<u>Present:</u> Miriam Hines, Elizabeth Russell, Patty Spears, Kathy Dick, Edward Brown, Christine Epps, Sharmeen Nokes, James Jeuck, Kim Paylor, Rosalie Tisa, Brian O'Sullivan, Joanie Aitken, Anita Keith, Liz Moore, Charles Craig, Matthew High, Steve Bostian, Brenda Asbury, Joe Sutton, Tenille Naumann, Wall Crumpler, Robert Davis, Carol Reilly, Cathi Phillips, Anna Lamm, Kate Christenbury, Roger Sims, Melissa Simpson, Wyona Goodwin, Hilary Kinlaw, Randall Rehfuss, Jim Stewart, Brenda Wilson, Karin Cousineau, BJ Okleshen, Sherry Lynn, Barbara Carroll (ex-officio), Corrinda Watkins (ex-officio), Deb Luckadoo

<u>Absent:</u> Brandon Moore, Audrey Hendriks, Molly Bradshaw, Amanda Holbrook, Maria Moreno, Joshua Gira, David Kelly, Maurice Alcorn, Nicole Burgos, Carl Dudley, Dustin Wheeler, Lee Ann Clark, Janice Coats, Chris Terwilliger, Judy Daniels, Joy Smith, Lossie Rooney, Erica Wisecup, Amy Kunkle, Martha Barrick, Clifton Williams, Tom Karches, Darren Fallis, Peggy Elliott

**Guest Speakers:** Karen Helm, Director – University Planning and Analysis Michael Ousdahl & Greg Cain, Transportation

Chair, Ryan Hancock called the 9th meeting of the 19th session to order.

Karen Helm gave an update on NC State's 10-year reaccreditation process. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) is the accrediting body for educational institutions in the Southeast Region of the U.S. The Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) is the division of SACS that oversees accreditation of higher education institutions in the region.

Karen reported information on the review process. She reported that the two major components in the review process are Compliance and Quality Enhancement Plan. NC State submitted a Quality Enhancement Plan that is designed to strengthen undergraduate student learning, focused on critical and creative thinking. NC State submitted compliance reports in September of 2013, which was reviewed by SACSCOC off-site committee in November 2013. The SACSCOC on-site reaffirmation committee will review the remaining compliance issues and QEP on March 16 – 20, 2014. The Reaffirmation Committee submits a report to SACSCOC in late spring of 2014. NCSU responds to the Reaffirmation Committee report in September of 2014. The SACSCOC makes an accreditation decision in December of 2014 and will give monitoring reports as necessary to demonstrate compliance with remaining issues in 2015 – 2016.

Karen Helm shared information on the remaining compliance issues (standards not yet judged in compliance) and the federal standards. Karen answered questions from staff and shared the following links:

NC State's accreditation website: <a href="http://accreditation.ncsu.edu/">http://accreditation.ncsu.edu/</a>
NC State's QEP website: <a href="http://qep.ncsu.edu/">http://qep.ncsu.edu/</a> - link to QEP and "Ata a Glance" summary

Reviewers' website <a href="http://2014.accreditation.ncsu.edu/">http://2014.accreditation.ncsu.edu/</a>

Michael Ousdahl and Greg Cain reported on the following:

 ${\tt NCSU\ Transportation\ Dept.\ -Proposed\ Changes\ in\ Parking\ Permit\ Prices\ for\ 2014-15\ Academic\ Year}$ 

		Student Permit Prices				Faculty/Staff Permit Prices			
Permit		Current	Proposed	Increase	Increase	Current	Proposed	Increase	Increase
Type	Description	Price	2014-15	%	\$	Price	2014-15	%	\$
A	Reserved Lot					\$765	\$786	2.7%	\$21
AS	Assigned Space					\$1,038	\$1,068	2.9%	\$30
В	North Campus					\$426	\$438	2.8%	\$12
CC	Centennial Decks	\$327	\$336	2.8%	\$9				
С	Employee					\$327	\$336	2.8%	\$9
CPE	Carpooling-Employee					\$105	\$108	2.9%	\$3
SCP	Student Car Pool	\$327	\$336	2.8%	\$9				
CDE	Coliseum Deck-Employee					\$327	\$336	2.8%	\$9
CD	Coliseum Deck-Student	\$327	\$336	2.8%	\$9				
DD	Dan Allen Deck-Student	\$327	\$336	2.8%	\$9				
RE	East Campus-Resident	\$313	\$323	3.2%	\$10				
RW	West Campus-Resident	\$313	\$323	3.2%	\$10				
RC	Resident- Centennial Campus	\$313	\$323						
P	Perimeter Fringe - Student	\$213	\$220	3.3%	\$7				
L1/L2	Off Peak (Annual Rate)	\$118	\$122	3.4%	\$4				
M	Motorcycle					\$65	\$67	3.1%	\$2
R	Retired					\$36	\$37	2.8%	\$1
RD	Resident Director	\$358	\$369	3.1%	\$11				
RP	Resident- Perimeter	\$260	\$268	3.1%	\$8				
RS	Storage - Resident	\$189	\$195	3.2%	\$6				
SL	Student Leader	\$318	\$330	3.8%	\$12				
SP	Service Provider (PV/off campus)					\$426	\$438	2.8%	\$12
SV	Service Vehicle (State Plated)					\$400	\$408	2.0%	\$8
T	Trustee					\$36	\$37	2.8%	\$1
UV	University Vehicle					\$360	\$369	2.5%	\$9
U/UD	Universal					\$426	\$438	2.8%	\$12
V	Varsity Lot - Commuter	\$99	\$102	3.0%	\$3				
W	West Deck - Student Commuter	\$260	\$268	3.1%	\$8				

Last update 10/14/13

# Notes: Change in number of permits

1. The number of EC-student permits were reduced by 500 and the Centennial Lot - Storage were increased by 500.

- 2. Project an additional 25 permits for Cent. Campus deck sales
- 3. Varsity lot projection based on number of spaces in the lot no oversell included
- 4. Cent. Campus storage permits projection includes an addl. 150 beyond capacity in the Oval Drive lots; requires use of Partner's II perimeter lots to achieve target

## **Committee Reports:**

There were no committee reports due to the revision of the bylaws.

### **Roll Call:**

A roll call was performed by Nancy Phillips to ensure accuracy and quorum.

#### **New Business:**

Patty Spears presented the following:

- 1. The first part of the revised bylaws was discussed during the large Senate meeting, so there was no small governance meeting in March.
- 2. Full Meeting Discussion:
  - a. Slide 1 accepted as written
  - b. Slide 2 accepted as written
  - c. Slide 3 accepted as written
  - d. Slide 4 accepted as written
  - e. Slide 5 discussed. As per Barbara Carroll, "special faculty" are referred to as "non-tenure track" faculty. The term was administratively changed.
  - f. Slide 6 accepted as written
  - g. Slide 7 discussed. Discussion was about the 60% amount and how it would not be achievable in those districts with 1 -3 senators. So instead of a mandatory 60% it was changed to be a 'goal'. Also, since many districts have only 1 senator, it was changed to indicate the goal of 60% is limited to the entire senate body and not each district. It will be further explained in the procedure manual as to how this will be accomplished and phased in. Also, the goal is to not have everyone in one district roll off at once if there are >1 senator in the district. This will also be addressed in the procedure manual. Text was amended as in the attached document.
  - h. Slide 8 discussed. Discussion about whether appointed senators were limited to unrepresented districts versus under-represented districts. For example, if a district should have 7 representatives, only has 1, it is not un-represented, but is under-represented. The language was changed to under-represented. The determination of under-represented will need to be further described in the procedure manual as well as a way to prioritize assignments if more than the maximum number of appointed senators is needed. Also discussed was the limit of having one year of experience before anyone can serve as an appointed senator. The language was changed to preferable, to accommodate special circumstances. [the last bullet was administratively moved to the 'terms of duty' section].

- i. Slide 9 discussed. The word "staff" was administratively removed, for consistency.
- j. Slide 10 discussed. The phrase 'prior to being nominated' was removed, since it was contradictory to a phrase earlier "Individuals are eligible to be elected", so the 12 month of prior employment is prior to be elected, not being nominated.
- k. Slide 11 discussed. The term of office for the Alternate Senators was discussed. This is the first time we are putting a term limit on alternates and suggested 1 year. After much discussion it was amended to be 2 years, particularly for those districts with 1 senator, so the terms 'match'.
- l. Slide 12 Added a number iii. Appointed Senators, and pasted the verbiage from slide 8, to this slide. An administrative change. We don't want it in 2 places.
- m. Slide 13 discussed. The duties of the Alternate Senators were discussed. It was suggested that Alternates are not required, but encouraged to attend meetings. Also, they may serve on committees (not mandatory) but cannot be officers of those committees. There was also discussion about what "perform their duties with integrity and professionalism" meant. Is there a code of ethics? This will be further explained in the procedure manual. Since the meeting ended after this slide, we will revisit this issue to ensure all are OK with the current wording as long as more is explained in the procedure manual, or if more clarity is needed in the bylaws.

### **Adjournment:**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Nancy Phillips, Staff Senate Administrative Assistant