

UNO Faculty Senate Meeting, February 24, 2015

Innsbruck Rooms—University Center 211 A-B

1. Call to Order and Welcome

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 PM by Faculty Senate President Dr. Pamela Jenkins, who welcomed and thanked everyone for coming.

2. Roll Call

Current roster of Faculty Senators:

Administration	Merrill	Johnson	(14-15)	Absent
Staff Council	Brian	McDonald	(14-15)	Present
SG President	David	Teagle	(14-15)	Present
Alumni Assoc.	Dinah	Payne	(14-15)	Present
Adjunct			(14-15)	
Business	Dinah	Payne (SE)	(13-16)	Present
Business	James	Logan	(12-15)	Present
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			(13-16)	
Education	Richard	Speaker (SE)	(13-16)	Present
Education	Zarus	Watson	(12-15)	Excused
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)	Present
Engineering	Malay	Ghose Hajra	(12-15)	Excused
Engineering	Nikolas	Xiros	(12-15)	Present
Engineering	Dimitrios	Charalampidis	(13-16)	Present
Liberal Arts	Nancy	Easterlin (SE)	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	David	Beriss	(14-17)	Excused
Liberal Arts	James	Mokhiber	(14-17)	Excused
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)	Excused
Liberal Arts	Beth	Blankenship	(12-15)	Absent

Liberal Arts	Peter	Schock	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	Steve	Striffler	(14-17)	Excused
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)	Absent
Sciences	Greg	Seab	(14-17)	Absent
Sciences	Wendy	Schluchter	(14-17)	Present
Sciences	Joel Andrew	Webb	(14-17)	Present
Sciences	Leonard	Spinu	(12-15)	Excused
Sciences	Vassil	Roussev	(12-15)	Absent
Sciences	Nicola	Anthony	(13-16)	Present
Sciences	Steve	Rick	(13-16)	Present
Sciences	Shengru	Tu	(13-16)	Excused
Library	Connie	Phelps (SE)	(12-15)	Present
Library	Marie	Morgan	(13-16)	Present

3. Approval of the Minutes from the 2/10/15 Meeting

Dr. Payne moved and Ms. Phelps seconded to approve the minutes of the 2/10/15 meeting. The motion passed unanimously. Dr. Jenkins thanked Ms. Morgan for the minutes.

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

- The date for the last meeting of the year has been moved up one week, Thursday, April 23, to not conflict with Jazz Fest.
- A question about the use of the student technology fee was sent to Faculty Senate Executive Committee and will be assigned to the Faculty Senate Budget Committee.
- The Ad hoc committee of top administrators and faculty representatives met two weeks ago Thursday and set up the format of the discussions. Dr. Jenkins will send the agenda, and members will also bring issues. They will not have a second meeting until the end of March.

5. Senate Committee Reports

Academic Procedures and Standards Committee (Dr. Corey, Chair; see presentation slides in Appendix 1):

Dr. Corey gave a brief update on what the Committee is doing, what has been completed and what is in progress (**first slide**).

a. “University of New Orleans Description of Course Levels”:

Referring to the handout distributed by Dr. Sharpton (**see Appendix 2**), Dr. Corey noted that this is a very basic document that could be used by all as a guiding document to help faculty with

course development and Courses and Curricula. Dr. Sharpton said that we have been found non-compliant on the graduate level and suggested that we use this for a guideline. He asked what we do as a Senate body to vote on this. Dr. Corey reiterated that they want to approve this document on course level descriptions and use it as a tool.

Dr. Sharpton said that, at this point, we are non-compliant as a standard; there is no policy, tool, or written document that expresses the difference between 5000, 6000, and 7000. Referring to the “general guidance” table, Dr. Logan asked if we are going to be evaluated if we do not have something at the 6000 level. Dr. Corey responded that this is really supposed to be about guidance; there is no suggestion that, if we do not have all four, our courses will not make. Dr. Sharpton said that he suspects that our reviewers are going to say something about the learning outcomes. When they pulled syllabi, they rarely found differences from courses at the 5000 level. Right now we have the same learning outcomes for senior level courses as graduate courses.

Dr. Logan asked if we adopt this, is this the one standard to which we adhere. That is going to cause every faculty member to reevaluate what they say in their syllabi, which is a massive effort. Dr. Sharpton said that last year the Graduate Council said that they were going to permit only 25% of required courses at the 5000-level, but they did not act on it. They said that they would not be doing the 25% this year but would instead be adopting the standard around the 5000-level. Dr. Sharpton sees this as an important part of the plan, the first differences between 5000 and 6000. He offered some suggestions on how to do this.

Dr. Rick said that when he teaches graduate courses, the material is deeper, not that he expects different learning outcomes. Dr. Sharpton referred to the level of content and the classic three areas of learning outcomes. It has to be expressed in the syllabi that expectation is different for seniors and graduate students. Dr. Jenkins said that it is not about what you teach but how you frame what you teach. Dr. Speaker noted that even elementary teachers use Bloom’s taxonomy, even if teaching 1000-/2000-level courses. Dr. Jenkins suspects that all of them do that in the graduate courses, but they just do not call it that.

Dr. Jenkins asked if we need to send it to SACS next week, and Dr. Sharpton replied that we could send it as a draft. Dr. Jenkins asked if there is some way that we can make a motion that says that it is a tool. Dr. Speaker asked if the statement on “general guidelines” needs to be rethought. He thinks that we would want a preponderance in higher-level courses but not exclude them from lower-level courses. After some attempts at rewording the statement, Dr. Day offered that what Dr. Speaker was suggesting could be changed by one word: in the 6000 section: use “should include” instead of “should have.” There was no disagreement to this suggestion. Dr. Speaker added that the wording should change in the entire document.

Dr. Brooks moved that we vote to support the general guidelines as a tool to be used for course development and review. There was a second, and the motion carried with three abstentions.

b. Transfer Credit Presentation (Interim Provost Dr. Sharpton; see presentation slides in Appendix 3):

Dr. Sharpton explained that a major is defined by the Board of Regents as 25% of total degree hours, which, for us, is a minimum of 30 hours. Some degrees might exceed that for

accreditation purposes. The UL System has three components for a major: general education, other requirements, and major requirements. We are now 100% compliant in our catalog. At UNO, we talk about upper classes as 3000+. From a SACS perspective, we need learning outcomes for each degree program, and we now have learning outcomes for all programs of study. Without the requirement of 50%, we have a problem when a student takes the majority of courses elsewhere; we have no background to say that they are fulfilling those learning outcomes. We have not been asked for learning outcomes for a minor, but that is probably coming. There are two types of transfer students: from community college or 4-year college. When we did an analysis of all of the programs in the catalog, we only have three below the 50% level, and almost every program that we already have meets the standard of 3000+ in the major.

Dr. Jenkins asked that we go back to what Dr. Corey has asked us to vote on: “Amendments to Degree Requirements for UNO Undergraduate Programs”:

“Degree-seeking students must acquire a minimum of 50% of in-major coursework at UNO (based on total number of course hours dedicated to the major).

To minor in a program of study, students must acquire a minimum of 50% of in-minor coursework at UNO (based on total number of required course hours dedicated to the minor).”

Dr. Schluchter said that she has no problem with this. Her only issue was specifying that 50% of the minor has to be at the 3000 level, but that is not what we are voting on. Dr. Sharpton reiterated that he thinks that we are going to need learning outcomes for our minors. We often transcript minors and concentrations with no coursework at the University, which is a huge problem because we are saying that the student had learning outcomes, but we have no idea what they have taken.

Dr. Rick asked if a consent agreement with a community college is okay. Dr. Sharpton replied yes unless one of the courses is required for a major. A second type of agreement deals with course of study, and there is a specific articulation agreement still in place.

Dr. Schluchter moved and Dr. Payne seconded to accept the amendments. The motion carried unanimously. Dr. Sharpton said that once they get the report out, they will post it.

Academic Freedom, Tenure and Professional Ethics Committee (Drs. Ehrenfeucht and Gill):

a. Exigency:

Dr. Gill reported that the Committee was charged at the last meeting with providing a small report on what exigency is (see [presentation slides](#)). Most of the report was taken from the UL System bylaws. Once in place, there is very little that an employee can do about it. Dr. Gill ended his presentation by suggesting that perhaps we should be given enough funds so that we do not have to how to declare exigency. Dr. Jenkins said that the piece important to her is with whom the President consults; we made a resolution that we would be the people who would be consulted.

b. Resolution response:

Dr. Ehrenfeucht discussed Dr. Fos' response to the resolution. There are three parts to this. The President has the authority to do this, and we need to be mindful of that, but it is still not clear how the policy was followed. The Committee's response: in the spirit of transparency, they would like some information on how the policy was followed. Also, discontinuing a department is included under the exigency policy, but they would just like some information about it. The other piece that her Committee discussed: they are asking for a list of procedural specificities. What can we do to really shape the outcome?

Dr. Jenkins asked what the Committee would like to do. Dr. Ehrenfeucht replied that they would like some clarification/explanation from President Fos to show how it was followed. Dr. Jenkins asked the Senate if they could get behind that request. Acting as substitute parliamentarian, Dr. Speaker stated that we can accept the Committee's report and ask them to pursue it. Ms. Phelps asked who is asking Fos; she thinks that the asking should come from the Senate. Dr. Payne suggested that maybe the Committee should frame the question and submit it to Dr. Jenkins, who will ask the Senate Executive Committee if they agree. Dr. Logan questioned why we could not ask the Committee to address this. It was determined that no rule suspension or vote was necessary for that to happen.

c. Additional discussion:

To follow up on the Committee's report, Dr. Day asked how we as a Senate are going to follow up on Dr. Gill's suggestion at the end of his presentation. Dr. Payne replied that at the Ad hoc committee between faculty, vice presidents, and others, she and Dr. Jenkins would like for them to explain the strategy for exigency, etc. Perhaps that is the follow up? Dr. Day said that she was talking about efforts to ward off the exigency. Dr. Payne answered that she thinks that the UL System is doing a lot about that, but she asked what our marketing strategy is. We as a University have not responded to it in any way except for a few emails. Dr. Day said that we also need to encourage the Legislature to find ways to raise revenue and to get a legislative super majority behind other types of legislation. UNO needs advocacy that is UNO-specific in addition to System advocacy. Dr. Payne referred to ULS Day at the Legislature.

Dr. Jenkins asked if the Senate needs to work on a strategy, to which Dr. Day responded yes. Ms. Phelps noted that she and Dr. Jenkins got an email early on from President Fos saying that we need to organize, but then Sandra Woodley said not to do anything until the Legislature meets, which is this Friday. Ms. Phelps suggested the next Senate meeting, but Dr. Jenkins said that that is too late. Dr. Speaker referred to the vague UL System policy on exigency and said that we need a specific UNO policy. Dr. Logan stated that the Board of Regents has the ultimate power, but the UL System also has the power. Mr. Teagle said that he would caution us letting the UL System drive the boat, that a legislation plan would be too late, and that UNO needs to take action and start fighting for ourselves.

Dr. Schluchter said that we asked for the review because our friends at Southern University have been down this path. Dr. Jenkins said that she thinks that late March is too far away to start working on this, and she proposed an Ad hoc committee of senators to start working on this now. Dr. Schock said that he could not hold off any longer and was working on something. The first priority is to quash the rumor that UNO will be closed; he used Rachel Kinkaid's language. The second part is that if we cannot ward this off, it will leave the University as a gutted shell, and we

have to oppose that. Dr. Jenkins said that she thinks that there is the piece that we have to do as a Senate, and we cannot wait until March.

Dr. Payne stated that a group on the Alumni Board wants to do something, but they do not know what the message should be. Maybe the President of Alumni Affairs would have more pull in talking to Dr. Fos. What is going to be the message, and how can we deliver the message further? A lot of alumni do not know because we have not been sending out any messages about it. Mr. Teagle said that students across the state have now demanded that the State change the way that funding is handled and the budget is done. Dr. Payne said that it easier for her to reach students through alumni, and she does not know how to make that happen. It is the job of the Vice President for Marketing and Communications.

Dr. Jenkins said that she would not ask for volunteers right now, but she will form an Ad hoc committee to work with her.

6. Senate Resolution on Changing Provost to Executive Vice President (Dr. Jenkins)

Regarding the resolution introduced at the last meeting, Dr. Jenkins reported that she has begun to gather more information and has talked to the new Provost and former Provosts. Each time that she talks to someone she gets more information, so she would like to postpone the vote until March. No one else in the UL System has this setup, so we would be an outlier in the System if we approve this.

7. Senate Committee Reports (continued)

Nominations and Elections Committee (Ms. Morgan):

Ms. Morgan presented the Committee's motion, to be voted on at the next meeting:

“On a one-time basis, due to the reapportionment of Faculty Senate representation, the Nominations and Elections Committee moves that current members in the College of Education and the Earl K. Long Library be allowed to remain until their terms expire.”

Ms. Phelps explained the representation in the Senate prior to the move to the UL System where each college and the Library had one Policy Committee member and at least one other member, with the remaining members based on college apportionment. There being no voiced opposition to returning to that structure, the Committee was charged with presenting a proposal for a bylaws change at the next meeting. In addition, Mr. Teagle suggested that we might want to include wording to make permanent the grandfathering in of senators until the end of their terms whenever apportionment changes. There was no disagreement to this suggestion.

8. Faculty Governance Committee (FGC) Update (Dr. Matt Tarr)

Dr. Tarr reported that FGC recently sent a message to President Fos expressing some concern about what was sent to the UL System because there was some discrepancy between what FGC sent to him and what he sent.

FGC is currently working on four things:

- (1) Evaluation policy – has to be in place by the end of this semester to comply with SACS;
- (2) Category 3 programs – FGC needs to try to help them;
- (3) FGC’s next priority is to look more broadly at the University as a whole;
- (4) To look even longer term at how to transform UNO into the university of the future.

9. University Budget Committee (Dr. Schluchter; see presentation slides in Appendix 4)

Dr. Schluchter wanted to remind everyone of their meetings every Wednesday from 9:30-11:00am. If people have ideas, they can send an email to ubc@uno.edu, and she will keep them anonymous. They will discuss FY15 budget tomorrow. We are overspending on some things, like scholarships, and they are trying to get some open and transparent process to deal with this. The really depressing part is the FY16 budget. Dr. Jenkins added that if anyone has time tomorrow, please come as it is a really interesting meeting, and the five faculty on the Committee would appreciate our coming.

10. Old Business. None.

11. New Business. None.

Dr. Jenkins closed by saying that she really appreciates the work that we have been doing here.

12. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was moved by Dr. Payne and seconded by Dr. Logan. The meeting adjourned at 4:26 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Marie Morgan
Faculty Senate Secretary, 2014/15
March 18, 2015

APPENDIX 1:

Academic Procedures and Standards Committee Task List

COMPLETED:

- Responsibilities of APS Committee
- Academic Program Coordinator Responsibilities
- Review/Approve Academic Calendars through 17-18

IN-PROGRESS:

- Define characteristics of various course levels
 - Clarify Undergraduate Degree Requirements for In-major coursework
-

Course-level Descriptions

- Formulated a description of characteristics of various course levels
- Incorporates Bloom's Taxonomy
- Connects expected SLOs (Student Learning Outcomes) with course level
- Lower level undergrad
- Upper level undergrad

- 5000
 - 6000
 - 7000
 - See handout
-

Amendments to Degree Requirements for UNO Undergraduate Programs

- Degree-seeking students must acquire a minimum of 50% of in-major coursework at UNO (based on total number of course hours dedicated to the major).
 - To minor in a program of study, students must acquire a minimum of 50% of in-minor coursework at UNO (based on total number of required course hours dedicated to the minor).
-

APPENDIX 2:

University of New Orleans Description of Course Levels

Course Level	Description
1000-2000	Lower division courses in the general core curriculum or introductory level taught primarily at the Freshman and Sophomore level
3000-4000	Upper division courses in the major/minor area taught primarily at the Junior and Senior level
5000	Graduate courses designed to prepare students for higher level graduate work (leveling for students without undergraduate degrees in discipline or prerequisites for 6000 level courses)
6000	Graduate courses
7000	Graduate courses designed for thesis and dissertation research and seminars

Undergraduate and Graduate Cross-Listed Courses

Only 4000 and 5000 level courses may be cross-listed and co-taught. In those cases where a course must be delivered to both undergraduate and graduate students simultaneously, there is to be a "substantive difference" in the experiences of these two groups of students.

A course must demonstrate substantive differences by:

- Identifying alternative and/or additional student learning outcomes, and
- Assigning alternative and/or additional reading assignments, writing assignments, problem sets, projects, presentations, or examinations.

A course may also demonstrate substantive differences by:

- Holding regularly scheduled additional meetings or discussion sessions that provide a "graduate only" environment.

The substantive differences described above, or others designed by the instructor, should be described in either separate syllabi for undergraduate and graduate students, or if only one document is produced in separate sections of the single syllabus. In any case, the instructor is responsible for outlining in detail the differences in the assignments, activities, standards and learning outcomes for demonstrating mastery. (Please note that if a student completes 4xxx as an undergraduate student, then later is enrolled in a graduate program, that student will not be permitted to count the 5xxx counterpart course toward the second degree.)

Student Learning Outcomes

Student learning outcomes are specific, measurable statements about what students will be able to do after teaching/learning has occurred. Bloom's Taxonomy helps describe and classify observable knowledge, skills, attitudes, behavior and abilities. Student learning outcomes that contain measurable verbs explicitly indicate what students must do to demonstrate learning. The table below lists sample verbs for stating specific student learning outcomes. The verbs are grouped so as to demonstrate the movement from lower to higher level thinking.

Cognitive Levels	Measurable Verbs	Definitions
Knowledge	Count, define, describe, draw, find, identify, label, list, match, name, quote, recall, recite, sequence, tell, write	Remembering previously learned information
Comprehension	Conclude, demonstrate, discuss, explain, generalize, identify, illustrate, interpret, paraphrase, predict, report, restate, review, summarize, tell	Grasping the meaning of information
Application	Apply, change, choose, compute, dramatize, interview, prepare, produce, role play, select, show, transfer, use	Applying knowledge to actual situations
Analysis	Analyze, characterize, classify, compare, contrast, debate, deduce, diagram, differentiate, discriminate, distinguish, examine, outline, relate, research	Breaking down ideas into simpler parts and how parts relate and are organized
Synthesis	Compose, construct, create, design, develop, integrate, invent, make, organize, perform, plan, produce, propose, rewrite	Rearranging component ideas into a new whole
Evaluation	Appraise, argue, assess, choose, conclude, critic, decide, evaluate, judge, justify, predict, prioritize, prove, rank, rate, select	Making judgments based on internal evidence or external criteria

Individual courses must have learning outcomes that are appropriate to the student level.

- Lower levels of cognitive skills (knowledge, comprehension, and application) are associated with student learning outcomes for undergraduate courses.
- Higher levels of cognitive skills (analysis, synthesis, and evaluation) are associated with student learning outcomes for graduate courses.

The table below is general guidance regarding expectations for course level student learning outcomes.

Course Level	Student Learning Outcomes (SLO)
1000-2000	Lower division undergraduate courses should have SLO's that reflect lower order cognitive skills at the knowledge and comprehension levels.
3000-4000	Upper division undergraduate courses should have SLO's that reflect higher level cognitive skills at the application and analysis levels.
5000	Graduate courses may include some SLO's that represent lower level cognitive skills. Students may be required to demonstrate mastery of a core body of knowledge prior to progressing.
6000	Graduate courses should have SLO's at the application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation levels.
7000	Graduate courses should reflect only higher order cognitive skills.

Graduate program student learning outcomes:

- Master's level should include research or an advanced demonstration of skill
- Doctoral level should include independent inquiry

Transfer Credit Presentation

Faculty Senate
February 24, 2015

Major Requirements

- ▶ Must comprise at least 25% of total degree hours by Board of Regents requirements
 - ▶ The proposed requirement focuses on the percentage (50%) of these hours taken:
 - ▶ At UNO
 - ▶ At the upper division (3000+) level
-

From a SACSCOC perspective

- ▶ How do we assure that our program graduates have attained the Student Learning Outcomes associated with their program of study?
 - ▶ Typically, the degree SLOs are addressed in the major coursework requirements?
 - ▶ The same is true of a minor program of study as it is also “transcripted”
-

Transfer Students from a Community College

- ▶ Students may only apply a maximum of 60 credits from a community college
- ▶ All community college transfer work must align with 1000-2000 requirements (Also a SACSCOC requirement)
- ▶ This is a SACSCOC standard that we must meet

- ▶ The fewest hours required for an undergraduate degree is 120 (governed by SACSCOC, BOR and UL System)
 - ▶ Thus, a transfer student from a community college would need to take a minimum of 60 hours at UNO
 - ▶ To meet the new requirement for a “typical” major at UNO, the student would need to take at least 15 credits at the 3000+ level in the major requirements
-

Transfer Student from a 4 Year Institution

- ▶ Transfer students must complete at least 25% of the degree requirements at UNO (SACSCOC requirement)
 - ▶ Typically, this amounts to 30 credit hours
 - ▶ A student transferring to UNO with the maximum number of credit hours would need to take a minimum of 15 credits at the 3000+ level
-

Summary

- ▶ UNO needs to ensure that completers of degree programs meet the Student Learning Outcomes for their program of study
- ▶ Most of our degree programs require 70% or more of major coursework to be at the 3000+ level
- ▶ A standard of 50% is not that rigorous but is a good starting point
- ▶ Our SACSCOC review takes place this semester

University Budget Committee

Meetings Rm 407 Library

Wed 9:30-11 AM

UBC tasks in progress

- Reviewing Cost/Revenue for the past three fiscal years to look at trends
- Development of an assessment survey for non-academic units
- Determining what current FY15 budget and what structural deficit is now
- Development of ideas about a new budget process
- Development of FY16 budget