

## Meeting Minutes, Faculty Senate, full meeting, November 26, 2024

### In attendance:

Phoebe Ajibade (A), Ayanna Armstrong (S), Jennifer Beasley (S), Stephen Bollinger (S), Trevor Brothers (S), Dewayne Brown (S), Chantel Simpson Carroll (S), Subrata Chakrabarty (A), Arvind Chandrasekaran (S), Eunho Cho (S), Daphne Cooper, Zaira Estrada-Reyes (S), Robert Ferguson (S), Yvonne R Ford (S), Galen Foresman (S), Valerie Giddings, Etta Gravely (A), Corey Graves (S), Scott H. Harrison (S); AKM Kamrul Islam (A), Floyd James, Yuhan Jiang (S), Stephanie Kelly (S), Joy Kennedy (S), Luba Kurkalova (S), Roland Leak (S), Jim Martin, Ademe Mekonnen (S), Adam McClain (S), Nicole R. McCoy, Ahmed C. Megri (S), Leticia Nuñez-Argote (S), Xiuli Qu (A), David Rachlin (A), Bill Randle (S), Ginger Redd, Zaira Estrada Reyes (S), Derrick Robinson (S), Mashooq Salehin (S), David Schall (S), Amy Schwartzott (S), Natasha Spellman (A), Christina Tupper (S), Pauline Ada Uwakweh (S), John Paul Ward (S), Jeff Wolfgang (S)

(S): Senator

(A): Alternate

Call to order was done by Dr. Scott Harrison at 3:00 pm. Roll call was led by Dr. Fuller. There was a link to attendance sent out and a QR Code. The agenda was presented. A motion was made Dr. Armstrong and seconded by Dr. Gravely for the agenda to be approved. The motion passed unanimously. Minutes were presented for the September and October 2024 meetings. A motion was made Dr. Ford and seconded by Dr. Gravely for the minutes to be approved. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Harrison made reference to the faculty roster and summarized representation across academic units, UNC System Faculty Assembly representation, contact and mailing lists for faculty senators, academic units and administrators. He encouraged everyone to continue to review and provide any related updates. Prior feedback on draft policies was described concerning post-tenure review and teaching effectiveness as being 3 pages of written feedback in response to the 12 pages of drafted policies. Mainly grammar issues that had been identified were corrected, but most recommendations were not adopted in the final versions of these policies. The draft academic program review policy was then presented for discussion. This included discussion of procedures and outcomes of recent academic program reviews in the UNC System such as at UNC Greensboro. It was mentioned that being aware about other institutional models and approaches to academic program review would be valuable. It was requested that input for feedback on the APR be sent to Faculty Senate leadership for incorporation into a document of written feedback to be sent to the administration.

Chancellor James Martin II joined the meeting and was recognized and thanked. Chancellor Martin expressed interest in the discussion and ideas, Chancellor Martin further indicated a primary objective for moving the university forward, and an appreciation for the substantial

role of faculty. A goal for continued engagement was indicated in further discussion with the Chancellor.

Dr. Giddings and a vendor representative for “Simple Syllabus” discussed the possible automation and templating of syllabi within blackboard using a technology known as “Simple Syllabus”. Upon discussion, it appears that this technology can be used in a way to allow faculty to generally prescribe and update their syllabi in a real-time manner without undue constraint, but depending on its configuration, this technology may also be inflexible and cumbersome if top-heavy authorization/approval chains are used. It may also not fully support styling a syllabus to be motivational and engaging specific to a disciplinary topic, but rather have a uniform template-based appearance. The tool may have value with accreditation reports, department-level customizations, and integration with a campus bookstore. Training is anticipated for Spring 2025 with potential adoption in Fall 2025. It was asked by Dr. Kurkalova whether other institutions could be communicated with regarding experiences and outcomes regarding adoption. On a different topic, Dr. Giddings reminded everyone of another objective in the university regarding workload plan submissions.

Dr. Harrison then mentioned and described an upcoming faculty survey, and thanked Dr. Marshall, Dr. Armstrong and other faculty for their leadership on putting together this survey. Dr. Harrison mentioned some interest from other UNC System university faculty senates in utilizing the survey that was developed. The discussion then proceeded toward different options regarding dissemination.

Work toward a faculty handbook revision was then presented by Dr. William Randle and further discussion and review within the Faculty Senate was planned for.

Dr. Harrison presented updates from the UNC System Faculty Assembly. There is discussion and extensive edits being proposed surrounding Chapter 6 of the UNC system code. This specifically includes objectives for recognitions and protections for professional track faculty. Intended justification for this proposed change is to respect dignity of all with terminal degrees and established records of scholarship who contribute to our university mission. Updates to Chapter 6 would make the UNC System a more competitive workplace to draw on the very best talent and retain the very best talent. Terms of service on the UNC System Faculty Assembly was also mentioned as a current topic of discussion.

Further discussion then moved onto a range of other items. Concern about the post-tenure review policy were described surrounding whether upper-level academic unit administrators (e.g., dean) should be the sole report sent to the UNC System. Will there be consistency across deans? Do deans have adequate disciplinary knowledge across different departments as members within each department? In that regard, would a dean’s report be best based around oversight of the process and not weigh in specifically on disciplinary considerations? Further follow-up with administration was recommended. There is a lack of transparency if the college and department PTR committee reports are not being included in what is sent onwards.

It was inquired whether there was further involvement of faculty with the simple syllabus, and whether there were reports from other campuses on its usage. Will faculty have involvement closer to the stage of configuration and rollout? Challenges with navigating ongoing changes to syllabi templates occurring immediately prior to various semesters was generally commented on as well. Questions regarding the bookstore were then put forward due to the recent change in bookstores. A suggestion was made that incomplete grades do not default to F, and whether instructors could specify a different default grade (such as a C). A motion was made and seconded for the meeting to be concluded. The motion passed unanimously.