

UNO Faculty Senate Meeting, March 25, 2015

Innsbruck Rooms—University Center 211 A-B

1. Call to Order and Welcome

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 PM by Faculty Senate President Dr. Pamela Jenkins, who welcomed everyone to the second to last meeting of the year unless a special meeting is called.

2. Roll Call

Current Roster of Faculty Senators:

Administration	Merrill	Johnson	(14-15)	Present
Staff Council	Brian	McDonald	(14-15)	Excused
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)	Absent
Business			(13-16)	
Education	Richard	Speaker (SE)	(13-16)	Present
Education	Zarus	Watson	(12-15)	Excused
Education	Lena	Nuccio-Lee	(13-16)	Excused
Education	Ivan	Gill	(14-17)	Present
Education	Matt	Lyons	(14-17)	Excused
Engineering	Edit	Bourgeois (SE)	(14-17)	Present
Engineering	Malay	Ghose Hajra	(12-15)	Excused
Engineering	Nikolas	Xiros	(12-15)	Excused
Engineering	Dimitrios	Charalampidis	(13-16)	Excused
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)	Excused
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)	Excused
Sciences	Elliott	Beaton	(14-17)	Present
Sciences	Greg	Seab	(14-17)	Absent
Sciences	Wendy	Schluchter	(14-17)	Present
Sciences	Joel Andrew	Webb	(14-17)	Absent
Sciences	Leonard	Spinu	(12-15)	Excused
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)	Excused
Library	Marie	Morgan	(13-16)	Present

3. Approval of the Minutes from the 2/24/15 Meeting

Dr. Speaker moved and Dr. Schluchter seconded to approve the minutes of the 2/24/15 meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

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

- a. Drs. Jenkins and Schluchter met with Kevin Cope (LSU Faculty Senate President) and Jim Robinson (LSUE Faculty Senate President) about the Association of Louisiana Faculty Senates. UNO is finally back as part of that organization. They had passed a resolution, which she expected to have a copy of by Monday, and she asked if the Senate could vote on it via email. Acting as substitute Parliamentarian, Dr. Speaker replied no, but we can vote to suspend the rules and vote on the resolution in April.
- b. Two people volunteered to work with her on the Senate's response to the state higher education budget cut issue. She will try to get more people to participate.

5. Senate Committee Reports

Nominations and Elections Committee (Ms. Morgan, Chair):

Ms. Morgan reminded everyone about senator representative elections being done by April 1 so that the Committee can start working on a slate for officer elections.

Proposed Faculty Senate Bylaws changes: The Committee presented a motion at the 2/24/15 meeting essentially to grandfather in for one year one Library and one College of Education senator who would otherwise have to be removed as a Senate representative due to

reapportionment. The Committee was asked instead to present Bylaws changes at today's meeting. The proposed changes, adding new items c. and d. to Article II. Representation, Section A. Composition, 5, Faculty, were sent out with the agenda one week in advance so that a vote could be held at this meeting.

a. Each academic unit (each college or the Library) shall be represented on the Senate Executive Committee, elected in a manner to be determined by that unit. This election shall precede and be separate from that for the remaining faculty Senators. Elected representation on the Senate Executive Committee from each unit is limited to full-time faculty, exclusive of the administrators of rank of Dean or above, with at least five years of full time academic service at UNO, or tenure.

b. The remaining faculty members of the Senate, elected from full-time faculty, exclusive of the administrator of rank of Dean or above, shall be divided among units to be one representative for every ten faculty members. Each unit shall determine the manner in which their representatives are elected. Each unit with ten or more full-time faculty members at the rank of Instructor will have at least one Instructor representative to the Senate at all times.

c. Each academic unit will have at least one Senator in addition to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee member.

d. Implementation of any reapportionment that would result in the removal of elected Senators shall only be delayed to the extent that they may complete their terms."

Mr. Teagle questioned the wording in d., and, after several senators offered attempts at altering the wording, wording proposed by Dr. Speaker was found to be acceptable to all: **d. A duly elected senator shall be allowed to complete his/her term.** Regarding c., Ms. Morgan was asked for the justification for the change. She responded that it was there before, removed from the 2007 Bylaws and put right back in, and then removed again when the Bylaws were redone in 2011. She also felt that it gives librarians an extra opportunity to contribute to University committees. There being no further discussion, Dr. Payne moved and Dr. Easterlin seconded to accept the changes as amended. A vote was held, and the amended motion was approved by all. Ms. Morgan thanked the Senate.

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

Dr. Tarr reported that one major item is that all Category 3 programs are coming to the Committee to present a plan on how to improve; two came already, and it is an ongoing process. The University is also out of compliance on evaluations of faculty performance, so FGC has a subcommittee working on a new faculty evaluation policy to be implemented at the end of this semester. He also expressed that he does not think that there is a plan in place to address effectively what would happen if/when there are major budget cuts.

Dr. Beriss questioned what the faculty evaluation means if there are no rewards or raises. Dr. Tarr replied that the University has to have certain implements in place and to utilize them to address improvement effectively over time. The current evaluation, with satisfactory/unsatisfactory, has no way of addressing where problems lie. If we implement an effective evaluation, in a few years we might be able to get rewards; rewards are not just raises. The new evaluation policy is being designed with five levels, from unsatisfactory to exceptional. Dr. Mokhiber asked, if we have five categories, are we producing some kind of data that is quantifiable and are we going to be ranking quartiles of faculty as well. Dr. Tarr replied that we

do need to have a legitimate and appropriate evaluation policy in place. Dr. Mokhiber stated that we are rushing to do that and will have faulty data.

Dr. Tarr noted that there are the three categories of teaching, research, and service. Dr. Schock said that all departments will develop their own criteria. Dr. Tarr explained that the evaluation policy is parallel to the workload policy and allows each faculty to be evaluated according to his/her workload assignment. In response to Dr. Jenkins question, Dr. Tarr responded that they are trying to finish a draft by next week; the full FGC will see it soon and the Senate soon as well. He believes that Academic Affairs will send an email letting people know that this is coming.

Dr. Baxter said that he understands that they are supposed to have a report on their Category 3 efforts by May 1st and asked if they will have feedback before then. Dr. Tarr replied that it is a tight timeline for everyone.

7. University Budget Committee (Dr. Schluchter)

Dr. Schluchter reminded everyone of the Committee's open meeting every Wednesday from 9:30-11:00am on the fourth floor of the Library, but they will not meet the next week because of spring break. They have various subcommittees working, and they got unit heads to fill out surveys. They are coming up with an assessment rubric with the need to increase efficiencies and also to reduce personnel in some areas. They had a lot of presentations analyzing the current budget, and next month they are coming up with a set of principles for if/when we get the budget cuts to determine how these budget cuts will take place. They have a Benchmarking Subcommittee, a subcommittee working on Business Processes to try to increase efficiency there, and a subcommittee working on Budget Processes to increase transparency, etc. They have had some recommendations to mull over to present to President Fos.

Dr. Payne noted that various people on campus have contracts, on the academic and non-academic side. We do not have tenure if we declare exigency, but what about contracts if we declare exigency? Is Dr. Fos under contract or tenured? Dr. Schluchter replied that Human Resources knows all of that. Dr. Payne asked if it would be inappropriate for them to share that information. Dr. Schluchter responded that we can ask Human Resources to come give a presentation, but nobody has a guaranteed job under exigency. Ms. Blankenship asked if vendor exigency affects vendor contracts. Patrick Linn (Director of Auxiliary Services) replied that he does not know, but he does not think that it would be a consideration of ours to cut out our revenue stream.

Dr. Jenkins asked if we have any idea whether the System or UNO is going to declare exigency. Dr. Schluchter replied that Greg Lassen said that the System is working on a policy. Dr. Sharpton added that it looks like eight of the nine institutions (all but ULL) are in favor of the System declaring exigency. Dr. Jenkins complemented Dr. Schluchter on doing a phenomenal job and encouraged everyone to come on Wednesdays, where there is a 10-minute window to speak. Dr. Schluchter stated that she does not have a mechanism to send out minutes to everyone, but if anyone wants to know, ask her.

8. SACS and Other Reports (Dr. Bill Sharpton, Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs)

Dr. Jenkins noted that this is the last Senate meeting before SACS, so some things need to be done before SACS comes on April 14-16. Dr. Sharpton explained that we follow the same procedures whether we are a private or a public institution in an 11-state region. SACS has 94 standards; the scoring is either compliant or non-compliant with each of the standards, and we have to keep working on it until we get a rating of compliant in all of the standards. There are three categories: core, comprehensive, and federal. There are seven people on our team, with each of them designated as a primary or secondary person for each standard. Dr. Sharpton explained in great detail how all of this works. Right now, our focus report was submitted in September and reviewed in Atlanta by an offsite team. 30 of our 94 standards identified in the first review were non-compliant. We were given an explanation in writing for each one. We will get a list prior to April 14 of those still not compliant.

Dr. Sharpton is creating a spreadsheet of who needs to see whom and for how long. So far, they have asked for program coordinators for each program, and another reviewer asked for a sample of chairs from different departments. They might ask for people involved in faculty governance, and he would like to come back to Dr. Jenkins once he has this list filled out. He would like to put together some sort of tips for different roles: (1) faculty role in general; (2) people who coordinate programs; and (3) chairs. He thinks that it would give people some idea of what kinds of questions might be asked.

He thinks that our two weaknesses are (1) graduate programs and (2) Institutional Effectiveness, for which he has greater concern because it got hit six times. Once was for core, but we passed that. Of the other five, the biggest one is around curriculum and instruction and how faculty uses curriculum data. Are we using those data to inform faculty decisions about program changes or pedagogy? In a major way, we lack evidence about improvement in our online courses. They want a sample of students and a sample of faculty engaged in online coursework, and he is hoping to know shortly who wants to be visited/interviewed. He is also doing another set of tips for staff. He is working with students primarily around the area of QEP. He is doing a working draft of what they are going to present to the SACS Team, and he will send the working draft to the Senate.

QEP (see draft QEP document) is something that we are doing at the core level to improve student success. Dr. Jenkins asked if they can ask anyone about QEP, and Dr. Sharpton replied yes; that is why he is going to have tips around the biggest thing that SACS will look at for us. QEP includes learning objectives and how we are going to use those findings to improve the student learning process. There are six learning outcomes. One of the things that the Team will look for is alignment of the topic with the campus. For general education, there are six rubrics. The weakest score was in the rubric about multiculturalism, and one of them comes back to GenEd. Regarding Figure 3, our QEP Committee tried to nest QEP in two initiatives: Service Learning and International Programs; activities listed on the left of this figure will be greatly stewarded by Service Learning and QEP. Regarding Assessments, there are four rubrics already developed on the national level, and the University of Florida gave us permission to use the assessments that they developed. There is a five-year plan for the Project Phases, starting small and working up to all areas. They will have college-by-college meetings with students and some all-college meetings.

Currently, we have Courses and Curricula for undergraduate courses and Graduate Council for Graduate courses. Dr. Sharpton is proposing that we use Courses and Curricula for all courses and still use the Graduate Council for other graduate matters. There would have to be safeguards on Courses and Curricula to elect people who can represent both graduate and undergraduate. Now, some 5000 courses could be coded 4000 and go through both bodies and get different recommendations. Dr. Sewell is putting together a set of recommendations that the Graduate Council can do that it is not doing now, and Dr. Sharpton would like to bring that back to the Senate, to which Dr. Jenkins agreed. Dr. Bourgeois asked if Courses and Curricula is under the Senate, and Dr. Speaker responded that it is under Faculty Council. Dr. Easterlin said that she wants people to understand that all coursework was covered by Courses and Curricula until three years ago and that Graduate Council is a very labor-intensive committee.

Dr. Jenkins said that, if we get through SACS, we owe it to Dr. Sharpton, and there was a round of applause.

Dr. Beaton stated that the Graduate School is very important to his faculty, and we need to be sure that graduate courses remain a major focus. Dr. Sharpton said that the problem will be to make the structure work for us, but he is not trying to diminish the role of Graduate Council.

9. Enrollment Management Steering Committee Report (Dr. Jenkins)

Dr. Jenkins explained that this Committee has staff, faculty, and administrators who come together once a week to work on student recruitment, retention, and marketing, and a report is generated. Dr. Schock listed some of the activities of the Committee, such as trying to initiate a process of planning scholarship recipients and looking at recruitment and retention data. This will enable them to intervene in a more dramatic way to allow students to persist.

10. Old Business. None.

11. New Business. None.

Mr. Teagle reported on what has been happening with students. A statewide higher education rally has been organized for April 15 in Baton Rouge to protest declines in higher education, and they were planning one on campus for the same day. It was pointed out to him that SACS is here that same day so they will have to change those plans.

Yesterday, Student Government leaders introduced a referendum on student self-assessed fees to go to restricted accounts that will go to subcommittees of the SGA. Mr. Teagle listed the various fee amounts, which total \$384.00 per semester for every student and is approximately \$7.6M per year to alleviate operational costs and overhead. It will be voted on as one package. He has already called for a special session of Student Government to vote this Friday. The next step will be a forum process, and he would like to have each college host one for people to express reservations. Ms. Blankenship asked if the Women's Center would be one of these departments. Mr. Teagle replied that they could put it forward, and the Committee itself would decide. No one is unwelcome at the table if they have a legitimate request. This is all about going from Student Government to a Student Government Association. Dr. Beaton noted that the faculty recognizes how great the student body is to stand up and do this; this is self-taxation. Dr. Jenkins

stated that she really thinks that this is an article for the *Times-picayune* or *The Advocate*, to which Mr. Teagle agreed.

Dr. Jenkins announced that if we go to the UNO home page, CHART is a finalist in a national competition for an award in creating solutions for risk, and she encouraged everyone to vote every day until May 15.

Dr. Jenkins stated that at the next meeting, we will have to talk about SACS and have reports from the Senate Budget Committee and the Senate Elections Committee.

12. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was moved by Dr. Payne and seconded by Dr. Speaker. The meeting adjourned at 4:25 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Marie Morgan
Faculty Senate Secretary, 2014/15
April 16, 2015