

Standing Committee Reports

Academic Year 2007-2008

Committees

1. Academic Planning & Budget Committee (Meg Morgan, Chair)
2. Faculty Committee on General Education (Greg Wickliff, Chair)
3. Faculty Academic Policy and Standards Committee (Rick Lejk, Chair)
4. Faculty Advisory Library Committee (Daniel Rabinovich, Chair)
5. Faculty Advisory Summer Sessions Committee (Frada Mozenter, Chair)
6. Faculty C/D/AP/D Grants Committee (Coral Wayland, Chair)
7. Faculty Competitive Grants Committee (Peggy Wilmoth, Chair)
8. Undergraduate Course & Curriculum Committee (Kim Harris, Chair)
9. Faculty Employment Status Committee (David Walters, Chair)
10. Faculty Grievance Committee (David Binkley, Chair)
11. Faculty Hearing Committee (Mark Clemens, Chair)
12. Faculty Honorary Degree Advisory Committee (Deb Ryan, Chair)
13. Faculty Information and Technology Services Committee (Mark Clemens, Chair)
14. Faculty Research Grants Committee (Jurgen Buchenau, Chair)
15. Graduate Council (Jerry Ingalls, Chair)
16. University Honors Council (Daniel Jones, Chair)

To: Kim Harris, President of the Faculty

From: Meg Morgan, Chair, **Faculty Academic Planning and Budget Committee**

Date: April 11, 2008

Subject: Annual Report 2007-2008

The Faculty Academic Planning and Budget Committee met four times this academic year. In fall 2007, we held two regular meetings and an extra meeting during which Provost Lorden reviewed budgetary principles and used some actual budgets as examples.

This year, however, I moved the committee away from budgetary issues toward considering planning issues. Thus, during the regular meetings last fall, the committee identified an issue that it chose to pursue through the UNC Tomorrow initiative—the re-institution of the faculty development aspect of Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC)/Writing Intensive program, formerly known as the Office of University Writing programs.

The FAP&B committee members were major players in two meetings about WAC, one in January and another in March. During the latter, Dr. John Smail, the Dean of University College, discussed the relationship of WAC to his UNC Tomorrow Task Force. In his report to the Provost as chair of the Task Force, he recommended that the WAC faculty development program be re-institutionalized, thus reinforcing the FAP&B committee's sense of the importance of this initiative.

Next year, the committee will consider some issues suggested by the Provost. They include:

- The role of this University on the Kannapolis Research Campus
- A consideration of the opportunities for programming on the Uptown campus, especially during the day.
- Discussions of the Master Plan
- Feedback on the University Diversity Plan
- Feedback on the Childcare Report, a discussion that should also reflect issues in the Master Plan.

Please feel free to consult with me or other members of the committee if you have any questions.

General Education Committee - Year-end Report

4/17/08

Chair- Greg Wickliff

A University College was established this year with oversight responsibilities for General Education, and this Committee worked with its new Dean, John Smail, to clarify processes and responsibilities throughout the academic year. Primary topics of discussion included: 1) LBST program assessment; 2) Trends in staffing General Education; 3) responses to UNC Tomorrow; 4) Software & Information Systems – Philosophy LBST proposal; 5) MGNT 3160 / COMM 3160 Proposal for Writing Intensive Requirement; 6) Composition Requirements and Writing Across the Curriculum; 7) Proposed Dual Degree Program with Beijing Normal University. Relevant details from each discussion are included below.

1. LBST assessment was redesigned in the fall 2007, and is in progress in spring 2008. John Smail indicates that the response rate may be low, that students may not have responded to the appropriate number of essay prompts, and so the results of the assessment may not what we had hoped for. He is working to process the results now.

2. Trends in Staffing General Education. The Committee reviewed data and expressed concern over the current trends in part-time staffing in the General Education program, and increasing reliance upon the large lecture format for these courses. We note that freshmen retention nationwide is negatively correlated with instruction delivered by part-time faculty.

3. Continued discussion of the response to UNC Tomorrow—specifically sections 4.1.1 on skills.

The Committee had an introduction from Tony Scott, Director of the Rhetoric & Writing Program, about discussions that have been taking place on how the university might think about ways to redesign, reconsider, and support the teaching of written (and oral) communication, critical thinking, problem solving in both the composition sequence and upper level writing in majors. This is emerging as the most tangible response to concerns raised in this regard in our meetings during the fall, with renewed interest in a Writing Across the Curriculum Program of some kind.

4. Software & Information Systems – Philosophy proposal to use special sections of LBST 2211 in their curriculum revisions.

Terms and conditions we developed for fielding Proposals:

Rationale: In principle, the LBST courses in the General Education curriculum are intended to be part of a common educational experience that is distinct from the particular professional or curricular needs of a given major or college. However, scenarios in which an LBST course is incorporated as a requirement in the curriculum for a program have the potential to more fully integrate general education and the major and can, if carefully constructed, preserve the ‘general’ features of general education. Therefore the Faculty General Education committee has established the following guidelines and procedures that must be followed as part of the curriculum process in order for a department to include an LBST course in their curriculum.

Guidelines for Courses:

- The all sections used for this purpose must have a substantial enrollment of students NOT taking the class to fulfill program requirements. 50% is a target. Situations in which 50% of enrollment serves one program, 25% another, and 25% a third are not acceptable. A robust plan for enrollment management must be in place to ensure this objective is met.
- The course in question must remain, in its essence, a Gen Ed class. The programmatic elements that make the section appropriate to the students pursuing a particular major are subordinate to general education purpose, and therefore the course must make sense to, and be attractive to, the students who are not there to fulfill programmatic requirements. Please provide details about the course.
- The teaching an LBST class to meet programmatic goals must not detract from the educational experience of that course and should, ideally, enhance it by bringing in perspectives and expertise that will allow the instructor to further develop students' understanding of and appreciation for the course materials.
- Normally, the courses meeting programmatic requirements should be taught by faculty from departments other than that of the students being served. Exceptions are possible, but the burden of proof will be upon the unit to demonstrate that the course will meet the conditions above.
- Normally, LBST courses that also meet programmatic requirements will be taught by full time faculty—tenure track if possible. Exceptions are possible if circumstances require.

5. MGNT 3160 / COMM 3160 Proposal for Writing Intensive Requirement

MGNT is proposing that the Writing Intensive course in the discipline be delivered outside the College by a new course to be delivered Communication Studies Department - affecting some 700 graduates per year. The heading for this requirement is 'writing in the discipline,' and the last phrase of the extract below discusses the "writing strategies appropriate for the discipline offering the course."

John Smail and the General Education Committee made follow-up requests of Daryl Kerr:

- The committee would like to get an update on the status of this proposal so we can understand what's happened and what still needs to happen.
- The committee would like to receive a formal proposal from the College regarding this change. That should include a copy of the curriculum proposal prepared for COMM 3160 as well as an explanation of how the structure and teaching of the proposed course will continue to address the specific language concerning W classes that is in the catalog. Specifically, the committee would like to know what mechanisms are in place to ensure that the course is 'in the discipline' or 'in the major' for graduates of the college
- Finally, the committee would like to have a better understanding of how – over the near and long term – the College and the Department of Communications propose to ensure that the course continues to meet those requirements. Here, the committee is particularly concerned about the degree of the outsourcing that is going on. It's one thing for students in the College of Computing and Informatics to have a single course in Computer Science that serves both majors, it's another to have that requirement met in a different college.

Dary Kerr presented the requested information to the committee. In the final analysis, he suggests the gains from this move will be in faculty costs only, and that by moving the course outside the major, the course will not be examined for the purposes of accreditation.

The committee expressed collective concern that the only Writing Intensive course in the discipline is now to be delivered outside the College. The faculty reallocation across Colleges appears to be planned only for reasons of faculty salaries, not for any pedagogical reason. Other units were not consulted about this plan, and the committee worries that an economically motivated "outsourcing" model undercuts the principle of University-wide full-time faculty participation in the General Education Program and in writing instruction across the curriculum.

6. Composition Requirements and Writing Across the Curriculum

John Smail has drafted a "white paper" outlining a potential proposal to change the English Composition requirements in General Education. Key elements include:

Currently, students entering UNC Charlotte as freshmen fulfill the first-year composition requirement for General Education by taking a two semester sequence—ENGL 1101 and ENGL 1102. In addition, about 500 students a year are placed into a one-semester 'accelerated' course, ENGL 1103 that fully satisfies the composition requirement; a much smaller number arrive with AP credit for composition and rhetoric. This proposal would replace both options with a program of integrated coursework to be taken in the freshman year which would link composition more directly into other elements of the general education curriculum.

B. New Courses*:

The two new courses making up the composition requirement are:

- ENGL 1201, First Year Composition: a 3 credit composition course, 22 students, based on the syllabus for ENGL 1103.
- UCOL 1300, First Year Writing Seminar: a 3 credit writing seminar, 25 students, that is always taught in close conjunction with a required general education course.
- Ideally, this new curriculum will also provide students with a college transition experience, either by incorporating some material into these classes or with a new 1 credit seminar.

C. Course Pairs:

Both of the courses making up the composition requirement will be linked with one other course to make a linked pair, one to be taken in the fall semester and one in the spring. The pairs are as follows: *

1. ENGL 1201 AND LBST 110X

The link between ENGL 1201 and a student's LBST 110X is intended to be flexible as both classes are conceived as free standing entities. It is expected that a lecturer responsible for 3-4 sections of composition would choose to link his/her sections with an LBST 110X course whose instructor has expressed an interest in working with composition; all of the students in that instructor's ENGL 1201 sections would be in the LBST 110X course, but not all students in the LBST 110X section would be taking ENGL 1201. At its most robust, faculty will work fairly closely together to incorporate course material from the LBST 110X into the

composition class and vice versa. At its least robust, the linkage might be limited to block scheduling. Any linkage will be optional.

2. UCOL 1300 AND LBST 2102

All sections of UCOL 1300 will be closely linked with a section of LBST 2102 so that every student in designated sections of UCOL 1300 will be required to also take a particular section of LBST 2102. The link is intended to be virtually seamless, creating, from the students' perspective a single 6 credit course that includes both lecture and seminar meetings. Assignments (and grading) for the 6 credit package will be treated as a coherent whole and will be designed to develop both students' mastery of course content and writing skills. The faculty member and the graduate students teaching the course will work as an instructional team to deliver content, facilitate discussion and writing skills development, and assess student work.

* The highly structured curricula in some programs may make it impossible to have two pairs of courses linked in this fashion. For that reason, the proposed link between ENGL 1201 and LBST 110X is optional rather than required (those students will take ENGL 1201 on its own and take LBST 110X at a later date)..

D. Transfer Students:

Incoming: Students with transfer credit for ENGL 1101 and ENGL 1102 will be deemed exempt from this revised composition requirement. Students with credit for ENGL 1101 but not ENGL 1102 will be required to take ENGL 1201. Students w/o transferred English composition credit will take the full sequence. Students with AP credit for composition will be strongly advised to complete the sequence as part of the first year experience.

Outgoing: Course descriptions for ENGL 1201 and UCOL 1300 will be written to show that the completion of both satisfies a two-semester first year writing requirement so that students leaving UNC Charlotte will receive appropriate credit.

E. Additional Benefits:

- First Year Experience: All new first year students at UNC Charlotte will have a common core of classes; other programs can build on this core and it could also serve as the basis for an expanded common reading program.
- Transfer Students: Because this proposal reserves space in specified sections of LBST 2102 for entering freshmen, additional space will be required to accommodate transfer students. These will be 'transfer' only sections, and many students will take this class during their first or second semester. It will thus be possible to use these courses as a way to reach out to transfer students.
- Faculty involvement in Gen Ed: The structure of the LBST 2102/UCOL 1300 requires ongoing commitment by departments to staff these sections with full time faculty, most of whom will need to be on the tenure track.

F. Writing Across the Curriculum:

A key element of this proposal is to simultaneously address the way that writing is taught in other areas of the undergraduate curriculum, for the concept behind embedding a writing seminar in a required LBST course is that writing should become an integral part of the learning process rather than skill used in specific, isolated, contexts. This proposal therefore envisages the following:

- Requiring students to complete LBST 2101 only AFTER completing the first-year composition requirements and teaching the course in a fashion that integrates writing as a regular and expected part of the curriculum in all sections.
- Involve the faculty teaching LBST 2102 and LBST 2101 in discussions about the teaching of writing that also involve English Composition faculty so as to ensure that students get a consistent set of messages about their writing.
- Extend those discussions to faculty teaching W courses within departments.
- Encourage and expect departments to identify the needs, standards, and responsibility concerning the use of writing in all courses taught by the faculty: LBST, W's, courses in the major.

G. Sequence:

Entering Freshmen will be required to complete both components of the composition requirement during the first year if they are in attendance both semesters (full or part time). However, the course pairs may be taken in either sequence. It is anticipated that roughly equal numbers of seats will be offered in both sequences during the Fall and Spring semesters.

Initial Committee Concerns

- The training issue is key—for both faculty and the GTAs. This plan requires a whole cohort of non-English department faculty to become conversant with the processes, ideals, and goals of the composition program hence the basis for a real WAC conversation. As part of this training, the plan for types, schedule and process for different writing assignments should be fairly standardized across all sections. The availability of quality TAs will be an issue.
- Faculty of Record and Workload issues: grade appeals, GTAs with 18 hours, contact hours - John is thinking of one 75 minute class meeting per week for 3 credit hours. He argues we need to conceive of the 6 credit block as an instructional package delivered by an instructional team of which the faculty member is clearly the leader.
- Course sequencing. The fall sections of either the ENGL 1201 or the UCOIL 1300 writing seminar (to use the numbers invented for the sake of clarity in discussion) will need to address college transition some how—those details need to be worked out. Those same classes taught in Spring will therefore have a slightly different character. Composition instruction will follow other writing instruction for half the incoming freshmen.

A pilot program involving Freshman Seminars taught by Graduate Teaching Assistants is planned for Fall 2008, but will not be writing intensive in nature, and so may not serve as a satisfactory pilot for the large changes to the English Composition requirements contemplated in the above "white paper." As chair, I want to express my concern that such a large-scale change to General Education program not be made quickly without research into similar curricular models, a successful pilot experience, and careful planning for implementation.

7. Dual Degree Program with Beijing Normal University

The consensus in the General Education Committee was that UNC Charlotte faculty should be involved with the direct assessment of written English fluency for the purposes of admission to this program.

Alan Shao's response suggested that he wants the University to rely upon scores in the written portion of a standardized exam delivered and evaluated in China.

Because the proposal calls for students to reside one academic year on the campus of UNC Charlotte, and to take General Education course work to meet requirements in Life or Physical Science, as well as Arts and Society, in which written English fluency will be necessary, we continue to believe that UNC Charlotte faculty should be involved the direct assessment of a writing on demand sample in English for the purposes of admission to the program.

TO: Kim Harris
Faculty President

FROM: Rick Lejk, Chair
Faculty Academic Policy and Standards Committee

RE: 2007-2008 Academic Year Annual Report

DATE: 31 March 2007

The Faculty Academic Policy and Standards Committee (FAPSC) met five times during the 2007-2008 Academic Year to date. We have one more meeting scheduled for April 18th. The Committee consisted of:

Lee Gray, ARCH	Gregory Starrett, ANTH
Rosemary Hopcroft, SOCY	Saul Brenner, POLS
Lloyd Blenman, FINN	Yuliang Zheng, SIS
Adam Harbaugh, MDSK	Martin Kane, CEGR
Linda Probst, KNES	Chuck Hamaker, LIB
	Rick Lejk, Chair

The Committee considered and concluded business on the following issues:

Academic Integrity (AI) Code: The Committee met and agreed, over several meetings, with several changes that were proposed. These included allowing written statements from anonymous witnesses; change in retention dates for AI records from five to eight years; allowing the processing of a second charge uncovered during the initial hearing; and restricting the number of family members that could attend a hearing. There were other editorial changes. All of these changes were supported by the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) and Faculty Council (FC). However, "rumor has it" that the Chancellor's group did not approve the anonymous statement submission, but we have not been officially advised to that effect.

+/- Grading System: The Committee discussed a +/- grading system at several of its meetings. This included one in which other groups were asked to send representatives to discuss the impact of such a change to their environments. Representatives came from the Athletics Department, Dean of Students Office, Student Government Association, Academic Affairs and the Honors Program, and the Registrar's Office. Although no one objected to the overall concept, many questions were raised and suggestions offered to change the initial model proposed. At its March meeting, the Committee agreed to make the changes and forward the proposal on to the FEC and FC. However, this action was intended to only be taken to start discussing the proposal and not for its approval. There are

many considerations to be evaluated and that it would take some time to implement such a change, if, indeed, the +/- system is to be approved.

Undergraduate re-entry: The Committee proposed an addition to the undergraduate catalog that would permit departments and programs to review an undergraduate student's course credits who was returning after a year's absence or so. This would allow the reviewer to require the undergrad to retake certain classes that may have been restructured or had new materials added.

Priority registration: The Committee reviewed the current policy and participants in the priority (early) registration process. After a discussion with the Interim Registrar and a review of the data that he submitted, the Committee concluded that all was well and no changes were needed. We asked the Interim Registrar to submit the data on this year's priority registration early in the academic year so that the Committee would have time to reconsider any actions that might be necessary.

The Committee has no open business except for the +/- . In addition, we are pleased to report that the two action items that were pending at the time of the submission of last year's report, and listed below, were both approved by FEC and FC.

Last day to withdraw from a class with a W: After several discussions, the Committee recommended that the last day to withdraw from a class with a W be moved to four weeks after the current date. The FEC and FC have yet to consider this proposal.

Credit for military training: The Committee recommended that the restriction on credit for military training to be part of the first 30 hours at UNC Charlotte be removed from the current policy as stated in the catalog. The FEC and FC have yet to act on this issue.

The Committee worked together very well, with members volunteering to take on specific tasks to research and to return to the group with their views and recommendations. We see no need to change any procedures or policies impacting FAPSC.

**Faculty Advisory Library Committee
UNC Charlotte
2007-08 Annual Report**

The Faculty Advisory Library Committee (FALC) met seven times during the 2007-08 academic year, three times in the fall (September through November) and four times in the spring (January through April). Meetings were held the 4th Tuesday of each month, approximately from 12:30 to 1:30 PM, in Atkins 271.

Carole Runnion continued her *ex-officio* role in the FALC as Acting University Librarian. The first item on the agenda in the September meeting was the election of a FALC Chair, position for which Daniel Rabinovich volunteered and was elected by acclamation.

1. Library Activities and Initiatives

The **Millionth Volume Celebration** activities culminated with a presentation ("Dead Bones Talk & Silent Stones Speak") by best-selling author Kathy Reichs and Dr. James Tabor (Dept. of Religious Studies, UNC Charlotte). The sold-out event took place on October 9th, 2007, and the discussion that followed the talks was moderated by WFAE 90.7 FM radio's Mike Collins.

The **Serial Needs Assessment** for journals, an initiative spearheaded by Associate University Librarian for Collections & Technical Services Chuck Hamaker, was conducted on October 15th–November 15th. University faculty were asked to complete an online survey about their needs for individual serial titles and electronic databases. The results of this survey and any suggestions to optimize resources, including those pertaining interdisciplinary research on campus, are still pending.

The **Atkins Express** service turned out to be very successful and has expanded to include the following services:

- Retrieval from the library collection of books, to be held at the Circulation Desk for the requesting individual
- Scanning of articles from the library's print periodical and microform collections and transfer to the requesting individual's Interlibrary Loan account
- Delivery of books from the library collection to a faculty or staff's office

Library **task forces** have been working on several issues revealed in customer service surveys. One task force has recommended the establishment of a Student Advisory Board (SAB), and researched models of such a board. It was recommended that the SAB do some of its work through the Library Facebook. Another task force is working on customer service, including providing training for both library staff and student employees.

The Library and TIAA-CREF sponsored a “**Rare Books Roadshow**” on April 17th, providing students, faculty, staff, and the general public the opportunity to have rare and antiquarian books evaluated by a professional appraiser. This event was part of both outreach to the community and the Library’s continuing development and marketing efforts.

2. FALC Interactions and Observations

The FALC corroborated the value of the **Serial Needs Assessment** and helped reassure the university faculty that it is not attempt to reduce or eliminate subscriptions to scholarly journals but an effective tool to optimize resources. As stated above, the results of this survey and its implications are still pending but should be available in the 2008-09 academic year.

The FALC expressed concern about the mechanism whereby the contract for the **Copy Center** is bid upon and granted. Although the Copy Center is housed in Atkins, it is not controlled by the library but by Auxiliary Services, which in turn falls under the Vice Chancellor for Business Affairs. The RFP apparently does not include requirements for the vendor to supply customer service and this impinges directly on library staff because students turn to them for customer service. A request to have access to the guidelines and help the FALC fulfill its advisory role has been made to Keith Wassum, Vice Chancellor for Business Affairs.

Staffing continues to be an issue essential to the development of the Library’s collection and the service it provides, and the FALC hopes that a permanent University Librarian will be appointed in the near future.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel Rabinovich, Ph.D.
FALC Chair, 2007-08

Faculty Advisory Summer Sessions Committee

2008 Year-End Report

The major issues were salary and incentive to teach during summer session.

The salary cap was discussed extensively during the year, as this has remained one of the most problematic issues for recruiting summer sessions faculty. The current cap (10% x \$70,000 per 3-hour summer course) is a concern for professors at higher salary levels, such as those in the Belk College of Business. However, departments also view an increase in the cap as a means of increasing overall interest in summer projects. Supplementing the allocation would allow colleges to respond to urgent needs, provide summer teaching/learning opportunities, pursue innovative programs, nurture new programs, and provide greater support for lab-based activities.

Within this context, the Faculty Advisory Summer Sessions Committee (FASSC) reviewed the current allocation strategy, how the cap could be adjusted, and the benefits / limitations of individual plans, including strategies employed at similar-sized campuses. The final determination was that for most faculty, the current cap is not problematic and raising the cap would be a limited approach, benefitting only a few. However, since it is tied to incentive to teach, the FASSC will continue this discussion next year. This deliberation will include how the cap might be adjusted as well as the use of supplemental summer dollars, thus providing Chairs some discretion to enhance salaries where there is a commitment to increase summer offerings and enrollments, while keeping the basic allocation system in place.

Increasing incentive to participate in summer sessions also may be aided by the changing format of classes. As the percentage of faculty knowledgeable regarding the development of online classes increases, summer sessions may become a more appealing teaching method. The FASSC plans to review funding policies for classes taught completely online and for partial online and traditional classes. The discussion begun with Distance Education regarding an integrated management and support program will continue.

The make-up of the summer student body was studied. There was some concern as to why the largest groups enrolled in the summer sessions are juniors and seniors but most classes taken are at the 1000- and 2000-levels. The answer appears to be that 1) juniors and seniors are doubling back taking needed courses such as Math, English, Statistics, and Language, 2) students are finding that they are short credit hours for graduating and 3) students are pairing upper-level intensive courses with lower-level courses to decrease work load. It was thus determined that the summer sessions are reaching the correct group.

The composition of the summer faculty also was reviewed. This included the involvement of Ph.D., Master, Part-time, TA/UA, and staff. Statistics on the College and University level as well as the relationship between faculty experience and summer teaching were evaluated.

Additional issues discussed / implemented:

- Evaluation of Summer Session courses: The FASSC agreed to encourage summer course evaluation but no more aggressively than is currently done;
- Re-introduction of PreSession: Because Banner offers no solution to billing and payment scheduling problems, the addition of PreSession is not advisable. This issue will be revisited as the billing/payment process becomes more flexible.
- General discussion regarding Year-Round Organization/Trimester and the "full-funding" of the summer program session.
- Marketing of Summer Session 2008:

- Posted on the University's website;
- Posters around campus;
- Postcards to all non-UNCC students who attended other colleges and were likely to be "home for the summer" in and around Charlotte;
- Postcards to incoming fall freshmen to get a head start in the second summer session;
- Focus on UNCC freshmen, the group that tends to attend summer school least;
- Electronic mail campaign to continuing students;
- Limited traditional newspaper advertizing.

Suggestions for future marketing campaigns: digital signs on campus, text messages, Facebook.

Frada Mozenter
Faculty Advisory Summer Sessions Committee, Chair

CID Grant Scoring Sheet

Proposal							Coral Wayland	Kelly Carlson-Reddig	Jim Hogue	Evan Houston	Janet Levy	Cindy Blanthorne	Ya-yu Lo	Bruce Gehrig	Rich Furman	Kayvan Najarian	Judy Walker
CID / API Grants Committee 2006-2007																	
#	API Grants	Last Name	First Name	College	Dept.	Amount											
1	Heafner	Tina	Jurgen	COED	MDSK	\$16,569.16											
2	Buchenu	Jurgen	Richard	COAS	LASP	\$25,700.00											
3	Hartshorne	Richard	Suzanne	COED	EDLD	\$17,850.00											
4	Lamorey	Suzanne	Deborah	COED	CHFD	\$11,050.00											
5	Ceglowski	Deborah	Kirk	COED	CHFD												
	Melnikoff	Kirk	Jennifer	COAS	ENGL	\$7,200.00											
	Munroe	Jennifer	Andrew	COAS	ENGL												
	Hartley	Andrew	Diane	COAS	DATH												
6	Zablotsky	Diane	Jennifer	COAS	COAS	\$18,000.00											
7	Hartman	Jennifer	Tanure	COAS	CJUS	\$21,750.00											
8	Ojaide	Tanure	Eric	COAS	AFST	\$18,000.00											
9	Sauda	Eric	Bernadette	COAR	ARCH	\$42,800.00											
10	Donovan-Merkert	Bernadette		COAS	CHEM	\$25,450.00											
						\$204,369.16											

)

)

)

Faculty Competitive Grants Committee

AY2007-08

Accomplishments

Committee Chair: Dr. Peggy Wilmoth

Committee Members: Lee Gray, Ryan Kilmer, Tina Heafner, Joseph Whitmeyer, Judith Cornelius, Andrew Willis, Joanna Kreuger, Cynthia Gibas, Donna Guntner, Beth Rubin, Lesley Brown, Ex-officio member

Committee Accomplishments

1. Reviewed 7 proposals for the National Endowment for the Humanities Competition and approved 2 for further development and submission representing UNC Charlotte.
2. Reviewed 6 proposals for the Oak Ridge Associated Universities (ORAU) Competition for the Ralph E. Powe Junior Faculty Enhancement Award. Competition and approved 2 for further development and submission representing UNC Charlotte. We have not yet heard the results on this competition.

The committee members worked quite efficiently in accomplishing their tasks. The guidance provided by Lesley Brown and her office was critical to task accomplishment and could not have been done as effectively without her!

Agenda Items for AY 2008-07

These two competitions recur annually, thus it is anticipated that the committee requirements will remain the same with regard to these two programs. New limited submissions grant programs are being added at an increasing rate at many agencies, particularly at the National Science Foundation. The current process is for the Vice Chancellor for Research and Federal Relations and the Director of Proposal Development to confer on each new limited submission program. Those that are likely to address strategic needs of the University are sent before the Deans and Provost, rather than the FCGC. We will never be able to say with certainty how many grant competitions the FCGC will decide each year, but we do know that there will always be at least two.

To: Julie Putnam
Administrative Assistant for Faculty Governance

From: Kim Harris, Chair
Undergraduate Course & Curriculum Committee

Re: Committee Report for Academic Year 2007-2008

Date: April 17, 2008

The Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Committee, as constituted for the 2007-2008 academic year, consisted of the following members:

Kim Harris, MATH, Chair
Deb Ryan, ARCH
Scott Terry, PSYC
Joanne Robinson, RELS
Joan Tweedy, ART
Christie Amato MKTG
Kayvan Najarian, CS
Charles Hutchison, MDSK
Greg Watkins, ET
Jan Warren-Findlow, HBAD
Kelly Evans, LIB

Although the members did not meet during the entire year as a Committee, they did vote via email to approve a proposal to establish a new degree program:

B.S. in Systems Engineering

In addition to the proposal mentioned above, the chair approved proposals to establish a Minor in Secondary Education, establish a 9-12 licensure program in Geography, eliminate the minor in Social Work, establish a "Pre-Law" concentration in Political Science, and establish a concentration in Finance & Accounting. The chair also approved 63 "short form" proposals consisting of 8 new course proposals, 47 minor course revisions, and 8 minor revisions to programs.

Discussions are also underway to deal with issues of catalog revisions and the continuous stream of curriculum changes throughout the year. More specific deadlines and issues related to advising problems will be considered. This will be the first item on our agenda next fall so that a proposal can be presented to FEC early in the academic year.

ANNUAL REPORT 2007-08

FACULTY EMPLOYMENT STATUS COMMITTEE (FESC)

David Walters, Chair
April, 2008

During the academic year 2007-2008 the FESC examined two issues:

1. Proposed changes to the UNC system tenure regulations;
and
2. Initiatives regarding improvements at UNC-Charlotte in the recruitment, retention and advancement of minority faculty.

Proposed changes to the UNC system tenure regulations.

The FESC studied all the relevant documentation and correspondence from the administration and other campuses before making observations in line with those of the Faculty Assembly to the effect that several of the proposed changes were unwelcome and unhelpful to the operation of academic units. In particular, opposition was voiced to the proposal to change the Tenure Performance Review process into a more punitive process rather than a remedial one.

Initiatives regarding improvements at UNC-Charlotte in the recruitment, retention and advancement of minority faculty.

The FESC considered these initiatives in two parts as ideas for improvement came forward from the Committee on the Future of the Faculty (CFF) relative to the campus-wide ADVANCE program.

First, the FESC broadly and enthusiastically supported the CFF's proposals for improved administrative support for mediation of disputes, for broadening the opportunities for extending the "tenure clock" to assist faculty who are balancing difficult family and personal needs, and for the creation of new flexible opportunities for faculty to move between full-time and part-time employment to suit changing personal and family circumstances.

Secondly, the FESC is about to support -- with similar enthusiasm and broad agreement - recommendations from the CFF to improve the hiring process, particularly relative to support for dual-career couples, and for improvements in the procedures for search committees, to make sure that these committees have all the necessary information regarding the context and opportunities for hiring minority candidates. The report of the FESC back to the Committee on the Future of the faculty and to the Provost on this matter is currently in the final stages of preparation.



UNC CHARLOTTE

The University of North Carolina at Charlotte

University Grievance Committee

MEMORANDUM

TO: Kim Harris, President of the Faculty
Faculty Council

FROM: David Binkley, Chair of the University Grievance Committee

DATE: April 16, 2008

RE: Annual Report

Committee Members

The Faculty Grievance Committee for 2007-2008 consisted of the following faculty members:

David Binkley (ECE, Chair, term ends 2008)
Banita Brown (CHEM, 2011)
Claudia Flowers (EDLE, 2011)
Jo Ann Lee (PSYC, 2011)
James McGavran (ENGL, 2011)
Linda Moore (SON, 2008)
Deborah Ryan (ARCH, 2011)
Ellen Sewell (ECON, 2008)
Deborah Sharer (ET, 2008)

Operation of the Committee

The Grievance Committee considers grievances from faculty members aggrieved by the decisions of university administrators, excluding promotion and tenure decisions that are considered by the Hearing Committee. The Grievance Committee consists of nine elected members having staggered four-year terms, where unexpected vacancies are filled by the Faculty Executive Committee. The Grievance Committee elects a Chair annually.

When a Grievance Petition is referred to the Committee by the University Mediation Coordinator, the Committee votes to hold, or not hold, a Hearing. If the Committee votes to hold a Hearing, a quorum of eligible members is identified who comprise the Hearing Committee. The Hearing Committee then elects a Hearing Committee Chair, hears evidence from the Petitioner and Respondent(s), and renders a recommendation.

Grievances

During the summer of 2007, a Grievance Petition was referred to the Committee. On August 22, 2007, the Petition was withdrawn as documented by a Committee Memorandum to the Respondents dated February 22, 2008.

During the fall of 2007, a second Petition was referred to the Committee. On December 14, 2007, the Committee met and voted unanimously to hold a Hearing. However, on December 13,

2007, the Petitioner delivered a letter of resignation, thereby withdrawing the Petition as documented by a Committee Memorandum to the Respondent dated February 22, 2008.

Meetings

The Committee met early in the fall to elect a Chair and discuss the possibility of an optional advisor for Petitioners as described in item 1 below. The Committee also met late in the fall, as mentioned above, to vote on holding a Hearing.

Hearings

There were no Hearings for the year.

Effectiveness

The Committee provides an important function by considering Petitions of faculty members aggrieved by the decisions of university administrators. When a Hearing is held, the Committee provides a recommendation that seeks to be insightful and fair.

Workload

The Committee workload is highly variable, but is heavy when Grievances are considered, especially when Hearings are held. The Committee enjoys the support of the Program Assistant to Faculty Governance to help ensure procedures and documents are handled properly.

Unfinished Business

There is no official unfinished business.

Recommendations for 2008 - 2009

Grievance Committee Chair, David Binkley (ECE), and Hearing Committee Chair, Mark Clemens (BIOL), discussed concerns common to both Committees at Committee Chair Meetings. These concerns include:

1. **Timing of Grievance Petitions and Hearings during the summer.** Here, the availability of, and expectation of, faculty service over the summer is a consideration along with the need of Petitioners to “move on with their lives” through responsive consideration. The timing problem is especially significant for the Hearing Committee following negative promotion and tenure decisions rendered late in the spring.
2. **Providing an optional advisor to faculty members for Hearings.** Such an advisor would not “weigh in” on Committee recommendations, but could help faculty members through a naturally intimidating process, which includes the organization and numbering of evidence. Perhaps a previous Committee member experienced with the Hearing process could be available as an optional advisor. Previous Grievance Committee Chair, Todd Steck (BIOL), suggested the use of a possible advisor in last year’s report.
3. **Providing an Ombudsman for faculty members feeling aggrieved, but unsure if a formal Grievance is the best course of action.** It is important to note that the University Mediation Coordinator, and Grievance and Hearing Committees, are not engaged until *after* a formal Grievance is filed. However, faculty members often seek guidance and possible resolution in hopes of avoiding the formal Grievance process. Faculty Employment Status Committee Chair, David Walters (ARCH), and the University Mediation Coordinator, Mike Corwin (PHYS), suggested the consideration of a possible faculty Ombudsman during a spring Faculty Executive Committee meeting.

David Binkley and Mark Clemens will meet with university legal counsel shortly after spring classes to discuss items 1 and 2. Additionally, they plan to assist in the consideration of items 1 – 3 during the 2008 – 2009 year.

End of year report: Faculty Hearings Committee

The faculty hearings committee received two petitions for hearings. Both petitions were found to be based on grounds within the scope of the charge of the hearings committee and two hearings panels were constituted. One petition was resolved when the petitioner accepted a position at another university and the other went to full hearing with the panel issuing a recommendation to the Chancellor.

During the course of the hearing, the panel identified problems in the existing guidelines related to processing of petitions over the summer and provision of an advisor for petitioners. Similar issues were identified by the faculty grievance committee. The chairs of these two committees are collaborating to draft recommendations for modifications to the guidelines.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mark G. Clemens". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Mark G. Clemens, Faculty Hearings Committee Chair

Memorandum

To: Dr. Kim Harris, Faculty President
From: Deb Ryan, Chair, **Faculty Honorary Degree Advisory Committee**
Date: 4/17/2008
Re: 2007-08 Committee Report

Committee members, 2007-08:

Dr. Suzanne Boyd
Dr. Ken Godwin
Dr. Jane Laurent
Dr. Jayne Tristan
Professor Deborah Ryan

Business: In fall 2007, the Committee received four nominations and considered another five of their own. Of the nine, seven were forwarded with a positive recommendation from the Committee to Chancellor Dubois and the Board of Trustees. Two names were not approved due to the committee's opinion that they did not meet the criteria for selection as outlined in the Honorary Degree Policy.

Of the seven nominees with a positive recommendation, one was selected by the Board of Trustees as the recipient for an Honorary Degree of Public Service. The award will be presented to that person on Saturday, May 10, at the 10 am Commencement ceremony.

A call for nominations for honorary degree consideration were sent and posted in the following venues:

- Alumni Board of Governors
- Athletic Foundation Board
- Board of Trustees Foundation Board
- Regional Chamber Presidents
- United Way of Central Carolinas
- Arts & Sciences Council
- Campus News
- Listserv to faculty and staff
- Student Newspaper
- Foundation of the Carolinas
- Knight Foundation
- Historic Preservation Society
- Museum of the New South
- University City Partners
- Leadership Charlotte
- Chancellors Emeritus

End of year report:

**Faculty Information Technology Services Advisory Committee
(FITSAC)**

This has been a year of transition for ITS with the year spent in recruiting a new CIO for the University. A new CIO has now been hired with an April start date. Thus the primary priority of the FITSAC is to establish a collaborative working relationship with the CIO with the goal of maximizing real faculty input in ITS policies and decisions. This will define the agenda of the FITSAC for the coming year.

There has also been a new director of the Center for Teaching and Learning (formerly FCTeL.) Although the CTL is highly involved in initiatives related to information technology, the relationship between CTL and the FITSAC has never been defined. Discussions have been initiated with Valorie McAlpen to identify whether such a relationship should exist and, if so, the nature of that relationship. This initiative is ongoing.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mark G. Clemens', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Mark G. Clemens, FITSAC Chair

Faculty Research Grants Committee – No report filed

Graduate Council – No report filed

University Honors Council

**Annual Report
2007- 08 Academic Year**

The University Honors Council approved Honors Candidacy Applications as follows:

**31 in University Honors
15 in Business Honors
 1 in Anthropology
 1 in Art History
14 in Biology
 4 in Chemistry
16 in Criminal Justice
 4 in History
 3 in Latin American Studies
 1 in Physics
 6 in Psychology**

(It should be noted that twelve applicants will receive both University Honors and Honors in a discipline; these applicants appear twice in the above list.)

Unfinished business to be concluded this academic year includes 1) consideration of proposed changes in the Honors programs in History and in the College of Computing and Informatics, 2) the certification of Honors Graduation for those students receiving degrees in May, and 3) the consideration of candidacy applications from candidates for Honors graduation in August or December.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel Jones, Chair



UNC CHARLOTTE

The University of North Carolina at Charlotte
9201 University City Boulevard
Charlotte, NC 28223-0001

Office of Faculty Governance
(704) 687-2226

Memo

To: President-elect Sonya Hardin
Faculty Council
From: Julie Putnam
Office of Academic Affairs
Date: 3/05/08
Re: Election

According to the 2007-2008 listing of the Faculty Council and Standing Committees for the Faculty, we need to elect representatives and alternates for the following committees:

VACANCY TO BE FILLED SPRING 2008 NAME OF INCUMBENT LEAVING UNLESS RE-ELECTED

- President-elect of the Faculty
- Secretary to Faculty Council (2008-10) Jeanie Welch
- Chair, Faculty Committee on General Education (2008-10) Greg Wickliff
- Chair, Faculty Academic Policy and Standards Committee (2008-10) Rick Lejk
- Chair, Faculty CID/API Grants Committee (2008-10) Coral Wayland
- Chair, Faculty Competitive Grants Committee (2008-10) Peggy Wilmoth
- Chair, Undergraduate Course & Curriculum Committee (2008-10) Kim Harris
- Members of Faculty Grievance Committee (2008-2012)
We need 4 Ellen Sewell
Linda Moore
Deborah Sharer
David Binkley
- Members of Faculty Hearing Committee (2008-2012)
We need 2 Kim Buch
Corey Lock

- Members of Faculty Honorary Degree Advisory Committee
We need 2
- Chair, Faculty Research Grants Committee (2008-10)
- Member, Bank of America Award Committee (2008-10)

Jane Laurent
Deb Ryan

Jurgen Buchenau

Ann Newman