

Faculty Development and Welfare Subcommittee

November 10, 2016, 3:30 pm

UC 233

Minutes

Members in attendance:

Yawo Bessa, SBS (to 2018)
Bill Brandon, NSM (to 2017), Chair
Terence Dollard, ARTS (to 2018)
Doug McBroom, NSM (to 2018)
James Robinson, SBS (to 2017)
Robin Snead, LETT (to 2018), Secretary
Laura Staal, EDUC (to 2018)

Members not in attendance:

Claudia Nickolson, EDUC (to 2017)
Tracy Thomas, ARTS (to 2017)
Angela Revels, Asst. VC for Human Resources (ex-officio)

Guests in attendance:

Liz Normandy, AVC of Planning and Accreditation
Joy Fuqua, Director of Distance Education

- I. The meeting was called to order at 3:35.
- II. The minutes of the October 6, 2016 meeting were approved as circulated.
- III. The agenda was adopted as circulated. Chair Bill Brandon indicated that the committee would discuss items out of order in the event that guests did not wish to remain for the entire meeting.
- IV. Report from the Chair

Chair Bill Brandon reported that FIAC spent a lot of time at the last meeting talking with Registrar Lourdes Silva about issues with advising and student graduation requirements. This is what prompted the change in when students must apply for graduation. There are issues involving writing intensive courses, many program changes, etc. Brief discussion ensued concerning issues with advising, policy changes being made by the Registrar's Office without going through the Faculty Senate structure, turnover/staffing issues in the Registrar's Office, and differences between departments in terms of advising tools offered to students (a "two-year plan" covering classes after general education, a checklist, etc.). The sense is that each department needs a checklist or similar tool. However, with program changes occurring frequently in some majors, there can be

majors in some departments on three different catalogs, which makes these tools more difficult to maintain.

V. Unfinished Business

A. 3x3 teaching load

Scott Hicks was invited to the meeting to discuss this, but he was unable to attend. This issue has been tabled for the next meeting.

B. Lab schools

Laura Staal has a meeting with Scott Billingsley and Alfred Bryant on November 28th (3:30, Lumbee Hall 428). Committee members are invited to attend. Laura is generating a list of questions to ask at this meeting. Anyone with input should email Laura. Liz Normandy indicated that this is not an option; we can talk about our position on it as long as we want to, but we are going to have to do it because the Legislature has said that we must. The bill targets the universities located where there are poor-performing students are located. Liz Normandy reported the plan is to take an existing school and make it a lab school. She also reported that there are no schools in Robeson County that are enthusiastic about becoming a lab school. Laura indicated that there are so many things—such as incorporating more service learning—that we might do that would be more advantageous than lab schools.

C. Academic Partnerships

Bill Brandon indicated that he has heard a lot of concern among faculty about AP. Concerns/ questions include 1) why we would go to an outside firm that will take 50% of our tuition revenue when we have our own marketing department, 2) whether AP will have any control over the structure and content of our online course, and 3) a possible conflict of interest given the political connections of Randy Best (AP President) and Margaret Spellings.

Joy Fuqua discussed some advantages of this sort of partnership: it saves time while ownership of the courses remains solely with the faculty, small schools like UNCP don't have the money to do the types of marketing this company can. She noted it is not suitable for all online programs. She also explained that each semester these courses will have more and more students, if it "works" like these sorts of partnerships generally do. Then the "coaching model" comes into play. This can be something that is a concern for faculty. The coaching company is a

subcontractor of AP. Coaches are employees of the coaching company, not UNCP. Essentially they work as TAs, but Joy reports that they hire highly qualified individuals as coaches.

James Robinson offered a description of the coaching model as utilized by Kaplan. The control of the classroom is determined by the supervisory structure of the coaching model. Joy responded that the university should be able to set that up in any way that works for the program in question; she indicated that there is a lot of freedom.

James Robinson asked if this is moving us closer to MOOCs. Joy answered this is not the case.

Douglas McBroom asked for clarification: we own the courses. Joy indicated that is the case. He asked what might happen if we go with AP, and we decide in several years that we don't like it; can we pull out but continue to use the content? How much do we retain once the contract ends? Liz responded that it would be very difficult to continue with the model, because we do not have an instructional designer, and it is next to impossible to get and keep an instructional designer at UNCP. We also do not have TAs.

D. Teaching and Learning Center

Liz Normandy reported on what is actually happening with the TLC. There are two goals of the TLC: to offer staff development, and to administer internal grants such as the Faculty Research and Development Grants. Cyndi Miecznikowski was asked to serve as interim director with a focus on the staff development aspect. There are questions about what topics to pursue first, with a goal of offering programming starting in the spring. There is consideration of a name change to the Center for Teaching Excellence. Currently, there is no discussion about the mission statement, the goals, etc. There will be an *internal* search for a new director in the spring. The search will be internal because there is no job line for the Director. The Director is a full-time faculty member who is given leave time for the TLC.

There is administrative support for the TLC, which there has not been in the past, but there are still no resources (physical space, money) for the TLC. The current budget is less than it was twenty years ago when the center started.

There will be small travel stipends offered through the TLC.

The Task Force on Teaching Excellence existed before the TLC. Members of the Task Force are appointed by the Director, with input from Deans, and generally serve 2-3 years. The current work of the Task Force is to look at teaching and

learning centers at other universities to understand what they do, how they operate, what resources they have, etc. No long-term decisions are being made, despite what might have been suggested.

E. Promotion and Tenure Policy Update: the “old” policy

Liz Normandy explained that the “old” tenure policy (the one the university had prior to the changes made by Carter/Kitts and the BOT) is the policy in place for this year. The new aspects of the policy developed by Carter/Kitts and passed by the BOT are not being enforced this year. The Provost has no desire to move forward with the new aspects of the policy. For now, no action is being taken on this. The future of this issue is uncertain, given that it is policy passed by the Board.

F. Administration/Faculty Relations

Because the time was nearing 5:00, this item was tabled until the next meeting.

VI. New Business—Assault on Academic Integrity

Melissa Schaub shared a Chronicle article with Bill Brandon that discusses the “cheating market” (<http://www.chronicle.com/article/The-New-Cheating-Economy/237587>). This is a real concern, particularly with fully online courses/programs. Terence Dollard reiterated, with additional information, what they have found in Mass Communication with students who pay an online company (homeworkmarket.com) to write original papers and complete student work.

VII. Announcements

The next meeting is scheduled for December 8th. However, this is during exam week. The committee will not meet.

VIII. The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 pm.