with a service learning field experience component might be offered as an online course. Their rationale was that this course is now a required course for birth-kindergarten majors, many of who are nontraditional students. (Previously this course was not required for birth-kindergarten education majors.) Dr. Staal is concerned that there is no way to replicate this course online, and she has no interest in attempting to do so. A further concern is that if this course is taught online, many students will choose this option and will not receive the same foundation as the face-to-face students, resulting in these students being less prepared for future courses. Dr. Robinson asked if there is a need to develop a policy concerning online courses and intellectual property. If a course is created in Blackboard, others can go into Blackboard, take those materials, and use them. Dr. Staal reported that this has happened with a hybrid course that she taught. An adjunct was hired to teach the course and used Laura's materials. A policy discussion will be added to the agenda for the March meeting.

Dr. Robinson asked what happened to the committee's request for information about NC Promise and its effect on faculty. Dr. Staal called the group's attention to the Q&A on the UNCP website. Dr. Robinson shared a conversation with a student who is concerned about the perceived quality of education at UNCP under NC Promise. A student asked him what he would do if he "was in the middle of his PhD program, and found out that by the time he finished, it would be equivalent to a BA." Students are concerned about a perceived reduction in the quality of their degree.

Doug McBroom asked if we can put into place a policy that requires the review of programs to determine if the program is actually accomplishing its objectives. (The faculty is evaluated every year, why can the programs not be evaluated?) It seems that programs get started and as they continue, they lose administrative support or degrade in other ways. An example is the QEP. When the QEP began, there was a lot of support, including a contract with Waypoint. The Waypoint contract has now been dropped, which seemingly ends the accountability of the program. We need a policy review structure.

Bill Brandon noted that it seems very difficult for FDW to accomplish anything, because the things that really affect faculty development and welfare are largely out of the hands of faculty.

## VIII. Announcements

There was discussion about the scheduling of the March meeting, as the second Thursday of the month is during spring break. The meeting date will be clarified by email.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50.