

The University of North Carolina at Pembroke
Faculty Senate Minutes

Wednesday, November 03, 2021 at 1530
<https://uncp.webex.com/meet/joe.west>

Joe West, Chair
Maria Pereira, Secretary

Order of Business

- I. Roll Call**

Members Present: Altman, Anderson, Bahhouth, Busch, Charlton, Goins, Grimes, Hansen, Hummer, Jones-Locklear, Lamphere, Lillis, Neal, Pereira, Robinson, Schaub, Snead, Stout, Thomas, Vela, Wells, West, Interim Provost Locklear.
Members Absent: C Locklear, Voecks, Chancellor Cummings.
Guests: Irene Aiken, Ashley Allen, Cherry Beasley, Scott Billingsley, Kirill Bumin, Polina Chemishanova, William Collier, William Gay, Lorry Floyd, Elizabeth Normandy, Derek Oxendine, Jonathan Ricks, Matthew Schneider, Aaron Vandermeer, Summer Woodside.
- II. Approval of Minutes:** (Appendix A) – Motion by Lamphere to approve the Minutes from the 2021.10.06 meeting as presented. **Approved by acclamation.**
- III. Adoption of Agenda (As Revised)** – Motion by Pereira to approve the amended Agenda. **Approved by acclamation.**
- IV. Reports from Administration**
 - a. Chancellor – Dr. Robin G. Cummings**
 - i. Comments from the Chancellor: (Interim Provost Locklear speaking for Chancellor Cummings)
 1. Budget: Chris Maples, (UNCP Executive Director of External Affairs) is currently in Raleigh and it appears that the budget approval is imminent.
 2. Questions: 1) Provost Locklear was asked if M-License was still in the budget. Provost Locklear replied by explaining that the M-License is related to teachers who earn an advanced degree, such as a masters’ degree, hence defined as M-License, which in the past carried a 10% pay increase. M-License was eliminated in 2014 and is now in the budget with hopes to be re-instated; 2) Another question was about the raises for faculty to which the Provost replied that in inquiring with Angela Revels (Assistant Vice Chancellor for Human Resources) there is a 2% legislator increase and any additional increases above that would be up to the campuses. The system office might approve an annual raise process, but it will be up to the individual campuses to find any extra money for raises.
 - b. Interim Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs—Dr. Zoe Locklear**
 - i. Updates on School of Business and College of Health Sciences dean searches - Search firms have been hired for both School of Business and College of Health Sciences. The School of Business search committee has been established and they had their launch meeting on Monday to establish along with the search firm all the necessary details. The College of Health Sciences committee is in the process of being formed with only two more confirmations needed. Most of the work for these two committees will start after January 2022. The search firms are very optimistic about these two searches because they see that UNC-Pembroke has much to offer in terms of making these positions attractive for potential candidates.
 - ii. New residency requirement for freshmen and sophomores – Additional information about the new residency requirement for incoming freshmen and sophomores for fall 2022 will be coming later in the semester. The Provost informed the Senate that she has circulated a draft with information to the Deans

which most likely have shared it with the Chairs and others. It is believed that the new residency requirement will help address and support retention.

- iii. Update on ICC Council - ICC Council has been established, met, and has had a couple of very productive meetings. Dr. Killian is the Chair and Dr. Fazio agreed to provide additional administrative support. Ben was in the process of distributing information pertaining how to get courses into the process.
- iv. Announcement of new Director of Financial Aid – Timothy Sampson is the new Financial Aid director. Tim is someone who worked with UNCP more than a year ago. He has been at Fayetteville Technical Community College and has returned to UNCP and his first day was Monday.
- v. Questions for the Provost: The first question inquired about students’ campus housing for fall 3 semester for students who are already on campus housing. Dr. Scott Billingsley replied by saying that there is no policy regarding that since all classes are online and therefore, there is no reason why students would need to stay on campus to take classes. However, Associate Provost continued, sometimes, there are students who may not have any place to go and for those, special arrangements for housing are made. The next question inquired about the cost for fall 3 and how it would be billed to the students. Dr. Billingsley replied that they were working together with the controller's office, Michelle Donegain (Controller). A Senate member contributed to the discussion by saying that a flyer had been sent out to the students’ listserv, the day before, describing billing and credit hour costs information. Another Senator made a request to have that flyer sent out again to faculty to aid in advising. Chair West mentioned noticing some confusion around the exceeding 18 credit hours and students needing and asking for overrides. The Senate was informed by the Associate Provost that that information was also included on the flyer mentioned above. Provost Locklear asked Associate Provost Billingsley to make a note and resend that information to all faculty.

V. Reports of Committees

a. Operations Committees

- i. Executive Committee – Dr. Joe West, Chair
 1. Introductory Comments – Chair West welcomed new faculty that were recently elected and informed the Senate that the newly elected senators will take their seats in the fall 2022 semester.
 2. **Vote Required:** Change two references (Page 25 and Page 28) in the 2021-2022 Faculty Handbook. The department name was changed but the faculty handbook was not updated. Change page 25 and page 28:
 - a. **From:** “Health and Human Performance”
 - b. **To:** “Kinesiology”

Chair West noticed while reading the Faculty Handbook that although the Dept of Health and Human Performance name had been changed to Kinesiology Dept a while back, the Faculty Handbook had not been updated - **Approved by acclamation.**

- ii. Committee on Committees & Elections – Dr. Tara Busch, Chair
 1. **Confirmation Vote Required:** Faculty Evaluation and Review Subcommittee member Kennard DuBose - **Approved by acclamation.**
 2. Faculty Senate Divisional Election Results: **CHS**-Jennifer Jones-Locklear, **NSM**: Timothy Anderson, **SBS**: Matt Schneider. **ARTS**, **EDUC**, and **LETT** elections are ongoing, and **At-Large** elections will follow these divisional elections. Faculty Senate **ARTS** election results:

Joanna Hersey. Faculty senate **EDUC** winner: Jennifer Whittington, Faculty senate **LETT** winner: James Hudson – Dr. Bush added that the winners for the two At-Large positions elections were Rachel Morrison and Carla Rokes.

iii. Committee on Faculty Governance – Dr. Carla Rokes, Chair

1. Comments from Dr. Vandermeer for Carla Rokes – Faculty Governance Committee (FGC) will bring at least three, may be four proposals for the Faculty Senate December meeting. FGC had further discussions on Roll Call Voting procedures and continues to try to figure out if the Senate is a policy-making body, which the committee believes it is not. Although mentioned in several places in the Faculty Handbook that the Senate is a policy-making body, FGC believes would be more appropriate to be named a policy-recommending body as the Chancellor must approve any policy coming from the Senate and if the Chancellor vetoes, the Senate cannot override that veto. FGC is going to the system code and at the same time they are in dialogue with the General Counsel with the aim to make the Senate as efficient as possible carry out their business. One of the proposals that the Senate will be seeing is the clarification about how the votes are counted and whether a proposal is approved or not, especially if there are a lot of abstentions. It will be stated that abstentions are not ‘yes’ nor ‘no’ votes and that they do not count against a quorum and that among the voting members a simple majority of ‘yes’ votes will carry a proposal. Dr. Vandermeer illustrated the situation above by giving an example where there would be twenty-three abstentions and one ‘yes’ vote, the proposal would carry. This is a direct reflection of Robert's Rules of Order but because it comes up frequently, FGC would like to specify it in the Faculty Handbook. Robert's Rules does not specify it one way or the other therefore if the Senate, its committees, and subcommittees are going to go by those bylaws, they end up being left open and with ambiguity. FGC would also like to specify that ex-officio members shall have voting privileges unless otherwise specified and that they would leave the door open for the Senate or Governance to specify otherwise if they thought a situation was not appropriate for an ex-official member to have a vote. Dr. Vandermeer added that the Chancellor and Provost are ex-officio members on the Senate with voting privileges, but that part is already specified in the Faculty Handbook. FGC also acted on the membership of the Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee and the proposal is to add a ‘Digital Faculty Evaluation Interfolio Administrator’ appointed by the Provost to sit on that committee to advise the committee on workflow, changes, user interface and what is possible. Furthermore, FERS committee requires two of the seven faculty members to be tenured and FGC proposes to require four of the seven to be tenured. The committee is still working on possible restructuring the Senate and hopes to get that information for feedback by the Senate December meeting. A Senator inquired whether the digital portfolio administrator person would also be an expert or at least be able to answer questions about the online student evaluations of instruction (SEI). Dr. Vandermeer admitted not to have a direct answer to that question but reflected out loud by saying that if FERS technical position would be coming from the Office of Academic Affairs and knowing that SEIs are also going to be administrated by the same office, perhaps that

would be a possibility. Associate Provost added to the discussion by informing the Senate that SEIs approval process on any policy is a bit more complex than just going through FERS as it must go through SGA approval as well. Dr. Billingsley added that Natricia Drake manages the technical side of SEIs which have been moved it out of the Office of Online Learning, last year, and therefore he suggested to work with Natricia on SEIs. Chair West asked Dr. Vandermeer as to how the FGC changes would be submitted to the faculty Senate for voting and implementation on the Faculty Handbook to which the reply was that the standard way is to provide a red line version showing any deleted or added text and to also recommend placement in the Faculty Handbook. Chair West recommend/requested that all four items would be brought to the Senate separate to allow for individual voting.

iv. Committee on the Oversight of the Faculty Handbook – Mr. Holden Hansen, Chair

1. Brief Report – during its October meeting, the committee decided to continue reviewing and making minor changes to Chapter 2 Section 2 of the Faculty Handbook which is about forty-three pages long. Last year’s committee had begun working on that section and the current committee is going to pick up where they left off. The committee is also beginning verifying that previous years’ changes approved by Faculty Senate made it to the Faculty Handbook. Chair Hansen concluded his report by informing the Senate that most likely no new business will be brought to the Senate until next Spring. Chair West offered a suggestion to Mr. Hansen to browse the Faculty Senate webpage which contains all Faculty Senate Routing Forms including those that are associated with Faculty Handbook, therefore making it easy to select those individually.

b. Standing Committees

i. Academic Affairs Committee – Dr. Robin Snead, Chair

1. **Vote Required:** Revision to change course catalog language to allow the Associate Provost to approve WX requests (Appendix B) – Dr. Snead shared on the screen Appendix B where it could be seen that wherever the VC for Enrollment would be listed to approve WX requests a second person (Associate Provost) was added as someone that could also approve those requests. The addition could be seen in four different places - **Approved by acclamation.**
2. Creation of a General Education Special Committee to revise GenEd course requirements (Discussion Item) – Dr. Snead started by informing the Senate that at the Academic Affairs Committee October meeting, the General Education Subcommittee came with a proposal/motion that reads (screen was shared) - *“The General Education Subcommittee recommends that an ad-Hoc taskforce be created to look at our current GenEd requirements and how they affect other areas of the university, including degree requirements, transfer credits, among other areas, and what revisions may be appropriate.”* Dr. Snead proceeded by informing the Senate that the only action that Academic Affairs Committee took was to strike the phrase ‘ad-Hoc’ and replace it with the phrase ‘Special Committee,’ because in Article VI Section 9 of the Faculty Handbook specifies, that “Continuing and Special Committees” may be constituted at any time by the Senate. Dr. Snead guided the discussion in the Senate by highlighting two main points: (1) whether the Senate as a body feels

that the formation of a Special Committee to look at the General Education program is warranted and, (2) whether right now is the appropriate time to do that. Dr. Snead reminded the Senate that currently there is already a Special Committee looking at SEIs and therefore, getting additional people to agree to participate on another Special Committee might be difficult. The reason that the General Education Subcommittee is requesting a Special Committee, as opposed to taking this on themselves, is that it is anticipated that this will be a large undertaking and chances are that once started would not be concluded by the end of the academic year, at which point membership in the General Education Subcommittee will change. However, per the Faculty Handbook guidelines a Special Committee stays in operation until it has concluded its work therefore, the work of a Special Committee can extend over one academic year. Chair West asked Dr. Snead if she could give the Senate a brief overview of why this change might be necessary as some may not have the background of how long it has been since the GenEd requirements had been updated and what the latest standards are. Dr. Snead started by mentioning that in her 17 years at UNCP, other than additions or deletions of some courses to the General Education checklist, there has not been a whole revision of the GenEd requirements. In summary, General Education is forty-four credit hours of which four courses come from the arts and humanities division, three courses from social sciences, three from natural sciences and math, two PE credits, two general education electives, two composition courses (I and II), and freshman seminar. Reasons that some believe that our General Education program needs revision are: (1) it appears that our General Education curriculum may be “outdated” as it has been a long time since any revision took place as compared to other UNC and peer institutions and, (2) our General Education program requires too many courses (approximately one-third of the total hours of a degree program are GenEd hours). Specific suggestions among others are to perhaps drop the two general education electives. If some credit hours would be freed up from the GenEd requirements, those would be available for individual degree programs therefore maintaining the current 120 total credit hours for any degree program. Chair Snead proceeded by indicating that in discussions, some felt that what we currently have is appropriate for a liberal arts university which tries to create a broad understanding across disciplines in our students while others argued that forty-five hours of GenEd is just too much. Overall, the General Education Subcommittee believes that perhaps some revision is warranted. Chair West opened the floor for discussion by asking if there were any questions for Dr. Snead with respect to the creation of this Special Committee. The first Senator speaking asked for more specific language, in terms of the charge, indicating that the way is currently written (above) and projected on the screen is extremely vague. Another Senator asked if the goal of the subcommittee was to change the GenEd requirements or to look at whether it needs change to which Dr. Snead replied that from her interpretation of the discussion she believes that the subcommittee wants to evaluate whether there is a need to move forward with revisions. Chair West asked Provost Locklear if Academic Affairs would welcome the formation of this Special Committee to which the Provost replied that the discussion would be welcome and she also informed the audience that other than a

conversation with the Executive Committee, this item had not been discussed within the Office of Academic Affairs with Deans, Chairs, or any other leadership. Dr. West inquired with Dr. Snead on the possibility of her going back to the subcommittee and ask them to use more specific language, describing exactly what they would like to see and, for them to formulate it in such a way that it would be an actionable item by the Senate or by the Executive Committee, in other words to clearly define the charge. Dr. West informed the Senate that the Executive Committee can also form Special Committees independent of the of the Senate but that his personal preference would be that the full Senate be involved. Dr. West sees this as a big multiyear change with lots of stakeholders and ideally, he would like to get the Senate behind. Like Dr. Snead, Chair West also expressed concern in getting enough faculty to participate in this committee by pointing out that there seems to be a great deal of burnout going on right now with faculty (a lot of requirements on the faculty) and getting faculty willing to staff this large committee that may run multiyear might be problematic. ICC special committee was used as an example that it took a while to get everything ironed out and therefore this new Special Committee may very well be the same way. Dr. West stated that when the full Senate does act on this item, it is imperative that the faculty will support and participate. Dr. Snead happily agreed to get back to the subcommittee with all the suggestions mentioned in this Senate meeting. Dr. Snead again reminded the Senate that Academic Affairs Committee took no action on it other than to say that as a body, they cannot form a Special Committee, reason why it was brought up to the Senate. A member of the Senate asked clarification about to whom the Special Committee would report and how would the report be acted upon. Dr. Snead gave an explanation that when Special Committees are formed, they report back to the body that formed them. Therefore, if it would be determined that the Senate would create this Special Committee to look at General Education requirements, then the committee would report back to the Senate. If the charge of the Special Committee would be to look at GenEd and see if it needs or not to be revised, the Special Committee will come back with a 'yes' or 'no' need for revision. At that point, the Senate would have to move the proposal forward by either forming a new Special Committee to proceed or by giving the work to the General Education Subcommittee. Senator Nathan Thomas wanted to go on record saying that 'yes,' the General Education curriculum needs revision and that a proposal would be warranted and hopefully would not take six years to get to a final product. Another Senator agreed for the need of a revision as it has been a long time since one has happened. At this point, Dr. Snead asked for a quick poll of the Senate by using the reaction buttons on Webex and it was determined that there was support to look into this item. One of the Senators added as a word of caution that this process could be very involved, and that the Senate would want lots of representation. The Senator clearly indicated that if all the work would fall on only one committee that would make it very tough for the committee but, if the Senate determined that the work would be divided in a two-stage process (two different committees) than the work would be more manageable. The Senator felt compelled to inform the Senate that the General Education curriculum affects staffing in most departments on campus and eliminating credit hours might mean

eliminating jobs (not necessarily lines) therefore, directly affecting employment and general education enrollment numbers in those departments. The Senator cautioned that removing GenEd elective credits is not an easy solution and overall, there would be no easy paths. Dr. Normandy added to the discussion by saying that General Education revision should start with the idea of “what is that we want students to learn in the General Education area” rather than looking at individual courses or the total number of credit hours. The focus should be on what the curriculum is providing to the students and if it is determined that needs are not met then identify what can be done to meet those needs. Dr. West added that some schools have General Education Mission Statements to which Dr. Normandy informed the Senate that UNCP also has its General Education Mission Statements as well as Learning Objectives and that perhaps a good starting point would be to revise those. Chair West concurred that updating Mission Statements and later flow it down to the actual curriculum and check if it meets our mission is a great way to start. Dr. Snead confirmed to the Senate that she is taking the above comments to the General Education Subcommittee and let them write a specific charge based on all suggestions given.

- ii. Faculty & Institutional Affairs Committee – Dr. Kelly Charlton, Chair
 - 1. No Agenda Items.
- iii. Student Affairs & Campus Life Committee –Dr. Renee Lamphere, Chair
 - 1. Student registration time changes –The registration time was officially changed to 9 PM effective spring 2022 but at this time, it had not been decided yet if registration would start on Sunday or Monday. Dr. West was happy to see that the Senate was able to move on a decision that will affect our students positively by making their lives easier.
- iv. Academic Information Technology Committee – Dr. Roland Stout, Chair
 - 1. No Agenda Items.
- v. Budget Advisory Committee - Dr. Sherry Edwards, Chair
 - 1. No Agenda Items.

VI. Faculty Assembly Updates – Dr. Lamphere pointed out that at the last Faculty Assembly meeting there was an emphasis on equity diversion and inclusion and the work of the UNC System Racial Equity Task Force. Guest speaker, Yvette Gullatt, which is the Vice President for Graduate and Undergraduate Affairs, Vice Provost for Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion, and Chief Diversity Officer for the University of California system talked a lot about evidence-based strategies to promote equity and diversion on campuses. Opportunities for members on the faculty assembly to get trained to become mental health first aid trainers were offered. Dr. Lamphere was in one of the first cohorts, got trained, and now is certified to teach mental health first aid courses. There is a push at the system level to get faculty members trained to allow them to teach mental health first aid courses. Dr. Lamphere informed the Senate that if any members of the faculty are interested in teaching such courses the route would be to send her an email and she would get those individuals linked up with the people at the system office to be part of upcoming cohorts.

VII. Graduate Council (Appendix C) – Dr. Aiken present to answer any questions in Appendix C.

VIII. Other Committees

- a. SEI Special Committee (Dr. Ottis Murray, Chair) - Chair West spoke for Dr. Murray by informing the Senate that the Special Committee on SEI was launched, and they chose a secretary and a chair at their first meeting. The committee has separated itself into two discreet tasks: (1) student evaluation of instruction instruments (identifying the state-of-the-art instruments that are currently being used with respect to student evaluation of instruction) and (2) looking at the process’ equity across race and gender (a comprehensive

approach to reevaluate how student evaluation of instruction are done). The committee is currently meeting once a month and should the need increase, the committee is willing to meet every two weeks with the aim to finish their charge in the current academic year.

- b. CEPP September approved minutes (Appendix D) – Dr. Loury Floyd present to answer questions.
- c. Faculty Research Advisory Board Updates (Dr. Steven Singletary, Chair) - Chair West spoke for Dr. Singletary informing the Senate that the Faculty Research Advisory Board (FRAB) announced a colloquium series in which interested faculty will be paid to present their research and that the hope is that these colloquium series will be well attended by the faculty. Currently, four of the slots are signed up and two are still available. The colloquium series is being conducted online to make it easy for faculty to attend. Dr. West spoke to the value of being informed about what colleagues are working on across the university with respect to research and he mentioned that if attendance is good the colloquium series might be something that can continue with the support from the Office of Academic Affairs and led by FRAB. In the past, the committee has had weak charges with less than a clear direction, but changes are in effect and the hope is to positively impact faculty and their research.
- d. Grievance Committee (Dr. William Collier, Chair) – Dr. West started the report by informing the Senate that in reading the Faculty Handbook he discovered by accident that the Grievance Committee should have presented an overview (number) of grievances submitted in the previous academic year to the Senate by its September meeting. Although a little bit later, Dr. Collier was invited to present the Grievance Committee information that he has available. Chair Collier took the floor and reported to the Senate that the number of grievances from last academic year was zero.

IX. Unfinished Business

- a. Derek Oxendine, EAB Update – Dr. Oxendine informed the Senate that as requested the progress reports campaign specifically for freshmen was relaunched on October 29th. The results were better with a 15% response rate from instructors by the end of the first week. As a reminder the progress reports campaign done earlier in the semester had a total of 18% response rate at the end of six weeks. Faculty has been quicker in responding because they have actual assignment/exam grades and midterm grades had been assigned. Dr. Oxendine was happy to report that his office is getting good data and they are being able to reach out to students that are at risk. Dr. Oxendine also reported on a recent meeting that his office had with EAB company where UNCP was categorized as the client with highest use of EAB for the month of October, primarily due to advising. Dr. Oxendine reported that 4,350 appointments had been created in EAB just in the past month and an interesting fact observed was that about 1,000 of those were student drop-ins that came for an advising session without being previously scheduled with their advisor. It is expected that the progress campaign will run for two more weeks giving faculty time to submit the reports and follow-ups with students will continue. Dr. West asked if any changes had occurred in EAB on how the information to the instructors had changed from a push to a pull design regarding hawk alerts to which Dr. Oxendine replied that the change was primarily from a cliental standpoint or customer utilization of the head institutions. At a certain point faculty reported that they did not want to have all steps of the process sent to them automatically and consequently, EAB turned the push notifications off. To mediate that and to help faculty members that do wish to be informed of all the steps of the process of helping students at risk, a document with screenshots is being put together. Dr. Oxendine proceeded by commenting that if enough institutions will request a change from pull to push, then EAB would process such request. One of the Senators stated getting email notices when a hawk alert is closed but not real time emails as it flows through the process step by step. Another Senator referred to the notes feature on the alerts as being restricted to two options

only and inquired if there would be a possibility to allow some more customization. Dr. Oxendine will investigate and later report on the possibility of allowing some more customization on the notes feature.

X. New Business - none

XI. For the Good of the Order

- a. Vice Chancellor for Advancement, Steve Varley. (Steve could not present today and will be moved to our next meeting). Dr. West had originally scheduled VC for Advancement Steve Varley to give an update on the status of endowed professorships across the university but he was unable to meet with the Senate (had to go to Raleigh) and therefore he will be rescheduled for the next Faculty Senate meeting.

XII. Announcements - none

XIII. Adjournment – Motion to adjourn moved by Stout and seconded by Busch. **Approved by acclamation.** The meeting was adjourned at 4:39 PM.