

University of North Carolina at Asheville
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Minutes, April 24, 2008 – 3:15pm

Senate

Members: C. Bell, G. Boudreaux, K. Cole, L. Dohse, P. Downes, B. Haas, J. Hartsfield, M. Harvey, H. Holt, K. Krumpke, A. Lanou, J. McClain, C. McKenzie, M. Moseley, D. Pierce, B. Sabo, B. Wilson, J. Wood; S. Schuman, A. Ponder.

Visitors: P. Catterfeld, G. Ettari, L. Friedenberg, G. Heard, J. Konz, G. Kormanik, B. Larson, B. Miller, G. Nallan, L. Russell, A. Shope.

I. Call to Order and Announcements

Dr. Downes called the meeting to order at 3:24 pm and welcomed Senators and guests. The 2008-2009 Senate will meet today around 4:30pm.

II. Academic Policies Committee Report

Dr. Bill Sabo reported for the Academic Policies Committee.

Second Reading: [Approved without opposition by APC]

The following documents were considered for Second Reading:

At Dr. Kormanik's request, Dr. Sabo edited APC 48 by adding under the "additional hours" selection: "BIOL 455, Principles of Animal Physiology (4). This course contains advanced discussion of nerve, muscle and synapse as well as discussions of neuronal and chemical communication useful to the minor."

APC 44: Addition of laboratory component to descriptions of Biology courses
APC 44 passed without opposition and became Senate Document 5308S.

APC 45: Delete MCOM 101, 102, 325, 364 and 494
APC 45 passed without opposition and became Senate Document 5408S.

APC 46: Change credit hours for MCOM 301 and 311; Change credit hours and descriptions for VMP 303 and 305; Change description for VMP 307
APC 46 passed without opposition and became Senate Document 5508S.

APC 47: Add three new courses in Environmental Studies: ENVR 315, ENVR 324, and ENVR 365
APC 47 passed without opposition and became Senate Document 5608S.

APC 48: Add Minor in Neuroscience
APC 48 passed without opposition and became Senate Document 5708S.

APC 50: Adding Prerequisite to Philosophy 255
APC 50 passed without opposition and became Senate Document 5808S.

APC 51: Addition of HWP 257, Internship – Exploring Career Choices
APC 51 passed without opposition and became Senate Document 5908S.

APC 52: Change the title and description for MCOM 421; Add a prerequisite to MCOM 499; Change prerequisites for VMP 437 and 439; Change description & prerequisite for VMP 493
APC 52 passed without opposition and became Senate Document 6008S.

APC 53: Reinstate MCOM 343 and 345; Add new courses, MCOM 369 and VMP 359
APC 53 passed without opposition and became Senate Document 6108S.

APC 54: Change requirements for Mass Communication majors; Add concentrations in MCOM
APC 54 passed without opposition and became Senate Document 6208S.

APC 55: Changes to MMAS major requirements as necessitated by MCOM curriculum change
APC 55 passed without opposition and became Senate Document 6308S.

APC 56: Change prerequisites/corequisites for MUSC 364 and 365
APC 56 passed without opposition and became Senate Document 6408S.

APC 57: Move catalog placement and change descriptions of MUSC 191-192; 291-292; 391-392;
 491-492; Change descriptions of MUSC 493-494
APC 57 passed without opposition and became Senate Document 6508S.

APC 58: Change course descriptions for MUSC 385, 387, 484, 485, 486, 487
APC 58 passed without opposition and became Senate Document 6608S.

APC 59: Add new course, INTS 354, The Nuclear Dilemma
APC 59 passed without opposition and became Senate Document 6708S.

APC 60: Change description of ANTH / SOC 225; Change description of SOC 335;
 Change description of ANTH / SOC 336; Change description of ANTH / SOC 455;
 Change description of ANTH / SOC 465
APC 60 passed without opposition and became Senate Document 6808S.

APC 61: Change requirements for General Sociology
APC 61 passed without opposition and became Senate Document 6908S.

APC 62: Change requirements for Concentration in Anthropology
APC 62 passed without opposition and became Senate Document 7008S.

APC 63: Change requirements for Sociology with Teacher Licensure
APC 63 passed without opposition and became Senate Document 7108S.

APC 64: Delete EDUC 355 and replace it with EDUC 386; Remove EDUC 318, 321 and 351 as
 required courses for B-K Teacher Licensure Program
APC 64 passed without opposition and became Senate Document 7208S.

APC 65: Change descriptions for EDUC 317 and 344
APC 65 passed without opposition and became Senate Document 7308S.

APC 66: Remove EDUC 318 and 345 from requirements for K-6 Licensure
APC 66 passed without opposition and became Senate Document 7408S.

APC 67: Change in List of Elective Courses for AFST Minor
APC 67 passed without opposition and became Senate Document 7508S.

Approved by APC as Minor

APC 49: Change course description for WMST 400
APC 49 passed without opposition and became Senate Document 7608S.

III. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee Report

Dr. Greg Boudreaux reported for the Faculty Welfare and Development Committee.

Student Rating of Instruction Recommendations

Dr. Harvey reported that FWDC recommends, as a first step, enacting the first two recommendations from the Task Force on Student Rating of Instruction (SRI, April 2006) which standardizes the administration of student evaluations. The Task Force made six other recommendations, but these are the easiest to implement quickly as a first step. FWDC's recommendations follow:

1. *Evaluation instruments be administered in the last week of class, to insure that students have the maximum amount of information and experience upon which to base their judgments.*
2. *The evaluation instrument be given at the beginning of class to help alleviate respondent fatigue and to encourage thoughtful responses.*

Second Reading

The following documents were considered for Second Reading:

Dr. Boudreaux edited the membership of FWDC 6 to read: “One staff person appointed by Chancellor’s Staff Advisory Committee (CSAC)”.

FWDC 8: Proposal to rename the Feldman Committee, Revise Membership and Duties
(Revision of SD2990S and SD0988F; Faculty Handbook Section 10.3.4)
FWDC 8 passed without opposition and became Senate Document 7708S.

FWDC 9: Proposal to revise the Duties of the University Research Council
(Revision of SD3006S; Faculty Handbook Section 10.3.5)
FWDC 9 passed without opposition and became Senate Document 7808S.

FWDC 6: Proposal to revise the University Service Council
(Replaces SD5204S and SD5304S; Faculty Handbook 10.3.7 and 10.4.1.2)
FWDC 6 passed as amended without opposition and became Senate Document 7908S.

FWDC 5: Proposal to establish a Research Misconduct Policy (Faculty Handbook Section 4.3.6)
FWDC 5 passed without opposition and became Senate Document 8008S.

FWDC 7: Proposal to Establish a Mentoring Program for New Faculty and
Establish the service positions of two Faculty Mentoring Program Coordinators
(Faculty Handbook Sections 4.1 and 10.5)
FWDC 7 passed without opposition and became Senate Document 8108S.

FWDC 10: Proposal to Revise the Professional Development Leave Policy
(Revision of SD4506S; Faculty Handbook 4.1.4)
FWDC 10 passed without opposition and became Senate Document 8208S.

Nominees to Standing Committees appointed by the Faculty Senate

A list of nominees to Standing Committees was distributed for informational purposes. The 2008-2009 Senate will vote on the nominees at its organizational meeting today.

Work-in-Progress

- FWDC needs to clarify the status of the following Standing Committees:
 - Distinguished Scholars Committee (on hold)
 - Institutional Effectiveness Committee (on hold)
 - Adjunct Faculty Committee (revisit the mission statement; possibly take a new direction)
 - Asheville Institute Advisory Committee
- It is critical to have faculty attend the Policy Review Sessions held by Human Resources. This is not only policy review – but discussion about proposed changes to policies.
 - Amy Lanou and Gary Ettari have agreed to be faculty representatives, but they may need help in attending all of the meetings. Meetings may be rescheduled to alleviate overlapping with class schedules. It would be helpful to have an agenda.

IV. Institutional Development Committee/University Planning Council Reports

Dr. John Wood reported for the Institutional Development Committee and University Planning Council.

Assessment Principles

Dr. Wood distributed “IDC’s view on Program Assessment at UNC Asheville, 4.24.08” to guide faculty, staff, administration, and senate discussions. IDC would like to post these principles on the university website to keep people aware of on-going assessment discussions and practices. Highlights of the discussion follow:

- The first public posting should originate from the Senate with its endorsement.
- Most campuses have a location on their webpage about assessment; we do not have one.
- Senators need time to digest the document before being asked to endorse it.
- At our next review, SACS will look at how we assess ourselves. Academic departments are not doing too badly. However, many departments on campus are not doing anything and this will be an enormous problem. Non-academic departments can start looking at how to do this. The document is meant for the entire campus.
- Post the document as “preliminary draft for discussion” on the Senate website and encourage people to give feedback to Institutional Development.

- IDC's report of two years ago on "preliminary criteria for additional graduate programs" was not voted on at the time yet became a Senate document by virtue of being in the minutes and by being available on-line. It became essential in our later discussions.
- A motion was proposed and withdrawn after discussion.
- It would be wise to post the draft for discussion and to send comments to IDC. IDC can bring those suggestions to the Senate for second reading – perhaps in September.
- Chancellor Ponder supported this strategy – it will be received as a warm and inviting collegial step in welcoming the new Provost who has talked with us about a culture of evidence. Giving her an opportunity to work with the faculty on this topic would be important.

Dr. Sabo moved to have the document posted as "preliminary draft for discussion" on the Senate website and to be included in today's minutes; that members of the campus community be notified that this is available and be encouraged to send comments to IDC; that the message be repeated in the first week of class; and that IDC bring this to the Senate no later than the September meeting. Dr. Bell seconded the motion, which passed.

Preliminary Draft for Discussion

IDC's view on Program Assessment at UNC Asheville, 4.24.08:

IDC recommends the following basic principles of assessment to guide faculty, staff, administration, and senate discussions. The committee suggests that these principles be posted on the university web site and in that way inform on-going assessment discussions and practices.

What is assessment?

Assessment, in our context, is a systematic reflection of teaching and learning. It is the basis of our growth as teachers and scholars. In a time of ever-increasing public accountability, doing what we love to do depends in part on our ability to demonstrate what we do, that we are getting better at doing it, and most importantly that our students benefit from our efforts.^[1]

Why we do it

- *Assessment is a matter of documenting what we do and what our students learn.*
- *It is an intellectual exercise in which we gather facts, analyze them, make appropriate adjustments to our practices, and gather more facts.*
- *The purpose is not to make us look good but to help us improve.*
- *Assessment goals and outcomes also help us align programs with the university mission, strategic plan, UNC Tomorrow, and campus-wide initiatives (such as general education).*

How we do it

- *Assessment involves clearly stated goals, expected outcomes that indicate progress toward those goals, and procedures that measure how well or poorly they are being achieved.*
- *Assessment should be annual and on-going.*
- *Assessment need not be onerous or cumbersome; not all outcomes need to be assessed every year.*
- *Assessment outcomes and methods should reflect the disciplines being assessed.*
- *Assessment instruments should measure what matters to us, not simply what is easily measured by us.*
- *The university should support departments and programs as they plan and carry out assessments and should take advantage of existing faculty and staff expertise.*

How we use it

Done well, assessment helps us improve our curricula, teaching, and student learning. It should not waste time, reduce flexibility beyond a department's own planning horizon, or take away a department's autonomy. Nor is program assessment a matter of evaluating individual faculty, classes, or students. All university units, not just academic ones, should participate in their own assessment, and a structure to assure accountability of the process should exist at all levels.

Characteristics of Quality Assessment in Academic Departments/Programs (Adapted from Mary J. Allen)

1. *Faculty identify outcomes appropriate to the knowledge, skills, etc. students are expected to learn.*
2. *Faculty ensure wide dissemination of learning outcomes to students (e.g. syllabi, web sites, handbooks, the Catalog).*

3. Faculty are passionate about helping students master the outcomes.
4. Faculty develop or select assessments that focus on how students demonstrate what they have learned.
5. Faculty integrate these measures into meaningful, manageable, sustainable assessment plan.
6. Faculty collect quality evidence of student learning; use rubrics to evaluate the evidence; and reach consensus on whether the results are satisfactory or disappointing.
7. Faculty are collegial and flexible when determining how to use the results to improve the learning experience (i.e. close the loop).
8. Administrators, staff and other campus professionals provide the support needed to faculty to develop the plan, implement the plan, and close the loop.

3.3 SACS Institutional Effectiveness Comprehensive Standard

The institution identified expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on the analysis of the results in each of the following areas:

- Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes
- Administrative support services
- Educational support services
- Research within its educational mission, if appropriate
- Community/public service within its educational mission, if appropriate

The document is available at:

<http://www3.unca.edu/facultysenate/2007-08/Preliminary%20Draft%20Assessment%20document%20for%20Discussion.htm>

V. Executive Committee Report

Dr. Downes reported for the Executive Committee.

Perceptions of Administration Offices Survey

Senators received the Executive Committee Report on the fall 2007 Perceptions of Administrative Office Survey at the last meeting. Dr. Sabo moved to approve the Sense of the Senate Resolution. The motion was seconded by Dr. Wood. The resolution follows:

Sense of the Senate Resolution

The Faculty Senate accepts the Executive Committee's report on the fall 2007 Perceptions of Administrative Offices Survey. At the October 2008 meeting of the Faculty Senate, The Institutional Development Committee will submit guidelines for planning and implementing such surveys in the future. The Resolution passed without opposition and became Senate Document 8308S. The report will be made available soon to the campus community (on-line with restricted access).

Work-in-Progress

Senators (2007-2008 and 2008-2009) received a work-in-progress report from Dr. Downes highlighting key issues the Senate will address next year. The report is appended to the minutes.

Faculty Assembly Report

- **Faculty Teaching Load**
 - Discussed the UNC system long range planning document monitoring faculty teaching workload. The last document that addressed faculty workload in this specific way was developed in 2001.
- **Domestic Partner Benefits; Child Care Options; Textbook Costs**
 - Several faculty members were interested in receiving the documents comparing the UNC system campuses on domestic partner benefits, child care options, and textbook costs. Dr. Downes will make these available when the Faculty Assembly places them on-line.
- **Board of Governors Policy on Academic Program Planning**
 - On April 4th, the Faculty Assembly recommended a redrafting of the Academic Program Planning policy and forwarded it to the BOG. Dr. Downes shared this with the Chancellor.
- **Branding Committee**
 - Widmeyer Communications from Washington, D.C. is working through University Relations and a team of 14 people to learn how UNCA is perceived locally and nationally, and to propose an integrated marketing plan. Faculty representatives are Tammy Huffman, Ed Johnson, Lei Han, Sandra Byrd and Peg Downes.

Second Reading

The following documents were considered for Second Reading:

EC: Sense of the Senate Resolution: Parking

Dr. Sabo moved approval of the Sense of the Senate Resolution. Dr. Cole seconded the motion. Following a lengthy discussion which involved a variety of possible alternatives, the last sentence was amended (Downes/Lanou) by deleting "SPA" and replacing it with "lower-paid". The Resolution passed on a voice vote as amended and became Senate Document 8408S. The edited resolution follows:

Sense of the Senate Resolution

In their January 8, 2008-report to the Faculty Senate, Steve Baxley, AVC for Campus Operations and Yuri Koslen, Transportation Planner, wrote of their interest and "need to involve the campus community in parking and transportation planning." They claimed it was their "job to find solutions that work for UNC Asheville" and they asked for "input and guidance" from the University community.

In its discussion with Mr. Baxley and Mr. Koslen on March 6, 2008 the Faculty Senate urged the Transportation Committee to clarify its goals for managing traffic and parking on campus and to specify the standards it will use when making decisions.

The Faculty Senate endorses the following principles and urges the committee to incorporate them into its decision criteria.

Because the university could not function without its employees, we urge the committee to give their transportation and parking needs highest priority.

Because of the varied and often uncontrollable life circumstances of many employees, we urge that any changes in parking rates involve only minimal increases in costs to faculty employees which are calibrated to salary with no increases in the rates charged lower-paid employees.

EC 2: Proposal to revise the Position Allocation Committee (Revision of SD1904S; Hdbk 10.4.3)
EC 2 passed without opposition and became Senate Document 8508S.

VII. Administrative Report

Dr. Sam Schuman reported for Academic Affairs.

Funding for ILS faculty development

Dr. Schuman distributed two handouts: "ILS Faculty Development Workshops 2004-2007" and "ILS Faculty Development Opportunities 2004-2007". This information was generated by Ed Katz and Pat Catterfeld in response to questions about the amount of funding for faculty development under the broad rubric of ILS.

Dr. Schuman said he asked Dr. Katz to summarize a history of this funding. Dr. Katz told him that when the ILS program was approved by the Faculty Senate five years ago, that Senate membership requested \$100,000 in faculty development funds to support the ILS curriculum for each of the four years. We have spent a little less than that, but in that range. That patterned continued for this year, the fifth year.

Dr. Schuman understood the concern to be one of proportionality: How much of our faculty development money are we spending on this particular area compared to faculty development as a whole? That is a harder figure to grasp in a short time. Dr. Schuman could account for \$430,000 of funding for faculty development above and beyond \$100,000 this year. He assumes this is atypical; the figure is probably closer to \$500,000. We are spending a little more than \$4.00 for non-ILS faculty development for every \$1.00 we are spending on ILS faculty development.

There is no particular sense of hoarding or proprietorship about those proportional relations and should it be the desire of the faculty to drop the funding for ILS faculty development and use it for other faculty development purposes he did not think anyone would be upset. However he trusts no one would want to make that decision on the spur of the moment. He would not be uncomfortable initiating that discussion with Dr. Katz and the Deans. Faculty development for ILS actually is faculty development in general. If faculty improve their interdisciplinary teaching, they would likely also improve their disciplinary teaching.

Other examples of faculty development funding: faculty travel at \$600 per person, and money allocated by the University Teaching Council and the University Research Council.

Update on Admissions search

Two candidates have been interviewed in the second search for the Dean of Admissions, but after extensive discussion a decision has been made not to offer the position to either candidate. Two other potential candidates have been brought forward by our consultants. After scrutinizing material from those applicants, the search committee, chaired by Bill Spellman, has decided to move forward with a telephone interview for one of those candidates. Should that interview prove encouraging, we will make a prodigious effort to bring that person to campus very soon for a round of interviews; otherwise, the committee will likely recommend that we revisit the nature of the position, our advertising, and possibly reopening a new search.

VIII. Old Business

Dr. Downes said it has been a privilege for her this year – and a growth opportunity – to work with Greg Boudreaux, Bill Sabo, and John Wood. She thanked all the Senators, but especially the Executive Committee with whom she worked more closely. She also thanked Ms. Gravely for her work on the faculty's behalf.

IX. New Business

Thank you to Senators: Hartsfield, Boudreaux, Downes, Holt, Krumpe, McKenzie, Wood

Dr. Sabo said, "The People completing their terms this year had as demanding a time of service as any of their predecessors. The faculty thanks you for your dedication and efforts, particularly your commitment to the principle of 'shared' in the concept of 'shared governance.' Some of the issues you confronted required difficult decisions, and you should all be proud of your work.

"Jane, it was an all too brief association, but we wish you well on your new endeavors. Keith, I want you to know how much I appreciate the way you helped me be certain there were never any prolonged silences at Senate meetings. Herman, your loyalty to and work on behalf of UNCA has been so impressive, that we forgive your total inability to keep your colleague from Chemistry under control. Greg, you have done such a marvelous job, I'm afraid you will be over recruited for similar tasks. Maybe both Keith and Herman can give you advice as to how to avoid being overextended. Listen carefully to what they say and do the opposite because they clearly haven't figured out how to avoid having to do everything. Claudel, over the years we have shared a lot and I have learned a great deal from you. You embody the careful attention to detail and the ability to think about the long term implications of ideas that is essential for APC and the Senate to function well and be effective. When I think about how your mind works, it occurs to me that maybe you have a future as an accountant.

"With due respect to the rest of you, I cannot imagine anyone carrying a heavier burden this year than both John and Peg. John, in trying to make the University Planning Council a viable entity again, you carried a heavy burden and responded with grace and style. The Senate is losing one of the faculty's most optimistic personalities, a person capable of finding a silver lining in almost anything. Finally, we all owe a debt of gratitude to our fearless leader, the queen of metaphors. Peg, your energy belies the fact that you are a grandmother and you have every right to be proud of the job you did this year. It is 'the way of our people' to present you with the following, in great appreciation for your efforts, even though it cannot possibly express sufficiently our admiration for the work you have done."

Thank you to Sam Schuman

"If all the faculty members in the room will rise, I will try to do this 'in an impressively expeditious (albeit respectful) manner.' We owe a huge debt to one other person at this table. To honor you, we would like to list your contributions and sing your praises. But despite the array of talent standing before you, we could not do justice to what you mean to UNCA generally and to the faculty specifically. The question before the Senate, acting on behalf of the faculty, is what can we do to show Sam Schuman our gratitude. Sam, even though it is not the *Twelfth Night*

[We] can no other answer make but thanks,

And thanks and ever thanks."

Senators followed with a prolonged ovation for Dr. Schuman.

X. Adjourn

Dr. Downes announced that the 2008-2009 organization meeting will begin in three minutes. The meeting was adjourned at 4:33pm.

Respectfully submitted by: Sandra Gravely
Executive Committee

Some 2007-08 Senate Issues (--moving into 2008-09)

(EC = Executive Committee: Senate chair & chairs of APC, IDC, FWDC)

- Working with Provost Jane Fernandes.
- Shared Governance: Faculty & Administration
 - Request:
 - Written agendas from administrators before meetings
 - Reports from university units that do not whitewash problems & concerns
 - Senate make faculty appointments to search committees before searches begin
 - The chairs of search committees should notify Sandra Gravely of this need
 - Encourage productive discussions (beyond “shared listening”)
- Faculty’s determination of faculty’s merit:
 - Clarify:
 - What constitutes excellence in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service
 - How these three meritorious components are to be balanced
 - How the same general criteria can be shared by all departments
- Discussion of a possible, wholesale move from 3- to 4-credit courses.
- Discussion of committee report on “Delivering the Curriculum”
- ILS/General Education Review:
 - Faculty perceptions of ILS (general education) as planned for now, in 2003:
 - How well are the new parts working?
 - How well are all the parts (new and old) working together?
 - Senate EC met with ILSOC, and we agreed on an outline and timeline for proceeding.
- Perceptions of Administrative Offices Survey:
 - EC’s summary report: available soon to campus (on-line, restricted access).
 - Supervisors will receive full results (comments and data) for those offices they supervise.
 - Senior Staff Supervisors of offices (Vice Chancellors, Chancellor, and Chief of Staff) will be invited, this spring, to address Senate in fall semester about Survey results:
 - *How was the survey helpful?*
 - *How could it be more helpful?*
 - *What did you learn from the comments?*
 - *How do the results of the survey affect your plans for improvements in the areas you supervise?*
 - Follow-up: next round of surveys, reviews, assessments: establishing a pattern.
- Other (in no particular order):
 - UNCA “Branding”: Bill Massey, campus “team,” and national consultants
 - SRI (Student Rating of Instruction form: improvements and proper use)
 - UPC: ongoing improvements
 - Dean of Admissions search
 - Vice Chancellor for Finance and Operations search
 - University Relations Faculty Advisory Committee’s report
 - Transportation (especially parking) issues
 - Diversity Action Committee: now underway; awareness of plans and progress
 - Study Abroad & International Studies, International Students: new Intercultural Learning Center (?)
 - UNC Tomorrow, and UNCA’s Strategic Plan
 - maintaining our focus, adjusting our aims
 - Faculty Assembly: sharing information and initiatives with other UNC campuses
 - Maintain alliances with CSAC and SGA