

University of North Carolina at Asheville  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
Minutes, January 22, 2009

Senate

Members: C. Bell, K. Cole, L. Dohse, B. Haas, M. Harvey, G. Heard, J. Konz, A. Lanou, B. Larson, L. Nelms, L. Russell, J. McClain, M. Moseley, E. Pearson, D. Pierce, B. Sabo, S. Wasileski, B. Wilson; J. Fernandes; Alt. G. Ettari.

Visitors: T. Brne, J. Cone, S. Haas, E. Katz, K. Krumpke, J. Leffe, R. Pente, A. Shope, J. Tieman.

**I. Call to Order, Introductions and Announcements**

Dr. Dohse called the meeting to order at 3:17pm and welcomed Senators and guests.

**II. Approval of minutes**

The minutes of December 4, 2008, were approved with two editorial corrections.

**III. Executive Committee Report**

Dr. Lothar Dohse reported for the Executive Committee.

**Delivering the Curriculum**

Dr. Fernandes has asked the Senate Executive Committee to serve on the Delivering the Curriculum Work Group. An urgent concern is the state's dire budget situation and where to make budget cuts. A separate issue that has been a problem at UNCA is how we teach and how much we teach. Over the years inequities have resulted in how reassigned time is awarded and how large classes are. These issues need to be addressed especially now when people are asking if we are producing enough student credit hours to justify positions. The group is composed of:

Jane Fernandes, Pat McClellan	Administrators
Lothar Dohse, Bill Sabo, Betsy Wilson	Faculty Senate
Alan Hantz, Dave Peifer	Natural Sciences
Robert Dunning, Cindy Ho	Humanities
Bruce Larson	Social Sciences (and FWDC)

**Meeting with the Chancellor**

Highlights of Dr. Dohse's discussion with the Chancellor before the end of the semester:

- Implementing budget cuts of 3%-5%-7%.
- The misunderstanding on the new Mission Statement. Unbeknownst to the Faculty Senate, the Strategic Plan included a new Mission Statement. Some faculty members were not aware that the Mission Statement had changed, and that has to be sorted out. Dr. Wilson will address this in the IDC/UPC reports.
- The Chancellor is not happy with the process of the Perceptions of Administrative Office Survey and she believes other methods may be better. This has to be sorted out. Dr. Dohse told the Chancellor that faculty would like to see a survey done.

**IV. Institutional Development Committee and University Planning Council Reports**

Dr. Betsy Wilson reported for the Institutional Development Committee and the University Planning Council.

**Institutional Development Committee Report**

IDC met with the Chancellor to talk about how we do administrative office self-assessment; this discussion will continue at its next meeting.

**Review of Athletic Program**

IDC has been asked by the Chancellor to initiate a review of Athletics. IDC expects to generate a proposal for this review at its next meeting, with a report on this review expected next fall.

**University Planning Council Report**

UPC minutes are posted on the Institutional Research website: [UPC Minutes](#)

Last fall, UPC focused on implementing the strategic plan, heard budget information and talked about budget cuts.

### **Mission Review**

Before the December 5<sup>th</sup> UPC meeting members were emailed a draft of the UNC Tomorrow (Phase II) Mission Review document, which included UNCA's new Mission Statement. This document is available on the Institutional Research website as part of the minutes of December 5, 2008. The draft was not discussed during the meeting. The document reports to GA a new Mission Statement and a Vision Statement.

The process statement describes how the new Mission Statement emerged as part of the Strategic Plan review process. Discussions in 2007-2008 revised the Strategic Planning document; UPC approved the document, and the document – which includes the new Mission Statement and a Vision Statement – was approved by the Board of Trustees on June 6, 2008.

It was brought to Dr. Wilson's attention that many people did not realize we were changing our Mission Statement as we adopted the Strategic Plan. IDC has discussed this with the Chancellor. The Chancellor has pledged to be less subtle in future discussions. She recognizes that the process was not clear and that there were some ambiguities that were not desirable. The Chancellor is not here today because she is in Seattle at an AAC&U meeting. We know communication was not ideal and are committed to making sure it is better from now on.

Highlights of discussion follow:

- Dr. Wilson did not know if the Mission Statement had been on the Board of Governors agenda yet.
- Dr. Haas expressed concern that at the January UPC meeting Vice Chancellor Pierce said the plan was for us to grow at 100 students per year over the next ten years. He asked how having 1,000 more students squared with the report of the Enrollment Growth and University Size Task Force Report – dated April 28, 2005 – of 3500 students. He asked how faculty were going to be involved in the decision and noted that over half of the members of the Task Force on Enrollment Growth and University Size were faculty members – unlike the UPC.
  - Dr. Bell who was on that committee noted that the issues were not just academic; there are physical constraints to enrollment. That was one reason they settled on 3500 students.
  - Dr. Konz added that the Chancellor publicly announced we would grow by 100 students per year over the next ten years at the faculty meeting. He too was surprised to hear that statement.
  - Dr. Larson recalled that the numbers became refined in the context of further development of the 2005 report. The report initially said 3500 students, but how to define students was unclear. Then the definition of students came to be 3500 full-time students plus/minus 250. The statements seem inconsistent.
  - Dr. Fernandes asked what document says we will grow by 1,000 students.
    - Dr. Haas said he did not know if there was a document. This has been said by the Chancellor and by the VC of Finance.
  - Dr. Dohse said there is a huge amount of pressure from the outside to grow.
  - Dr. Sabo said there may be pressure to change, but the appropriate way is to start from the document on which people invested a lot of time and energy. To depart from this framework, someone needs to make an argument justifying any departures so the evidence for change can be judged and evaluated. He is concerned that doing things any other way leads to arbitrary decisions.
  - Dr. Fernandes said she heard of adding 100 students per year for five years with a goal of 3500, as well as plans to expand the cafeteria and to construct a new dorm.
  - Dr. Sabo said this is why two years ago the Senate re-established the UPC. This is a planning issue. It is not something the UPC should be told about; it is where proposals should be presented for discussion. The purpose of the UPC is to debate long term strategic decisions, discuss the costs and benefits, and determine if we can afford certain actions.
    - Dr. Pierce suggested a resolution to this effect and that UPC receive the report or have access to a link to the report.
  - Dr. Sabo moved approval of the following Sense of the Senate Resolution:

### ***Sense of the Senate Resolution***

*The Senate asks the Institutional Development Committee to insist that plans for future growth be fully debated and discussed by the University Planning Council to increase the chances that integrated, coherent, and widely accepted growth decisions are made, particularly when they are at variance with the Task Force on Enrollment Growth and University Size Report dated April 28, 2005.*

### [Task Force on Enrollment Growth and University Size Report dated April 28, 2005](#)

Dr. Moseley seconded the motion. During discussion Dr. Haas noted that Task Force report should be part of the foundation of our discussions. Dr. Harvey supported the resolution – the spirit of this is that we want

to be involved in this decision. Dr. Sabo noted that the UPC should be the forum for debating and discussing ideas. The Sense of the Senate Resolution passed without dissent and became Senate document 1009S.

Discussion returned to the new Mission Statement:

- Dr. Sabo noted that the cover sheet describing the mission review process said the work continued during the Summer of 2007 with a subset of the Conveners, known as the Think Tank. He argued that the conclusion -- "This process revealed an affirmation of the University's current mission, expressed in a revised and considerably more concise statement" -- is an empirical statement for which there is no evidence. He claimed the new statement departed markedly from the old one. It concerned him that this is the Mission Statement which says who we are and what we strive to accomplish, yet it was not fully discussed nor is it meaningful.

There are two fundamental issues. The first is the process by which the statement was developed. He feels responsible for allowing this to slip by. He has looked through older copies of the Strategic Plan from the website and only in the most recent is the Vision and Mission Statement made somewhat explicit. We talk a lot about community and maybe the Think Tank had reasonable representation, but he did not recall any kind of vote. From his study of democratic politics, the most important thing you can do is legitimate a practice or legitimate a statement. Not only does this statement not inspire him, he did not feel like he had any opportunity to comment on it.

Second there is the critical issue of substance. Is that all we are going be -- a leader of public liberal arts education? That is not inspiring, motivating or assessable. And the accompanying Vision Statement only mentions three of the nine items from the Strategic Plan. Is that saying we really did not mean it when we included diversity and sustainability in the Strategic Plan? He is disappointed in the statement because it is so commonplace.

He understands there is a process and the BOG and the BOT have to approve it, but he wanted to know what the university community can do to have a say in establishing its purpose and reason for existence. He wanted to see the UPC debate and discuss it as a preliminary to broader faculty involvement. We should begin by thinking over what our mission really is and how far we want to reach. He hoped that next year we can get this back into circulation to discuss and debate. He preferred that it be rewritten because he cannot imagine many people being excited about it.

- Dr. Wilson said she talked to the Chancellor about some of these concerns and she expects more input as the various working groups designed to implement the Strategic Plan try to use the Mission Statement to set benchmarks such as diversity goals. For example, the Culture of Evidence workgroup will need to link student learning goals to this Mission Statement. We will be using this statement often. The Chancellor is committed to refining it or changing it if it does not meet our needs.
- Dr. Sabo said this is the wrong way to think about a Mission Statement. There is a danger to think in terms of it meeting our needs. A Mission Statement should not justify what we do. A good Mission Statement dictates how we have to change to improve. He hopes in these discussions people will set high standards. Students do not get better unless we maintain high standards in our classes. Similarly we as an institution will not get better if we do not pursue lofty goals against which we can measure improvement. He was pleased to hear that it is open for discussion and hopes that UPC keeps people's feet to the fire about this.
- Dr. Larson said the statement: "To serve as the standard of excellence in public liberal arts undergraduate education" does not limit us to COPLAC although COPLAC is an important example of that type of teaching and learning. We are talking about all public liberal arts undergraduate education. That is one reason it lifts him up more than he was hearing Dr. Sabo say. The Mission Statement underscores the importance of our university arriving at a coherent and evaluating set of learning outcomes for our students. It provides us with an opportunity to think clearly. What is excellence in public liberal arts undergraduate education? We have not decided yet as a university community and the Mission Statement gives us an opportunity to take that on.
- Dr. Sabo noted that large research universities also present themselves as embodiments of liberal arts education and centers of liberal learning. By the time we have included everybody it seems to be an empty statement. He agreed that it gives us an opportunity, but sees a danger in vague and amorphous statements. The old Mission Statement may have been long and somewhat cumbersome, but it provided a clear set of standards against which to measure progress. It needs to be developed more fully to keep a diverse array of groups from redefining it with every action. This should be in the forefront of the UPC and possibly Faculty Senate deliberations.

- Dr. Nelms asked: what is the most appropriate mechanism to have this discussion openly so that people can see the differences of opinion and influence the discussion sufficiently, so as to accept the outcome whether or not it is what they want.
- Dr. Sabo said he was on the Faculty Senate that wrote the old Mission Statement and it took about seven months to write, partly because groups are inefficient. UPC is probably the agency that should be most centrally involved. When the Senate re-established the UPC it was envisioned as a coordinating mechanism that would pull together administrators, faculty from the Senate, appointed faculty members, and people from other groups. This is the place where the campus community needs to hash these things out. If there is some degree of consensus – it then has to go to IDC who would bring it to the Faculty Senate. It must also go to other organizations such as student government. UPC needs to be the center of these discussions. It must be more than a sounding board. It has to serve as a debating group.
- Dr. Dohse said this topic must not go away. Mission Statements live and they change. The Senate can put the burden on IDC to keep the discussion alive, but at some point we must develop a statement and work from there.
- Dr. Bell noted that the statement is short and succinct. He asked if it came out of an effort to create a brand.
- Dr. Moseley agreed, noting that it was a slogan.
  - Dr. Dohse explained it did not come from the branding group as it has not reached any conclusions.
- Dr. Larson suggested that Dr. Sabo's comments are more content oriented while his are more oriented toward form. We need to find a statement which combines successfully both of those things. Dr. Sabo added that the statement must also be widely accepted.

## V. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee Report

Dr. Merritt Moseley gave the Faculty Welfare and Development Committee Report.

### Second Reading

The following documents were considered for Second Reading:

FWDC 6: Revision of UNCA Tenure Policies and Regulations  
(Revision of SD0102F, SD4089S, SD1089S; Faculty Handbook 14.2)

Editorial changes were made to make pronouns gender neutral.

FWDC 6 passed as amended without dissent and became Senate document 1109S.

FWDC 7: Proposal to Amend the Duties of the University Research Council  
(Revision of SD7808S; Faculty Handbook 10.3.5)

FWDC 7 passed without dissent and became Senate document 1209S.

FWDC 8: Proposal to Amend the Duties of the University Teaching Council  
(Revision of SD7503S; Faculty Handbook 10.3.6)

FWDC 8 passed without dissent and became Senate document 1309S.

### Committee Assignments

- **Chancellor appointments to the Distinguished Scholars Committee**

Leisa Rundquist (HUM)

Don Diefenbach (NS)

Joe Brownsmith (SS)

- **Provost appointments necessitated by the changes in deanships:**

- Pre-Health Professions Advisory: Chuck Bennett replaces Keith Krumppe

- Intellectual Properties Committee: Ed Katz replaces Gregg Kormanik

- University Research Council: Keith Krumppe replaces Gregg Kormanik

- University Service Council: Gwen Ashburn replaces Bill Spellman

- Position Allocation Committee: Keith Krumppe replaces Gregg Kormanik

- **Faculty Senate appointments:**

- Textbook Committee: Laura Facciponti replaces Gwen Ashburn

- IILSOC: Noah Allen replaces Keith Krumppe

Announcement, for information purposes:

- Faculty Assembly: Alternate Lora Holland replaces Gwen Ashburn

## VI. 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:

APC 19: Delete ENVR 443 and 444; Add new course, BIOL 322, cross-listing it with ENVR 322;  
Add new course, BIOL 323, cross-listing it with ENVR 323; Editorial changes as a result  
of the deletions and additions

Dr. Konz said this proposal increases the prerequisites to courses that are typically taken only by majors in those disciplines, thereby limiting the participation of students in other disciplines. Dr. Sabo tabled the proposal until a member of Environmental Studies could be present to answer questions.

APC 2: Delete LANG 351, Writing for Business and the Professions  
Delete LIT 351, Beginning Old English

APC 2 passed without dissent and became Senate document 1409S.

APC 3: Addition of LIT 363; Revision of LIT 491 description

APC 3 passed without dissent and became Senate document 1509S.

APC 4: Change in frequency of CLAS 102 and CLAS 212

APC 4 passed without dissent and became Senate document 1609S.

APC 5: Changes to Classics Senior Research Thesis (CLAS 495)

APC 5 passed without dissent and became Senate document 1709S.

APC 6: Change course description for ATMS 223, Physical Climatology

APC 6 passed without dissent and became Senate document 1809S.

APC 7: Add new course, ATMS 345, Tropical Meteorology

Add new course, ATMS 464, Scientific Writing

APC 7 passed without dissent and became Senate document 1909S.

APC 8: Removal of prerequisites for CHEM 132 and inclusion of a preparation  
recommendation in the course description

APC 8 passed without dissent and became Senate document 2009S.

APC 9: Change AP credit awarded for CHEM 132

APC 9 passed without dissent and became Senate document 2109S.

APC 10: Add new course, ENVR 106, Earth History;

Add new course, ENVR 310, Economic Geology

APC 10 passed without dissent and became Senate document 2209S.

APC 11: Delete ENVR 321 and its cross-listed course, BIOL 321; Delete ENVR 350;

Editorial changes resulting from deletions

APC 11 passed without dissent and became Senate document 2309S.

APC 12: Add ENVR 343, Stream Ecology; Add ENVR 343 as an option for the Concentration in  
Ecology and Environmental Biology

APC 12 passed without dissent and became Senate document 2409S.

APC 13: Delete ACCT 215 as an option in Concentration in Environmental Management and Policy

APC 13 passed without dissent and became Senate document 2509S.

APC 14: Change course number, description, and credit hours of ENVR 382, Environmental Geology;  
Editorial changes resulting from adding Environmental Geology to core requirements for  
Environmental Studies

APC 14 passed without dissent and became Senate document 2609S.

APC 15: Change title, credit hours and description of ENVR 338 and its cross-listed course,  
ATMS 338; Change title and description of ENVR 362

APC 15 passed without dissent and became Senate document 2709S.

APC 16: Delete Concentration in Pollution Control, merging it w/ Concentration in Earth Science  
APC 16 passed without dissent and became Senate document 2809S.

APC 17: Editorial changes to Earth Science with 9-12 Teacher Licensure  
APC 17 passed without dissent and became Senate document 2909S.

APC 18: Editorial Changes to the Environmental Studies Narrative  
APC 18 passed without dissent and became Senate document 3009S.

**First Reading: [Approved without opposition by APC]**

APC first reading documents have always been distributed to Senators. Dr. Sabo asked for the Senate's indulgence in changing APC's operating procedures. Under APC's new practice, documents unanimously approved by APC would be listed on the agenda. The electronic copy of the agenda will have links to access the documents for review. APC will continue to provide hard copies of any document that is not passed unanimously or any document that a member of APC thinks the Senate should look at more carefully (even if they do not oppose it) because it may have important ramifications. This will dramatically reduce the number of hardcopies that APC distributes. Proposals will be circulated upon request. The new operating procedures were agreed upon by Senate consensus.

The following documents were approved unanimously by APC and considered for First Reading:

- APC 20: Change title and course description of SOC 385
- APC 21: Delete ECON 215 and add ECON 342; Revise Concentration in Monetary Economic Finance
- APC 22: Change Scheduled Offering of ECON 314
- APC 23: Add IP Grading Option for ECON 480
- APC 24: Revise Title and Course Description for ESI 490
- APC 25: Revise Requirements for Concentration in Ethics and Social Institutions
- APC 26: Delete HIST 390, Seminar in Historiography; Add HIST 250, The Historian's Craft; Add HIST 451, Research Seminar Preparation
- APC 27: Change major requirements for History; Change prerequisite for HIST 452
- APC 29: Add new course, ECE 456, Mechatronics, and add it as an option for the major
- APC 30: Delete ECE 206 and ECE 302
- APC 31: Change course description for E 115
- APC 32: Change course descriptions for ECE 200 and ECE 211  
Change the pre- and corequisites for ECE 220
- APC 33: Change the descriptions for MAE 310 and MAE 316  
Change the pre- and corequisites for MAE 315

**[Approved by APC with opposition - 4 to 1 vote]**

APC 28: Addition of LS 205, Peer Mentoring Addition of LS 305, Leadership in Peer Mentoring

**VII. Administrative Reports**

**Academic Affairs**

Provost Jane Fernandes reported from Academic Affairs.

UNCA has been asked to cut an additional 2% from our budget and it is retroactive to July 1. We may have to cut another 1-2% before the end of the year. The Chancellor will be sending out rather stringent guidelines that restrict travel and some purchases of goods and services. We have stopped filling vacant staff positions. The searches on four faculty vacancies will continue. The nine faculty searches that were put on hold will be carried forward as a priority. The approved searches on hold may be filled with qualified lecturers.

**Retention**

Retention from fall to spring last year was around 87%. This year it is 93% on average. The dorms are over capacity with some students still in temporary spaces. A high rate of retention will increase our graduation rate. She thanked faculty for motivating students so they stay in school and graduate.

The retention rates follow:

On average	93%
New Freshmen	92%
Continuing students	95%
Non-degree	50%
Graduate students	70% (some were lost to graduation; 2-3 MLA students graduated)

**Student Government Association**

Stephen Haas reported for the Student Government Association

**Campus Smoking Prohibition Policy**

The Student Affairs Committee has been working with the administration in making revisions to the Smoking Policy. SGA passed a couple of bills to that effect, giving recommendations to the administration. Some of the recommendations were taken into consideration and adopted in the new policy. They are interested in faculty and student input on the new plan as we move forward.

**Humanities Curriculum**

The Academic Affairs Committee has been continuing in its efforts to talk with the Humanities curriculum coordinators to improve the level of diversity in the program. They suggested better integrating the lecturers with the material in the course and also taking a more non-Eurocentric approach.

They met with Dr. Ho and Dr. Ettari and discussed the possibility of adding other languages as options for study, such as Mandarin, Cantonese, and American Sign Language.

Dr. Fernandes and Dr. Lanou commented that the administration and the Classics Department are working to offer Asian courses.

**Update on Textbooks**

Dr. Bell spoke with Textbook Manager Carole Marrs about generating a list of required textbooks on line. He learned that the list is already on line and he sent this information to the SGA.

Dr. Pearson noted the student concern was not whether the information was put on line, but rather when the information was made available to them. Dr. Bell said the list was up in November. Students were requesting the information six to eight weeks before the end of the semester.

**VIII. Old Business**

There was no Old Business.

**IX. New Business**

Dr. Sabo expressed condolences to Sandra Byrd and her family for the recent loss of a family member.

**X. Adjourn**

Dr. Dohse adjourned the meeting at 4:45pm.

Respectfully submitted by: Sandra Gravely  
Executive Committee