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Senate Recommendation re: Sedona

At the January 19, 2012 Faculty and Institutional Affairs Committee meeting, it was moved and unanimously approved that the committee ask the Faculty Senate to recommend that the implementation of Sedona be suspended pending further investigation of possible uses of the database, as well as to allow continued exploration of other databases. The reasons behind this recommendation are:

1. Meetings of the Working Groups have not been publicized and faculty have not had an opportunity to be involved.
2. At this late date, even if meetings were publicized and faculty were involved, there is not enough time to come to a thoroughly thought out decision.
3. There are concerns about the makeup of the Working Groups, especially regarding a.) the number of untenured faculty on the group focusing on promotion and tenure concerns, and b.) the fact that an administrator is chairing the promotion and tenure group.
4. UNCP needs to explore other comparable instruments. There are at least three course management systems currently under review; there should be a similar effort with this type of database.
5. Most of the deans that were involved with the original decision are no longer here.