

## Faculty Council Minutes February 23, 2012

**Present:** *FEC* - Michael Green (Faculty President), Ed Jernigan (President Elect), Judy Walker (Secretary), Charles Bodkin (Past President), Randy Haldeman (Arts & Architecture), Heather Lipf (Computing & Informatics, Alternate), Tracy Rock (Education), Terry Xu (Engineering), Meg Morgan (Liberal Arts & Sciences), Barbara Tierney (Library)

*Unit Representatives* – Casper Wiggins (ACCT), Dennis Ogburn (ANTH), Jeff Balmer (ARCH), Janet Williams (ART), Jian Zhang (BIO), Tom Schmedake (CHEM), Johnny Graham (CENG), Richard Leeman (COMM), M. Tughi Mostafavi (CS, Alt.), Joe Kuhns (CJUS), Ellen Sewell (ECON), Mark D’Amico (EDLD), Bharat Joshi (ECE), Carlos Orozco (ETCM), Meg Morgan (ENGL, Alternate), John Diemer (GEO/ES), Roy Fielding (KNES), Betty Ladner (LIB), Linda Swayne (MKTG), Alan Dow (MATH), Nigel Zheng (MENG, Alternate), Spencer Salas (MDSK), John Allemeier (MUSC), Eddy Souffrant (PHIL), Vasily Astratov (PHYS), Beth Racine (PHS), Kate Popejoy (REEL, Alt.), Julia Robinson-Harmon (RELS), Xintao Wu (SIS), Robert Herman-Smith (SOWK), Kelly Anderson (SPED)

*Ex officio* – Phil Dubois (Chancellor), Steve Ott (Dean, College of Business), Richard Buttimer (Associate, Dean, College of Business), Yi Deng (Dean, College of Computing & Informatics), Mary Lynn Calhoun (Dean, College of Education), Robert Johnson (Dean, College of Engineering), Nancy Fey-Yensan (Dean, College of Health & Human Services), Nancy Gutierrez (Dean, College of Liberal Arts & Sciences), John Smail (Dean, University College)

*Also Attending* - Leslie Zenk (Academic Affairs), Clarence Greene (Academic Affairs), Valorie McAlpin (Center for Teaching & Learning), Connie Martin (Extended Academic Programs), Tina McEntire (Admission), Janet Daniel (OASES), Tony Carter (Office of Student Financial Aid), Christopher Knauer (Registrar), Denise Dwight Smith (University Career Center), Stuart Smith (Chair, FAPSC), Claire Kirby (Undergraduate Admissions), Susan Sell (Graduate School)

*Guests* – Amiee Parkison (Chair, FESC), Michael Dreen, Briana McNeil

**Absent:** *FEC* – Alice Tseng (Business), Gwen Foss (Health & Human Services), Susan Peters (Liberal Arts & Sciences), Tanure Ojaide (Liberal Arts & Sciences)

*Ex Officio* – Joan Lorden (Provost), Tom Reynolds (Dean, Graduate School), Ken Lambla (Dean, College of Arts & Architecture), Yi Deng (Dean, College of Computing & Informatics), Stanley Wilder (University Librarian)

*Unit Representatives* – Veronica Hilliard (AFRS), Dennis Livesay (BIOINF), Xiuli He (BISOM), Pam Lassiter (COUN), Kim Jones (DANC), Keener Hughen (FINN), Garth Green (GIAS), Gregory Mixon (HIST), Mike Doyal (LCS), Kent Curran (MGMT), Lucille Travis (NURS), John Szmer (POLS), Jane Gaultney (PSYC), Murray Webster (SOC), Jeanmarie Higgins (THTR)

Meeting was called to order by President Green at 12:31 PM.

### 1. **Approval of the Minutes of the January 26, 2012 meeting of the Faculty Council**

Fielding moved and Jernigan seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the January 26, 2012 Faculty Council meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

### 2. **Motion to Award Degrees**

The Provost moved that, *consistent with the Board of Trustee’s Resolution on May 5, 1980, the Faculty recommend to the Chancellor that appropriate degrees be conferred on all candidates who have met the established requirements of the Faculty since December and that the degrees have a award date of May 2012.*

She also moved that, *consistent with the Board of Trustees's Resolution on May 5, 1980, the Faculty recommend to the Chancellor that appropriate degrees be conferred on all candidates who have met the established requirements of the Faculty of the period between May and September and that the degrees have award dates of June or August 2012.*

Koons seconded the motions, which passed unanimously,

### 3. Motions from the Faculty Academic Policy and Standards Committee.

#### A. Priority Registration Policy

During the 2010-2011 academic year FAPSC determined that the Priority Registration Policy was outdated and in need of review. In a memo dated August 26, 2011, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Joan F. Lorden officially charged FAPSC with review of the current policy and procedure.

The original policy was reviewed by a small working group of FAPSC. The outcome of this review was a revised document that includes two suggested changes. The first proposed revision is a minor rewrite of the documentation necessary to obtain consideration for priority registration in the second paragraph of section titled - **Activities and Programs Causing Severe Scheduling Restrictions**. The document should read:

*The justification: (1) documents the existence of a severe scheduling restriction that is caused by involvement in the program or activity, (2) demonstrates that the program or activity and its current design are highly valued university priorities, (3) justifies that this particular class of students deserves priority registration and will be disadvantaged without it, and (4) describes the amount of variance from normal registration (ahead of all students, ahead of the participant's class) needed to achieve equal opportunity for an optimum schedule.*

The second proposed revision specifies consultation with the Registrar and FAPSC Chair in review of applications for priority status by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The elimination of an annual review of the priority list is justified due to the existence of the review procedure.

Green noted there was a minor change made to the document at the FEC meeting. The FEC recommended that College Dean and/or Athletic Director be added to the *Approval of Requests for Special Registration Priority* section.

Rock seconded the motion.

Stuart Smith, chair of FAPSC, provided some additional background information about priority registration. Priority registration is usually used as a reward or to address specific needs and/or problems. To make sure all students have equal access to registration, specific criteria and procedures have been put in place. The edited criteria in this proposal are much clearer. The committee took out a lot of historical information, which will be archived, and removed an annual review that wasn't taking place anyway.

There was no further discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

#### B. Cap on AP Examination Credits

FAPSC submitted the following motion:

*'No more than 8 credit hours can be awarded for any single advanced placement exam.'*

And based on this motion it is suggested that the existing policy statement will be replaced by the following statement (changes shown in **bold**)

#### **ADVANCED PLACEMENT COURSE CREDIT (AP)**

The University will accept appropriate undergraduate credits earned through Advanced Placement Program Tests completed prior to graduation from high school. Students must request that official Advanced Placement test results be sent directly to the Office of Undergraduate Admissions for evaluation (UNC Charlotte code 5105). Prospective students who desire further information about policies and procedures for awarding credit should view score requirements and other related information at [admissions.uncc.edu](http://admissions.uncc.edu). **No more than 8 credit hours can be awarded for any single**

**advanced placement exam.**

Smith provided additional background in regard to the proposal. Currently there is no policy on how many credits could be awarded for AP exams taken by students. John Smail's group did an audit, and they surveyed other universities to find out what policies they had in place. The audit revealed that some departments were giving a lot of credits for AP exams while others were not. That is why the committee is proposing that we institute an 8-credit cap for AP exams which would bring UNCC into line with sister institutions.

Morgan seconded the motion.

*Discussion:*

Swain asked Smith to give the council a better idea of how the credits are awarded? Smith indicated that based on the audit some of the language programs were giving 11-12 credit hours. So would that be equivalent to someone taking 6 classes?

MacIntyre, who was instrumental in writing the motion, provided a little more clarification. Students take exam at the end of an AP course get rated on a scale from 1-5. Institutions use that score to determine how many credit hours a student will receive. Some institutions give credits for a score of 3 or above, others for 4 and above. The number of credit hours generally runs from 3-6 credit hours. Some of our language programs wanted to award 12 credit hours, but that seemed too high for one high school course. The National Board does not recommend giving that much credit. So this proposal brings the university in line with the guidelines recommended by the National Board and our regional peer institutions.

The motion passed unanimously

C. Academic Calendar Reading Day Policy Revision

FAPSC moved that the following statement be added to the Academic Calendar policy statement (addition in **bold**):

*The Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina has enacted regulations (UNC Policy Manual, Chapter 400.1.6) for the minimum number of class days per semester and academic year. All UNC campuses must ensure that every course offered for academic credit adheres to the standard minimum requirements of instructional time for the semester and academic year. The time may include required examination periods, but not Reading Day. **Required activities are prohibited on Reading Day.***

Smith indicated there was no explicit policy on reading day, which was designed to provide students with a day devoted to studying. Without such a policy, the committee felt faculty would use that day for other purposes. That would put some students at a disadvantage.

Discussion: Green mentioned a recent situation that illustrated why we need this policy. A student who was on the Soccer team which was going to be playing in the final four of soccer could not leave until he got permission from his professor who had rescheduled a final exam for reading day.

This policy will cause a problem for the College of Engineering. They run an expo for capstone projects on reading day. Students are required to present their capstone project, which is not optional. We would have to stop that event completely. Green suggested that the event could be made optional, but the students would still be required to do and present their capstone project at some point in time.

The motion passed with one opposed.

#### 4. University Professor Honor award

The following motion was submitted by the Faculty Employment Status Committee:

*After researching and discussing the University Professor Honor draft and comparing it to similar awards at other universities, the FESC voted unanimously in favor of the proposal and would like to make a motion to accept the proposal for the University Professor Honor draft with the following recommendations –*

- 1.) *The initial description should be clarified to highlight a more specific area of achievement and expectation for the person holding the title, for example: "the title is given to a full professor who is not only a scholar of national distinction but also who has a demonstrated record of significant engagement within the university community."*
- 2.) *There should be no more than one University Professor distinction awarded per year, but each University Professor should hold the title for life.*
- 3.) *The University Professor shall receive a one-time stipend the year designated as a University Professor.*

Jernigan seconded the motion.

Amy Parkison, FESC chair, provided some background information on the proposal. It was drafted by the Provost's office, and the committee was asked to review it and make recommendations. The committee made three recommendations that were added to the proposal. Green indicated the title would only be held while the person was employed by the University. Morgan questioned the idea that it only lasts as long as the person is employed at UNCC. Green pointed out that a person cannot take tenure with them when they go to another institution. The Chancellor noted if they retire, they could be University Professor Emeritus.

Calhoun wondered if there had been any discussion about awarding the honor to a team and not just an individual since it celebrates interdisciplinary work. Parkison indicated the committee did not discuss this issue since it wasn't part of the original proposal, and all the other universities with similar awards honored individuals. The question of why only one per year was asked. Parkison indicated that this would ensure its uniqueness. Green indicated that the University could revisit and revise the document if the future.

Motion passed unanimously.

#### 5. Proposal from Ad Hoc Committee on Adjunct Faculty Voice

The Ad Hoc Committee on Adjunct Faculty Voice, which was created by the Faculty Council last fall, is forwarding two proposals where were discussed in open meetings with the faculty.

- A. The first motion is to create a Part-time Faculty Standing Committee

*The FEC moves that the Standing Rules of the Faculty Council be amended as follows:*

*Add to Article V, Section 6, the following:*

*E. Part-Time Faculty Committee (PTFC)*

1. *The function of the Part-Time Faculty Committee shall be to consult and advise university leadership on policies, processes and practices, as well as the enforcement of same, pertaining to the welfare of part-time faculty as it is related to the workplace environment that can affect recruiting, retention, professional development and morale of faculty. These issues could include, but are not be limited to part-time faculty workload policies, employment status, working environment, support, continuity, productivity, and diversity.*
2. *The membership of the Part-Time Faculty Committee shall consist of:*
  - a. *One part-time faculty member and one alternate chosen by each academic college and the Library except the College of Liberal Art and Sciences, which will choose three representatives and three alternates. The part-time faculty members for this committee will be determined by each college through a faculty election process.*
  - b. *The Coordinator of Academic Policies, Procedures, and Faculty Governance serving in an ex-officio capacity with non-voting privileges.*

3. *The Part-Time Faculty Committee shall be accountable primarily and fully to the Faculty Council.*
4. *The term of membership shall be for two years with a maximum of two consecutive terms. To ensure continuity, terms of part-time members shall be staggered so that one-half of the part-time faculty members are elected each year. To begin this rotation a random drawing will determine which members will serve only one year.*
5. *The committee chairperson shall be elected by its members at the committee's last meeting each spring. All members of the committee are eligible to serve as chairperson except the ex-officio member.*
6. *Membership on this committee does not constitute employment at the University.*

*Further, to accommodate this addition, subsequent subsections under Section 6 should be re-lettered accordingly (E becomes F, and F becomes G).*

Green noted that this committee would consist of part-time faculty, and they would elect a chair from its members. This would set a new precedence for faculty governance. This committee would be solely accountable to the Faculty Council.

Calhoun seconded the motion.

*Discussion:*

Hardin, chair of the Ad Hoc committee gave a brief overview of the committee's work. She noted that the committee was comprised of both full and part-time faculty. They surveyed sister institutions both nationally and regionally.

Question: Does this change the definition of faculty? No, the definition of faculty remains tied to full-time status. This does not give individual part-time faculty voting privileges. This does not change the definition, nor does it change the faculty constitution. It is just adding a standing committee of the faculty council with these specifics.

Question: The wording in the proposal does not include full-time lecturers. Does that mean they will have no voice? Hardin indicated that full-time lecturers are considered faculty and already have voting privileges. The Faculty Constitution defines faculty as full-time lecturers or above.

Question: How will this actually work if a part-time person does not continue their employment? Hardin indicated that was why they included alternate members. Green also mentioned that there is a statement in the proposal that says membership does not constitute employment.

Motion passed unanimously.

- B. The second proposal is the creation of a Part-time Faculty Handbook.

*Be it Resolved that, Faculty Council request that Academic Affairs prepare a Part-Time Faculty Handbook on the entitlements and rights, as well as responsibilities and lines of reporting of part-time faculty that will apply to each college. This handbook would act as a foundation and address university-wide issues. Each college is encouraged to develop a college level part-time faculty handbook or resources to address the unique policies and practices of each college; and*

*Be it Further Resolved that Faculty Council requests that Academic Affairs make this Part-Time Faculty Handbook available on the Academic Affairs website by Spring 2013.*

The Provost at the FEC meeting has already agreed to create this document.

Fielding seconded the motion.

*Discussion:*

Calhoun asked if we sure there isn't one already? Green commented, if there is one, the provost doesn't know about it. Some colleges have their own part-time faculty handbook, but there isn't one over arching

one for the University.

The motion passed unanimously.

#### 6. Security incident Report (Dr. Jay Dominick)

- The University is taking the incident very seriously, and he personally apologizes to the community and takes responsibility.
- They are totally committed to fix the issue, make it right and do the right thing by those who are affected. They are taking the problem very seriously and are working on it on a daily basis.
- What happened?
  - There was not one single issue but multiple issues occurring simultaneously.
  - The basic root cause of the problem was people made incorrect choices about who had permissions to what files.
  - They don't believe it was malicious or intentional.
  - Files became available on the internet.
  - Banner was not hacked.
  - The core systems with our most sensitive information were not hacked either.
  - Research systems are intact as well.
- Jerigan asked – Can you give us an example of what kind of information and/or files were affected? Dominick indicated that millions of files could potentially be affected but couldn't say exactly which ones or what kind.
- What they are doing.
  - They have hired an investigating team from the outside to verify that the incident was accidental.
  - They are also trying to determine what files were retrieved by people who shouldn't have had access to those files. The files are being reviewed by another external company to determine which files have been compromised (accessed by someone who shouldn't have gotten to it)
  - After the investigation is complete, they (IT) will notify folks who may have been affected. That won't happen tomorrow because they have a ways to go before the investigation is finished.
  - The recent email to faculty and staff was not required by law but was meant to alert folks to the problem without alerting the broader digital community there is/was a vulnerability.
- The majority of exposure has been shutdown/stopped.
  - One area is still exposed, and they are working very hard to contain it.
  - They couldn't turn off the exposure without affecting the teaching and learning process. That is why the memo was vague because of this ongoing exposure.
  - They hope to have it contained this coming weekend.
- Chancellor indicated that Dominick does need to be opaque. What we really need to look at now is what functions need to be centralized and what doesn't need to be centralized. We will probably bring in some external folks to help us make these decisions. There are many pluses to decentralization on the service side, but security is not one of them. It is what needs to be centralized. This is a very expensive situation. Hundreds of thousands dollars are needed for the fix.

#### Questions:

How long have they been exposed? It varies from a very short time to a very long time. Some files were exposed for a very long time.

How long will the investigation go on? They are continuing to add things to the investigation so it is hard to say. It could be several weeks on the first incident but a month or more for the second.

What about copying of the files? They will look at what files have been downloaded, then they will go back to the original files to see what was in them. If it is a file with personal and/or critical information in it, such as credit card numbers, they will notify the owner of the file.

Have you established with certainty that some files have been downloaded and/or inappropriately accessed? If so have people been notified? This is of utmost concern to the group. When they have the facts, they will notify folks. They don't have all the facts yet. They don't know who to tell what to. He thinks they will know soon.

How does this impact information for our research? Doesn't feel competent to answer. They are trying to identify where this classified research information might be and whether it was affected. He really can't provide a satisfactory answer to the question.

Although Banner was not affected, is it possible that information from Banner such as phone numbers, addresses, etc. was exposed? He reiterated that Banner was not hacked. As to that type of information being exposed, yes, it's possible, and as soon as they are confident of the facts, they will start notifying people.

Are we certain there wasn't any write permissions exposed? The investigators will let us know for certain. That's why we have hired external investigate to do the due-diligence that we may not be capable of. We have no reason to believe there were any write permissions exposed, but he is not the definitive authority on that, the investigators are.

What should we put in grant proposals & IRB as to where we will store our data? – He didn't really have an answer for this. He will find out about this. Green asked that he send out notification about it when he finds out what would be the best solution to the problem.

Dominick indicated that their key goal is to restore the faith in the system.

How has the training been altered? Yes, training is important and so is layering of security. Chancellor indicated that the long-term exposure was the fault of decentralization.

Was email affected? Doesn't have a good answer to that at the moment. The email system itself was not compromised. Where people store their email may have been compromised.

What should we do as individuals to protect ourselves? Working on a document – top ten things to do to protect yourself. Don't store social security numbers or passwords on anything you own that's not good. Have secure information encrypted. He will be sending out tips.

Chancellor reiterated that the first incident has been stopped. The second incident is not completely contained and is similar in nature.

Where should we put things we need to share? Create folders that have specific permissions associated with them.

What about grades on the H-drive and J-drive, are they secure? Yes, it is secured today.

He will continue to keep the council up-to-date on the matter.

## **7. QEP Progress Report (Dr. John Smail)**

- Part of SACs accreditation (March 2013)
  - required campus wide program to improve student engagement
  - needs to have broad impact across the campus
  - focused on student learning
  - good excuse to do something of importance
- Focus on student academic engagement
  - active partners in the educational experience
  - be intentional about the choices they are making
- Focusing on new freshman
  - need fall and spring component
  - embedded in curriculum
  - we are doing a lot of this already (freshman seminars, learning communities, etc.) – just connecting dots
  - also adding new components to draw in students not currently involved in the established programs
- Committees involved
  - 7 development teams to develop a QEP curriculum for the different colleges

- A committee to do PR across campus, common messages, expectations, etc.
- QEP steering committee
- QEP executive committee
- Core outcomes
  - Commitment to academic success
  - Inquiry (creating knowledge)
  - Personal & intercultural awareness
- Assessment Model
  - Everything will be assessed in the curriculum
  - Some form of reflective response – will look different for different majors
- Still working on
  - Required curriculum elements
  - Planning for faculty development
  - Coordination with support units
  - Prepare the QEP document
  - Get feedback

*Questions:*

What is your timeline? Draft end of this semester, get feedback, final draft January 2013.

When will it be assessed? – Small - probably at the end of the freshman year. Assessment assignments will also be built into the classes. They may continue to track engagement as they continue through the program.

**8. Report of the Chancellor (Dr. Dubois)**

- Reiterated that we are going to get to the bottom of the security incident and make things right. He wants to be more transparent but can't.
- Tuition increase has been approved
  - The legislature could change the amount but will probably not.
  - We were the 4<sup>th</sup> lowest increase (6.5% on tuition, 6.5% on fees)
  - Total increase is 7.8%, which is still well into the bottom quartile of our sister institutions, which is where the BOG likes us to be.
  - \$100 fee to address infrastructure problems (roads, electrical systems, etc.)
    - This will generate about \$35 million used for debt-funded infrastructure.
    - It will go toward a bond that we will use for these projects.
    - We will address the entire infrastructure on the south side of campus. That area needs water, power, IT infrastructure before we can add buildings.
    - It will hopefully help fix Phillips Road.
    - We have at the moment \$79 million in deferred maintenance costs.
    - The Chancellor warned the council that we are about to enter one of the busiest building periods in our history of UNCC. Between the completion of the EPIC and the football stadium, the building of PORTAL and the last phase of the dorms by the student union and all of the upgrades, there will be construction activity all over campus.
  - It should be noted that even with the tuition increase we will not come close to making up our losses.
    - Last year we lost \$3.5 million last year and over the last 4 years we lost \$49 million in appropriations.
    - The tuition increase will generate \$6.7 million. \$1.7 million of it will go to student financial aid.



- We are in the process of trying to recalibrate how we compute aid to give the greatest aid to the neediest students
- Budget is in good shape. No reversions are expected, although they have been holding back some money in reserve. So be looking for one time funding to be spent at the end of the year.
  - He does not expect any new money. It will still be a lean year but not a disaster.
  - He has asked for about \$12.6 million new planning money for the science building. He doesn't expect to get it all but hopes to get a fraction of it so they can start planning.
- Football/Athletics
  - He has established a new committee on ethics to educate the public about rules violations because football expands exposure with all the additional athletes.
  - The university has received 26 letters of intent from student athletes; 23 from North Carolina; 2 from South Carolina, 1 from Georgia, 9 of which are quarterbacks.
- He put in a plug for the faculty scholarship proposal. He thinks it's a great idea and a good investment.

*Question:*

Were the graduate school tuition increases approved? Yes, they were, but the colleges that submitted multiple year requests will have to go back again next year.

**9. Provost's Report: None**

**10. President-elect's Report:**

Jernigan reported that he was putting the finishing touches on the spring slate, which will be going out in March.

**11. President's Report:**

- Thanks to Valerie McAlpin for working with council on the implementation of the electronic evaluations. It couldn't have been done without her.
- Scholarship Ad Hoc Committee Update: The committee has been meeting weekly, working hard to put together recommendations to present at the March meeting.
- Textbook orders
  - We really need to change the culture around ordering textbooks.
  - We are 4<sup>th</sup> from the bottom among all 16 institutions with 74.5% compliance.
  - The bookstore did move the deadline back a week so that it is not right after spring break.
  - He has talked with the bookstore about putting together spreadsheets of last falls book orders that can be sent to the department chairs. The chairs can then ask their faculty what changes need to be made. All we would need to do is report the changes. This would help automate the process. So have your department chair request a spreadsheet from Mr. Grinnell in the bookstore.
- Reporting Grades
  - On January 10<sup>th</sup> 1,500 students were missing grades. 47% of them were on financial aid and couldn't buy books.
  - 50 faculty members repeatedly don't turn grades in. We have to do a better job of policing ourselves or someone else will do it for us.

**12. New Business: None**

Meeting adjourned at 1:43 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Judy Walker, Faculty Secretary

*Judy Walker*