

UNO Faculty Senate Meeting, September 30, 2014

Homer Hitt Alumni Center Ballroom,

1. Call to Order and Welcome

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 PM by Faculty Senate President Dr. Pamela Jenkins. She thanked Jason Gilbeau for making the Alumni Center space available and setting it up for us.

2. Roll Call

Current roster of Faculty Senators:

Administration	Merrill	Johnson	(14-15)	Present
Staff Council	Brian	McDonald	(14-15)	Present
SG President	David	Teagle	(14-15)	Present
Alumni Assoc.	Dinah	Payne	(14-15)	Excused
Adjunct	Michelle	Esposito	(14-15)	Present
Business	Dinah	Payne (SE)	(13-16)	Excused
Business	James	Logan	(12-15)	Excused
Business	Matt	Zingoni	(12-15)	Absent
Business	Cherie	Trumbach	(14-17)	Present
Business	Mark	Reid	(13-16)	Absent
Business	Christy	Corey	(13-16)	Present
Business	Ivan	Miestchovich	(13-16)	Excused
Education	Richard	Speaker (SE)	(13-16)	Present
Education	Zarus	Watson	(12-15)	Present
Education	Lena	Nuccio-Lee	(13-16)	Present
Education	Ivan	Gill	(14-17)	Present
Education	Matt	Lyons	(14-17)	Present
Engineering	Edit	Bourgeois (SE)	(14-17)	Excused
Engineering	Malay Ghose	Hajra	(12-15)	Excused
Engineering	Nikolaos	Xiros	(12-15)	Absent
Engineering	Dimitrios	Charalampidis	(13-16)	Absent
Liberal Arts	Nancy	Easterlin (SE)	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	David	Beriss	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	James	Mokhiber	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	Chris	Day	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	Elaine	Brooks	(12-15)	Present
Liberal Arts	Peter	Yaukey	(12-15)	Present
Liberal Arts	James	Lowry	(12-15)	Present

Liberal Arts	Marla	Nelson	(12-15)	Present
Liberal Arts	Vern	Baxter	(12-15)	Present
Liberal Arts	Beth	Blankenship	(12-15)	Present
Liberal Arts	Peter	Schock	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	Steve	Striffler	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	Pam	Jenkins	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	Renia	Ehrenfeucht	(13-16)	Present
Liberal Arts	Laszlo	Fulop	(13-16)	Present
Sciences	Jairo	Santanilla (SE)	(12-15)	Present
Sciences	Elliott	Beaton	(14-17)	Present
Sciences	Greg	Seab	(14-17)	Present
Sciences	Wendy	Schluchter	(14-17)	Present
Sciences	Joel Andrew	Webb	(14-17)	Absent
Sciences	Leonard	Spinu	(12-15)	Present
Sciences	Vassil	Roussev	(12-15)	Excused
Sciences	Nicola	Anthony	(13-16)	Present
Sciences	Steve	Rick	(13-16)	Present
Sciences	Shengru	Tu	(13-16)	Present
Library	Connie	Phelps (SE)	(12-15)	Present
Library	Marie	Morgan	(13-16)	Present

3. Approval of the Minutes from the 8/25/14 Meeting

Ms. Phelps moved and Dr. Schock seconded to approve the minutes of the 8/25/14 meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Announcements from the Faculty Senate President (Dr. Jenkins)

Dr. Jenkins acknowledged the hard work of the Faculty Senate and committees this fall. The big issue to talk about in October will be the changes in group benefits and the fight going on around that.

5. Senate Committee Reports

Faculty Welfare Committee (Dr. Schluchter):

Dr. Schluchter said that they just met today and will be investigating their charge [why and how the fall semester was lengthened a few days]. Dr. Striffler added that they have a foolproof plan and will be reporting out at the next meeting.

6. Faculty Governance Committee (FGC) Report (Dr. Matt Tarr)

Dr. Tarr reported that the immediate task is to evaluate all programs at UNO and make recommendations to the President about which programs are for closure and which are to be maintained. The Committee has been working on this since June; it is a very big project, and it has been publicized. They broke up into subcommittees, and each subcommittee is currently scoring all degree programs based on criteria that the full Committee deemed appropriate. That is almost done. Once completed, all the scores will be used by the Committee as a whole to make an objective judgment on the future of the University. The conclusions of the subcommittees will be sent out to everyone on the faculty. After that is done, there will be a draft ranking by the full Committee, which will be sent out to faculty, along with a report by the Committee specifying procedures used, etc.

Ms. Blankenship asked when the Committee anticipates getting it out. Dr. Tarr replied that it is due to the President on October 31. The subcommittees have to finish scoring each program, which is supposed to be done by Wednesday. The Committee still has to go through and categorize each program. There are at least two categories, keep and close, and possibly more. They have four weeks to get it all done. In response to Dr. Mokhiber's question, Dr. Tarr said that there is no ranking and the groups are not agreed upon yet. The President will submit programs for closure to ULS in November, and those programs will be closed in January 2015.

Ms. Esposito asked about the determination on categories, saying that the categories are usually decided before completing a rating. She expressed concern about the closed category because, at the last meeting, Dr. Tarr talked about revitalization. Dr. Tarr explained that there was not yet agreement in the Committee as to what the categories are. Dr. Striffler asked for some idea of what the categories are, and Dr. Tarr referred to the problem that the Committee is having with language. Ms. Blankenship asked if it would be helpful to open up for faculty input earlier. Dr. Easterlin replied that what is taking time is scoring the narratives. Dr. Tarr explained that they are doing two different types of evaluation; some of it is based on data, but that is not the final score. Dr. Trumbach said that there has been a lot of discussion with people from different disciplines who all express things in a different language; there is a lot of representation across campus and a lot to discuss. Dr. Trumbach added that some of the things that Ms. Esposito mentioned have been discussed. Those categories initially might be broader than what we end up with because certain decisions have to be made. It is not just that here are some numbers and here is the cutoff.

Dr. Tarr said that normally this is a one to one-and-a-half year process, and the Committee is doing it in four months; the time constraints are making it very difficult. Dr. Trumbach added that they do not want to make bad decisions because they only have four months, so they will err on the conservative. Dr. Easterlin said that there are four subcommittees working on separate elements, and Dr. Jenkins added that the Committee has really thought about this. Dr. Day said that it has never been entirely clear to her why a two-year process is being squeezed into four months, even though she knows that we have immediate difficulties. Stating that he believes that there are things that UNO has not optimized for

the future, Dr. Tarr responded that the urgency is that if we look forward and predict the budget of the University, we will be out of money in two years if we do not change our spending patterns; (1) we need to be strategic; and (2) we have this budget issue.

Mr. Teagle said that he also had a question about the timeline and asked if it is related to SACS at all. Dr. Hansen responded that it is not related to SACS, but it is a tremendous positive thing to do for SACS when we report it. As Dr. Tarr said, most institutions have done this on a regular basis, but we have not.

7. Update on University Positions

a. Provost Search (Dr. Schock)

They began with a pool of 73 applicants and have narrowed that down and done Skype interviews. They should know by the end of this week whom they will invite to campus. There are some strong applicants.

b. Dean Searches (Dr. Hansen)

College of Liberal Arts: they just met at 1:30pm and are in the interview stage. They interviewed one person on campus already and will have two more in the next two weeks. They will make a recommendation by the second week in October. There are three strong candidates on paper. Dr. Hansen encouraged everyone to attend the Open Forums.

College of Engineering: they are doing Skype interviews with six candidates this week and next. Hopefully, they can decide which candidates to bring to campus by the middle of October.

Dr. Jenkins asked if the deans would start in January. Dr. Hansen replied that that was the goal, but that will all depend on the situation.

8. Discussion of INTO-UNO (Dr. Hansen)

Dr. Hansen was asked to do a brief update on the INTO partnership. The INTO organization is a for-profit international company that brings international students to campus. This is a joint venture between INTO and the UNO Foundation. The intent is to provide educational and degree programs for students that are recruited. Students are recruited through international organizations and come in through pathway programs. President Fos made the decision after a lot of review that this organization has financial backing, experience, and success. Folks are coming here this Thursday to look at the contract.

Students pay the joint venture in the first year; they probably enter for two terms and twelve academic credits. We set the progression requirement terms, and if they reach a certain level of efficiency, they are accepted at UNO. There are pathway groups for

various disciplines with pathways to be developed for graduate programs. They will have to move the IEP program from 6-12 credits. They are pretty well fixed on undergrad pathways and are talking about where to put the program. Dr. Hansen thinks that it has to sit in a department and not the Provost's Office. They are working hard to get to the point of contract signing by December to get it on the ULS Board of Supervisors agenda in December. The next step is familiarization training when they bring about 80-100 people/recruiters from around the world to get to know UNO and New Orleans. They are trying for January 24 or 25 if all works out.

Total academic control of programs at UNO rests with the University, and all the homeland security issues have to rest with the University. They anticipate 240 students in the fall of 2015 in the pathway programs. There is a whole system of support around students who come, including an Academic Director who reports to the Provost and a Student Services Director. Communication around this has been spotty. Dr. Hansen has asked President Fos to set up an advisory committee as we need a broader discussion and regular forum to talk about the issues that come up with this. Several workgroups are working on admissions and enrollment and on HR. We have to find a way to provide professional development in our faculty as some in IEP are not Masters'-qualified. Dr. Hansen welcomes Faculty Senate involvement in any of the discussion.

Mr. Teagle asked if students in the pathway programs will be considered UNO students and be able to participate in student organizations. Dr. Hanson clarified that they will not be considered degree students, but they could participate if all non-degree students can participate. He wants them to be as involved as much as possible.

Dr. Spinu said that this is a for-profit organization, and it is good that other organizations are involved. In response to Dr. Spinu's question, Dr. Hansen replied that it is a joint venture, and we are in it 50/50. He thinks that they try to fit students in the best place for them. We are not giving up any of our other international recruiting. There is nothing exclusive about this arrangement, and it will be significant dollars in enrollment for us.

Dr. John Hazlett asked Dr. Hansen if he has any idea at other schools what proportion of students become regular university students. Dr. Hansen responded that it is well above 90%. Ms. Esposito stated that there will be around 240 students the first year and asked if there will be more students the following year. Dr. Hansen thinks more, as INTO knows how to do the recruitment.

Mr. Teagle said that he realized that this was an unfair question, but we are already at a 96% threshold for on-campus living, so where would we put an additional 240 students? Dr. Hansen replied that there are big plans to build. He added that one other piece is that our study abroad program will remain intact.

Dr. Mokhiber said that a quick Googling of INTO online does not instill confidence. One thing that they are criticized online for is the building of new structures on campus. Would we own that? Dr. Hansen thinks that the joint venture would own it. Dr. Jenkins asked

about the kinds of things in place for transparencies on budget information, etc., when we do not own it. Dr. Hansen responded that they have to talk about that, and that is one reason why they are waiting.

Dr. Robert Shenk referred to the workgroup for better communication that Dr. Hansen mentioned and asked if we are going to have it before the contract is signed. Dr. Hansen said no because the contract is to be signed this week. Dr. Shenk asked if it was 30-year contract, which Dr. Hansen confirmed. Dr. Shenk asked if it goes to the ULS Board of Supervisors after it is signed, and Dr. Hansen replied that it has to be approved by them.

Dr. Spinu inquired about the funds used to pay INTO. Dr. Hansen answered that it is through the joint venture, but he has not seen the financial details yet. Mr. Teagle asked about the logic behind creating the joint venture with the Foundation instead of with a University department or the Administration because the Foundation is not accountable to us. Dr. Hansen replied that it is all around the financial; there will be a debt incurred, and the University has no capitol to put into it right now. Dr. Striffler stated that discussion on the academic level seems complicated but could be worked out, but he does not think that we will ever know a lot of information about the financial because it is a private company that negotiates with other universities. Dr. Hansen agreed.

Dr. Easterlin had a question about ongoing support for getting them up to English-language proficiency, and Dr. Hansen stated that they have a huge support system at other institutions. Dr. Easterlin wants to make sure that Administration understands that this is going to cost money.

Ms. Juana Ibanez stated that she is thrilled that the University is trying to find new revenue sources but terrified that INTO is going to be another one of those contracts with which we get involved. Dr. Baxter strongly questioned the 30-year contract and said that we need to have things clarified before the contract is signed. Dr. Speaker asked if the ULS Board has to approve it. Dr. Hansen does not think that the contract will be finalized this week because there are a lot of red lines. The objective is to get it approved by December. Ms. Blankenship asked if there is any other contract that affects our pedagogy that we are not going to have input on before the contract is signed. Mr. Teagle added that the Foundation does not have to do an RFP, and he is concerned that students have no input on how it is going to affect the students that are coming.

Dr. Hansen said that he thinks that we need to get President Fos and Gregg Lassen in the room to discuss it. Dr. Jenkins asked if we wanted to make a motion on the discussion going on on Thursday, and the consensus was yes. Dr. Jenkins reiterated that we need to have a meeting where Gregg Lassen and President Fos come to lay out the financial support. Dr. Striffler expressed little confidence in their coming and laying out the reasons why it is being done through the Foundation, and he thinks that the level of detail will be generalities.

Dr. Jenkins inquired what we wanted to ask for in a broad sense and added that we do not have enough information. There was then a discussion on what the motion should include. Ms. Esposito would also like to see some data that UNO can sustain the contract, and Dr. Beaton referred to existing contracts such as the Aramark contract that places limits on feeding people. Dr. Mokhiber eventually proposed a statement for the motion. Dr. Striffler thinks that some of these questions can be settled if Drs. Lassen and Fos come to a meeting. Dr. Jenkins asked if we want to move this to a Faculty Council meeting, say in two weeks. Dr. Beaton suggested adding something about our support for international students. Dr. Tu does not think that our concern is with the academic side. Someone asked if the students pay out-of-state tuition, and someone replied that INTO gets half and we get half.

Dr. Mokhiber revised his motion, which Dr. Baxter seconded. Mr. Teagle recommended that a University advisory panel be created instead of a faculty advisory panel, and Dr. Jenkins said that that was the plan. Ms. Ibanez reiterated the concern about what other contracts we should know about in which the University is involved.

At this point, Dr. Seab moved to suspend the rules and vote immediately, which was seconded by Ms. Esposito and approved by all. The following motion was voted and approved by all:

“The Faculty Senate supports the University’s effort to internationalize its student body in significant new ways. However, given the need for clearer information regarding potential long-term academic and financial ramifications, the Faculty Senate expresses its serious reservations regarding the imminent signing of a 30-year contract with INTO. It requests that the Faculty Advisory Committee be constituted and meet, and further requests that an Administration official address the Faculty Council at a meeting before the contract is signed.”

9. Discussion of QEP (John Hazlett; see his [presentation slides](#))

Dr. Hazlett stated that his purpose today was to inform us about something a little less controversial, the University Quality Enhancement Plan. He introduced himself as Director of the B.A. in International Studies Program and Chair of the QEP Committee. He noted that many of its members were here today, and he wanted to thank them for being very cooperative and hard working.

Going over points on his slides, Dr. Hazlett emphasized that we have a QEP because SACS-COC requires it. He talked about picking the topic (“Global Engagement, . . . and professional communication, with the potential for a measure of general education reform”); the charge; the committee members; and the three subcommittees (Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs); Assessment; and QEP Literature and Best Practices), praising Dr. Speaker, chair of the latter, for an excellent job of gathering information on what others are doing.

Dr. Hazlett reviewed the Committee's work to date and thought it important to read the text referring to the three SLOs (knowledge; skills; attitude and behavior). He briefly mentioned identifying the appropriate assessment tool (the Global Perspectives Inventory, which has now been purchased); the review of best practices; and the development of strategies for fostering global engagement (30 different strategies grouped into seven groups), with examples of possible strategies. He stated that the "Overall QEP Timeline" slide was probably an important slide as the report is due on January 15, 2015. He ended his slide presentation by noting that Dr. Speaker has already given them a first draft of the document.

Dr. Tarr stated that SLO 1 listed some specific disciplines, and he was wondering what the motivation was for doing that since it should cover all disciplines. Dr. Hazlett replied that "study of the topics of diversity, sustainability, and global problems and opportunities" could potentially apply to all disciplines, but Dr. Tarr said that it makes him uncomfortable to see some disciplines listed and not others. Dr. Hazlett said that they would welcome others on the Committee. Dr. Sharpton mentioned an easy fix for the language, and Drs. Hazlett and Speaker agreed that they can change the language of the SLOs. Someone suggested that it be broad categories.

At this point, Dr. Jenkins said that the Faculty Senate did three substantive things today. Dr. Striffler stressed that, when SACS comes on campus, we should not pretend that we do not know about the QEP. Dr. Hazlett added that in a month or so, the PowerPoint will be revised.

Re the question posed earlier about other contracts, Dr. Hansen said that they are looking at some contracts related to distance learning, e.g., Learning House, but they have not done anything about it.

10. Old Business. None.

11. New Business. None.

12. Adjournment.

Dr. Jenkins said that people should let Faculty Senate know if there is anything that needs to be discussed.

A motion to adjourn was moved by Ms. Blankenship and seconded by Dr. Easterlin. The meeting adjourned at 4:40PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Marie Morgan
Faculty Senate Secretary, 2014/15
October 22, 2014