

University of North Carolina at Asheville
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Minutes, February 10, 2011

Senate

Members: R. Berls, G. Boudreaux, R. Bowen, G. Ettari, V. Frank, E. Gant, G. Kormanik, B. Larson, T. Meigs, S. Mills, K. Moorhead, G. Nallan, L. Nelms, K. Reynolds, L. Russell, B. Schaffer, M. Sidelnick, S. Subramaniam; J. Fernandes.

Visitors: G. Ashburn, S. Capone, P. Catterfeld, L. Friedenberg, C. Galatioto, E. Katz, J. Konz, K. Krumpel, L. Langrall, M.L. Manns, P. McClellan, R. Pente, A. Shope, S. Walters.

I. Call to Order and Announcements

Dr. Frank called the meeting to order 3:46 pm and welcomed senators and guests.

II. Approval of minutes

The minutes of January 20, 2011, were approved with editorial corrections.

III. Executive Committee (EC) Report

Dr. Volker Frank reported for the Executive Committee.

Administration responses to two Senate Resolutions

Two Sense of the Senate Resolutions were sent to the Chancellor and we have now received responses:

[SD0610F: Sense of the Senate Resolution on Academic Freedom](#)

As Provost I am responding to the Faculty Senate resolution, after consultation with the Chancellor who knows I am responding for us. Since the Code already includes very strong support for academic freedom, public scrutiny and/or recommended revision to the Code on this matter run a considerable risk of weakening our current protection. Strong support for academic freedom is so important to our university that we advise against provoking this risk.

[SD0910F: Sense of the Senate Resolution on Externally Generated Initiatives](#)

As Provost, I am responding to the Faculty Senate resolution, after consultation with the Chancellor who knows I am responding for us. We approve the resolution with the caveat that upon the decision to communicate about initiatives and directives originating from off-campus, we will confer about the best way to work together for the good of the campus community.

Comments

- Dr. Nallan asked the Senate to send the response to the academic freedom resolution to Dr. Sandi Gravett, Chair of the Faculty Assembly.
- Dr. Ettari asked that Senators receive the resolutions and the responses before formulating a response.
- Dr. Kormanik was interested in knowing how other campuses in the UNC system responded to the academic freedom resolution.

Curriculum Task Force

Dr. Frank has received several nominations and volunteers to serve on the Curriculum Task Force. These faculty members can expect to receive an email from the Provost on how we propose to proceed. The Task Force will have representatives from the various academic divisions and programs.

Faculty Assembly Report: Scott Walters

Dr. Walters reported on the January 21, 2011 Faculty Assembly. He attended the meeting as the alternate representative for Pamela Nickless, along with Lora Holland.

Faculty Assembly Chair, Sandie Gravett, said in a pre-meeting memo: "It is going to be a daunting task ahead and there is much reason for concern. The process is really two-fold. There are short-term strategies emerging to meet the immediate budget crisis next year and longer-term strategies to restructure who we are and what we do in light of changes to the educational enterprise as well as our new financial normal. Both will have impact on the faculty in ways we will all want to understand."

There is a new Faculty Assembly Website where all faculty of the UNC System can keep up with what is happening: <http://www.northcarolina.edu/facultyassembly/index.htm>

Chair Gravett also communicated appreciation for all those who passed the Academic Freedom Resolution which was passed by the Faculty Assembly at its September meeting, and that this Senate endorsed at its November meeting. The Resolution reaffirmed the UNC Code regarding academic freedom, including the following specific freedoms:

- Freedom of research and publication
- Freedom of teaching
- Freedom of internal criticism
- Freedom of participation in public debate

There were also a few bylaws changes, which pertained to allowing the Chair and Vice-Chair to serve two 2-year terms instead of only one.

New UNC System President, Tom Ross, addressed the Assembly and discussed his opinions regarding the budgetary crisis and its impact on the university. The budget crisis is real, and we will have to respond. General Administration is creating a committee, headed by former UNC Charlotte president, to examine "unnecessary duplication" of programs on the campuses. President Ross was careful to emphasize the word "unnecessary," saying that there is a lot of duplication between campuses, but that many of them he would not see as "unnecessary" duplications. More centralization of some functions, e.g. payroll, and other collaborations across campuses can help to save money. Tax reform absolutely needs to be done, but the Legislature is not too interested in it.

Incoming State Senator Peter S. Brunstetter, Republican from Forsyth County, addressed the Assembly. He told us that his three children graduated from UNC schools, and that he has enormous regard and respect for what we do. He recently taught his first university class, and was shocked at how much work it required.

Senator Brunstetter placed the budget shortfall at \$3.8B (not the figure we had been hearing of \$3.7B), which he pegged at 18%. He indicated that it is likely that the tuition increases will stay on the campuses and that greater flexibility will be granted to the campuses regarding how the budget challenges are met: the legislature will not dictate specifics. He indicated he felt that the pension fund should be fully funded, and should have been fully funded in the past. He said the general belief was that furloughs were not the way to go and that in early discussions they were not on the list.

Senator Brunstetter also said a few alarming things:

- His feeling was that we are looking at an 18% budget cut.
- When asked why extending the current sales tax rate, which would wipe out \$1.1M of the budget deficit, was not being considered, he responded that "we are not predisposed" to look at the revenue side of the balance sheet.
- He also referred to the committee that was formed to look at duplication, and said that the university will need to look at eliminating entire programs, not just RIFs and pay cuts.

- We are retreating toward “core programs,” he said, and they will be looking particularly hard at “newer add-ons.” This was a new theme that a Faculty Assembly employee had not heard before.
- We should not think that these cuts will be restored in the future – slow growth, just like the economy.

Barry Boardman from GA’s Fiscal research Division addressed the Assembly. He said that revenues for the first half of the fiscal year were “on target” or even slightly ahead of projections, but most of the “forecast risk” resides in the second half of the year. Indications are that the economic recovery is starting to take hold and forecasts are for continued improvement throughout 2011. But, modest growth means that we will not get back to where we were for at least another year or two.

Laura Lugar, GA’s General Counsel, reported on program elimination/major curtailment.

- It takes 18-24 months to eliminate programs, so no immediate savings—not a “quick way to get rid of faculty.”
- Chancellor in consultation with campus recommends an elimination; or top-down process when BOG does own review of programs, pursuant to due diligence process and decides a program will be eliminated, communicated back to Chancellor; Chancellor looks at who is affected, what are their rights, how will the elimination proceed.
- Phrase “unnecessary duplication” appears in policy.
 - Existing committee will ultimately issue a checklist that will track policy, define terms, etc. to help campuses apply policies on program elimination and major curtailment. This committee will conclude fairly quickly and a new second committee will be started under Jim Woodward (BOG) to look at immediate savings and will be composed differently; wants faculty to be involved;
 - Program definition: degree programs, certificate programs, teacher licensure programs;
 - BOG is currently not undertaking any program assessments or reviews
- Furlough remains in governor’s authority through 20 June.
- Pay cuts a possibility for short-term budget gap closure.

The last presentation was from Purificacion Martines, the North Carolina AAUP President. Her presentation was a corrective to everything we had heard so far. Much of the discussion of the elimination of programs and majors rests on the declaration of a financial exigency. AAUP defines this as follows: “An imminent financial crisis that threatens the survival of the institution as a whole and that cannot be alleviated by less drastic means” than the termination of tenured faculty appointments.”

- Based on rules that derive from the chief provisions and interpretations of the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* and of the 1958 *Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings*.
- AAUP rules regarding how to proceed (quite extensive). A faculty body should participate in reaching the determination that a condition of financial exigency exists. The burden of proof is on the administration.
- A faculty body should play a primary role in developing the criteria for decisions on programs to be discontinued and where appointments will be terminated.
- Of particular note is that AAUP has brought suit against State University of Albany for their discontinuance of the majors in French, Italian, Russian, classics and theater. A more detailed outline can be found at: <http://www.aaup.org/aaup/financial/mainpage.htm>

IV. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee

Dr. Gary Ettari reported for the Faculty Welfare and Development Committee.

Elections

Dr. Greg Boudreaux said the first election (Committee of Tenured Faculty) is underway. The elections for Faculty Senate and Post-Tenure Review begin February 21. He encouraged colleagues to vote. Anyone who had concerns about the current nomination procedures are asked to send comments to FWDC. Dr. Ettari thanked Dr. Boudreaux for his hard work on the elections.

Two paragraphs missing in Faculty Handbook

Dr. Ettari reported that two paragraphs from a Senate document passed in November 1994 were never inserted in the Faculty Handbook under Section 3.1: Faculty Rights, Responsibilities and Evaluations. FWDC decided that because this was a Senate action that was never acted upon, the corrective procedure would be to insert the two paragraphs. When speaking to our incoming colleagues, in terms of mentoring faculty and defining what kind of institution they are now working at, the entire section is helpful. The document is available: <http://www2.unca.edu/facultysenate/y9495/sd0294f.txt>

Comments

Dr. Sidelnick read from SD0294F: *“The professional responsibilities of full-time faculty at UNCA are divided among the three general headings of teaching, scholarship and service. All three are considered important, but historically UNCA has placed the heaviest emphasis on teaching.”* He said at a presentation by the Committee of Tenured Faculty, the Chairperson last May put slides up including a statement from the Handbook (which he could not find) that suggested that service is in fact considered third in importance on our campus. He asked for clarification at that meeting and the ranking of service as lower than teaching and scholarship was confirmed.

This goes against the General Administration directive two years ago for campuses to indicate how they are going to equate all three areas. An ad hoc committee has been looking at this for a year and a half and we have yet to receive a report. The longer we go without a recommendation by the committee, the longer we are not in compliance with the GA mandate.

Senators asked that the GA mandate be included in the minutes. From November 7, 2008 UPC minutes: http://www.unca.edu/sites/default/files/UPC/Nov7_Review_Tenure_Reward_System_1.pdf

V. Institutional Development Committee/University Planning Council Reports

Ms. Linda Nelms reported for Institutional Development Committee and University Planning Council.

Institutional Development Committee (IDC)

There are a number of surveys of broad issues that are currently required by GA and there is currently no faculty group that reviews and analyzes these reports. Our concerns: Which of these reports would provide insight for faculty consideration? If we can identify the most important reports, should we have a schedule that puts them on the IDC agenda regularly? These would provide focused conversations especially as they relate to comparative information.

It is extremely helpful to have the Director of Institutional Research as a resource for IDC and would be helpful in the future to have the Institutional Effectiveness Director as a resource. At present, there is no formal recognition that either position has such a relationship formalized. We are looking into the process of making the occupants of those two positions ex-officio, non-voting members of IDC.

IDC reviewed the concerns from Fall 2010, and reiterated its concern over supporting scholarship both for ongoing faculty and in terms of setting a standard for incoming faculty. We are concerned over that which we can lose during this period of crisis and never get back, or can only get back very slowly. It was noted that some private liberal arts schools deliberately downplay scholarship but require a record of positive faculty/student interaction outside the classroom.

IDC wants to explore ways to save faculty time. One area may be the Faculty Record. A tremendous amount of faculty and administrative time is spent on generating and reviewing a very detailed Faculty Record for every member of the faculty every year. Members are taking an informal survey to see what other universities are doing and whether they have found it useful. A key question is whether tenured faculty needs to generate a detailed Faculty Record every year.

Another area for saving faculty time may be to reduce the service load by seeing if the number of committees can be reduced or that the service load can be distributed more evenly. One option might be to combine the charges of committees that address similar issues. Yet another is to examine those committees that have provided no information to show they have met or have accomplished anything. The FWDC collects reports annually on committee activities and if there is no activity, there may be no need for the committee (it would be necessary to exclude those committees from this list who meet when specific circumstances require it, i.e., Grievance or Hearings).

A further area for exploration falls in line with our state governor's focus on removing archaic laws. There appear to be institutional barriers to some forms of collaboration. Is there a way to count hours that are spent for creative purposes? Are there barriers to collaboration between departments that could be removed?

At the February meeting we will be discussing Faculty Records and sharing information we have gathered. We are also trying to get a better identification of the less active committees.

University Planning Committee (UPC)

Because of the complexity of schedules all UPC meetings will be held on a Friday starting at 8:55a.m. and can formally last only one hour.

Chancellor Ponder noted that there are a number of empty chairs at UNC General Administration during this transition period, and Ms. Riley is working with Jeff Davies, Chief of Staff, to make sure that the lines of communication between our campus and GA are working smoothly.

December Board of Trustees meeting passed the Tuition and Fee proposal. This proposal provided a 6.5% campus based tuition increase. The fee component was below the 6.5% maximum and in the middle of the range for all UNC schools. Chancellor Ponder reported that there is a strong need for these increases as our state allocations have declined sharply and that, even with the proposed increase, UNC Asheville remains the least expensive option in our peer group. The new NC state legislative leadership has stated that tuition increases should remain on the campuses, as opposed to reverting to the state as suggested earlier, but these increases will not close the budget gap. Chancellor Ponder requested UPC's advice on how to help our campus understand the seriousness of the budget crisis while maintaining focus on student success and optimism about our future. The budget problems we previously thought would occur next year are now with us this year as the Governor is pulling resources from agencies to address the current shortfall. Chancellor Ponder expressed hope that we wouldn't have a 15% cut that we've been asked to plan for, but reminded us that President Bowles said last semester that even 10% would be devastating.

In response to UPC questions, Chancellor Ponder reported that decisions about how to manage the budget cuts will be made at the Provost/Vice Chancellor level. She also reported that pay cuts have not been discussed at the UNC system level, but it was being discussed at the state level. At least one UNC Chancellor has stated that he would rather have fewer people than underpay everyone. Chancellor Ponder stated that we would continue to manage vacancies carefully. We would only fill highest priority positions, such as those in academic support, development and public safety.

UPC members asked a number of questions and made budget suggestions.

Rob Nelson gave a presentation on the Campus Master Planning Process, similar to the presentation he gave to the Faculty Senate. The presentation is available: <http://www.unca.edu/node/2183>.

N.B. Some of the wording of this report is taken from the minutes of the UPC meeting: <http://www.unca.edu/node/2183>

Questions/Comments

- Dr. Kormanik asked about IDC's report given at the January 20 Senate meeting. Ms. Nelms reported that IDC met with the directors of the MLA Program and the Asheville Graduate Center, two of the programs on campus that generate flexible funds. There is an ongoing record of these programs providing financial support for the university in ways that increase flexibility in a time when pressures seem to be decreasing flexibility. Dr. Kormanik said he has heard disturbing comments relating to the direction and to the leadership in these programs that could compromise or affect resources. He asked Ms. Nelms to comment.

- Ms. Nelms asked that the minutes indicate that she and Dr. Kormanik have not discussed this. She planned to make the following comment today under Old Business:

At the last meeting of the Faculty Senate, I reported on an IDC meeting that involved two faculty leaders of programs that provide flexible dollars. In addition to providing information about the contribution of the MLA and the Asheville Graduate Center, the two directors asked that the faculty understand what the programs do and that faculty be involved in decisions that affect the programs. At this time, neither of the two professors who made the presentations to IDC will be leading these programs next year. Decisions were made, steps were taken, and the faculty members involved were told that there would be no discussion or negotiation.

We as a faculty are given tremendous information about problems but we are given much less information about the decision-making process to address those problems. There is an advisory committee for at least one of these two programs. If the advisory committee cannot provide advice, it should not exist.

All of us who have provided advice to students or faculty or administration know that sometimes our advice is taken and sometimes it is rejected; but we want to know it is, first, requested before decisions are reached and, second, it is actually processed before action is taken.

At the heart of the liberal arts is critical thinking. At the heart of critical thinking is acknowledging the validity of different points of view and making thoughtful decisions after weighing the alternatives. This is what we should be teaching. This is what we should be modeling. There should be dialogue about serious issues and transparency about the process of decision-making.

Dr. Frank said this would be discussed further under Old Business.

VI. Academic Policies Committee

Mr. Rob Berls reported for the Academic Policies Committee.

First Reading: [Unanimously approved by APC]

The following documents were made available for First Reading:

APC 11: Creation of Community Engaged Scholar Distinction for Graduating Students

APC 12: Change in the description of the Key Center for Community Citizenship and Service Learning; Formalize the designation of Service-Learning Courses

APC 13: Delete CSCI 142

APC 14: Delete CSCI 201; Add new courses, CSCI 181 and CSCI 182

APC 15: Changes to required courses for CSCI major and minor

APC 16: Replace CSCI 244 with CSCI 185

APC 17: Change prerequisites in the course descriptions for CSCI 202, 255, 310, 344

APC 18: Editorial changes resulting from changes to CSCI courses

Mr. Berls applauded Dr. Joseph Berryhill for bringing APC 11 to the Senate for consideration. Dr. Sidelnick encouraged senators to read the impact and rational statements in APC 11. It addresses the university's historic lack of incentive for faculty to take on service-learning, much less acknowledge and reward this investment of time and energy on the faculty's part. It is imperative that faculty assume the mentorship of these students: this will come out of faculty time because there no course load attached to it.

VII. Administrative Reports

Reaffirmation Update

Dr. Mary Lynn Manns said the QEP Leadership Team, in talking with Dr. Fernandes, is putting together an outline of the QEP draft based on the surveys received last semester. This is being sent to SACS and other people who can give us feedback. Dr. Manns distributed a Draft Outline for the Quality Enhancement Plan.

Student Government Association

Highlights of Ms. Courtney Galatioto's report:

- Elections are underway.

- Love Fest, dedicated to opening a dialogue on about relationships, sexual awareness, and sexual safety, will be held February 14 – 17.
- Our first faculty lecture series was held last night. The series will have a coffee shop atmosphere where everyone can sit, relax, and listen to a lecture. The interaction and sharing of knowledge is exciting.

VIII. Old Business

A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the rapid loss of leadership in two of our revenue-generating programs: the Asheville Graduate Center and the MLA program, and possible consequences of reducing course offerings in small departments, thereby weakening them. Highlights of discussion:

- Dr. Kormanik said the report distributed at the last meeting shows that the Asheville Graduate Center generates \$526K annually in net revenue. Is there a plan to keep the revenue coming with the change in leadership of the Asheville Graduate Center? There could be a significant loss of discretionary revenue if folks look for other places to deliver their curriculum. Is there a plan to reduce the use of space on campus by others?
 - Dr. Fernandes said she is committed to support revenue-generating programs at the same level or perhaps at an increased level than she has in the past, especially during this difficult budget time.
- Ms. Nelms shared her concern: the leadership is changing, somewhat rapidly, because when these two directors met with IDC, each of them seemed enthusiastic and dedicated to the program that they were working on. They did not show an interested in leaving. And now they have left. That causes concern.
 - Dr. Fernandes said she could not explain individual's decisions about remaining in employment or not and personnel matters are confidential. As Provost, she has every intention of continuing the programs at the same level they are currently operating on if not more. She is 100% confident that we will do quite well as we always have.
- Dr. Kormanik asked if the MLA program will have an intellectual leader with a liberal arts background who can bring academic rigor and leadership to a master's program.
 - Dr. Fernandes said she did not know who the leader will be so she cannot say that, but we would certainly hope so.
- Ms. Nelms asked if the advisory committees to these programs will be asked for advice.
 - Dr. Fernandes said yes, they had conferred with the members of the Graduate Council or not as entirely consistent with the way that they have been consulted in the past. Nothing has been done in this situation that is different than what has been done in the past. She said she was not clear on what the concern is.
- Ms. Nelms said she would like to have the performance of both programs brought before the Senate next year and the following year, on an on-going basis.
 - Dr. Fernandes fully supported this idea. She encouraged IDC to continue the work it started this year with the report it generated and shared with the Faculty Senate. She asked IDC to also look into how all departments and programs generate revenue in different ways to be more accountable in that way.
- Dr. Sidelnick said he understands the budget is in a quagmire and the decision to let adjuncts go across campus. His concern is this may result in unforeseen consequences. The dance minor, which was a long fought victory to come into existence, has been depleted of all of its adjuncts. De facto the dance minor has no faculty; de facto the program does not exist, although it has one faculty member. A consequence of losing adjuncts means the program cannot offer the courses needed for the students to complete the minor. If releasing adjuncts depletes the staffing of a program, a consequence is that the program becomes vulnerable. The Music Department has 24 adjuncts listed on its website. He did not know if it has also been weakened as an unintentional consequence of this move.
 - Dr. Fernandes asked Dean Jeff Konz to respond. Dean Konz said last fall chairs were asked what their schedule would look like without adjuncts with the imperative given that we seek to offer courses which satisfy major requirements and graduation requirements. The dance program and the fitness classes in Health and Wellness were largely populated by adjuncts, so the schedule that Dr. Ray developed had no dance classes in it. In recognition of the students who have declared

minors in dance, we backfilled and there will be six hours of dance – three classes offered each semester of next academic year. That is not the level of courses that we have had in the past and we recognize that. There are no plans to discontinue the program any time in the foreseeable future.

- Dr. Sidelnick said a consequence might be that the dance program is in a weaker position to defend itself because it has no faculty. A year ago the Senate heard that the German program was going to be cut and the Senate said no, it is too important to cut. The AAUP statement that Dr. Walters read said the AAUP recommends that the people being cut have to be involved in the decision and faculty must be one of the main bodies that contribute to those decisions. What happens to the dance program in a year when the program is in a much weaker place to defend itself? I understand if we are losing programs it has to come through this body. The German program did and the Senate decides if it goes away, not by virtue of unemployment but by virtue of making a conscious and intentional decision to keep or not keep a program. That is supported by the AAUP statement; there is some parallel there that he hopes the Senate will stay aware of. Mr. Berls agreed we should not let attrition make decisions for us.
- Dr. Fernandes said she is not an expert, but she thinks the AAUP guidelines and what Dr. Walters was talking about would apply if we were in a position of deciding to close a whole department. German, as a major, even when we discussed that possibility, we never intended to lose the faculty member in German. She asked to close it as a major because she thought it was in the best interest of continuing German as a language on this campus and that continuing it as a major is a weak position for German to be in. She still thinks that, but we are past that. Closing a major, or discontinuing a minor, or discontinuing a concentration is not exactly the same category as closing a whole department or a whole set of faculty serving a program. That is probably what the GA Task Force is working on.
- Dr. Sidelnick agreed it is not the same, but he would argue that it is parallel.

IX. New Business

Facilities Management

Following concerns led by Ms. Nelms, Senators wanted to know what will happen with facilities management with Steve Baxley's impending departure. Senators expressed the concern that the new building(s) on campus will have the flaws inherent in the buildings that were built when there was no knowledgeable person who could note inherent problems with the construction process; i.e., Lipinsky, Zageir, Rhoades, Carmichael. Vice Chancellor Pierce will be asked to address these concerns.

Comments from Dr. Volker Frank

Dear Senators, I want to talk about the contemporary moment we live in at UNCA, and make some suggestions. It will be blunt perhaps, but my intentions are merely to contribute to better communication and understanding so that down the road it could affect the way we produce education at UNCA.

This has been a hectic and nerve-wrecking week and that may continue for a while. Many of us were saddened and shocked by the news that several of our colleagues were dismissed.

This shock has two versions: one is that it happened at all, the other is not that it happened but how it happened. I want to address these two dimensions of campus response, and what we can do about future responses and/or future dismissals, or future budget decisions or future administrative decisions or, very importantly, future faculty decisions.

What my comments address is an issue that John Stevens brought to the forefront yesterday in his email link to an article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* entitled "[Shared Governance is a Myth.](#)" Interestingly, we talked about that very issue early last semester, though my words were 'increasing bureaucratization' and 'increasing paradoxical rationalization' and the illusion that we feel we can stop it.

Clearly the mood on campus is bad and to many there is a rift between the administration and the faculty and staff. Although I do not wish to debate specific events such as the dismissal of UNCA employees today, it is paramount that these issues be addressed.

Today I want to open a conversation. First, I would like to extend an invitation to our administrators to think about ways and means to address the moment we currently live in. Primarily it is not the administrators here in this room today, it is administrators on this campus. I hear from many of my

colleagues: the administration appears to care very little about faculty and staff; the administration, though it claims to take our concerns into consideration, in reality it does not.

Very importantly, to ignore this will be very costly for all of us. Frankly, neither we nor the administration can afford to do this. This is not only an invitation to talk; it is a friendly affirmation that this is too serious for the short, medium and long term consequences of UNCA. Also, remember I said that many were shocked not so much that the dismissals happened, but how. In the weeks ahead, the Executive Committee would like to speak with different administrators about this.

But now let's talk about us, the faculty. To a considerable degree, I shared my thoughts with all faculty in my e-mail earlier this week. Among the things I addressed was the way we as faculty respond to administrative decisions. The response pattern – observed over the past 15 years, is pretty consistent, and what is troublesome, it is a weak response with little or no follow-up or follow-through.

I would like to briefly address the “Shared Governance is a Myth” article. If we consider other shared governance experiences, particularly those in Northern Europe – not in academia but collective action by labor organizations – we will quickly see that it is not a myth at all. And this is profoundly important for us. One, many benefits can and do result from more effectively shared governance, though there it is called “co-determination”.

Two, admittedly, not all objectives were accomplished. Thus what can be called capital's “holy cow” was not significantly affected, that is, capital's prerogative in investment decisions. But three, the list of accomplishments is enormous, especially when seen through the U.S. lens where comparatively few benefits exist. If co-determination addresses welfare, why can we not think of it in a similar or the same way? Because it is here in the U.S. or because it is in academia and not in the private economy and not related to labor? Why can we not start thinking about what we can learn from collectively expressed grievances? I for one think we can learn an enormous amount. Four, to debunk co-governance as the author of the article does, there is a good chance of it becoming a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Let me finish the point about collective action by saying that comparatively, strong collective action is quiet. Ever gone to Scandinavia, Austria, Germany, and seen your vacation plans ruined by striking folks? Weak collective action is loud, visible, and noisy. Now remember what I said about our response pattern, which I see much more as the latter type here (weak and loud), rather than the former (strong and quiet).

Finally, part of becoming a more coherent faculty body involves a shift from speaking not only as an individual entrepreneur of ideas, but as a member of a faculty body. So what can we do? I would like to raise a question. Where does the shoe “pinch”? We know we feel a certain amount of discomfort, but with what and with whom exactly? On what basis do we address all the campus issues and “problems,” and should we address them all? Often when we speak we come from a moral perspective, more so since we are faculty at a liberal arts college, and therefore, wittingly or not, explicitly or not, values are important to us. A possible difference we see may reside in the existence of two ethics here (see Max Weber), one which is the ethic of ultimate ends, the other is the ethic of responsibility. Is it possible that we do not always speak the same ethic, among faculty and between faculty and administration? Remember, this may separate us all, not just faculty from administrators.

I am reminded a bit these days of the Michael Moore movie “Roger and Me.” With all its shortcomings, Moore has a point: who makes decisions?

And this brings us to the faculty again. Here are some ideas:

- 1) This body, the Senate, has too much inertia and not enough dynamic.
- 2) Senate is not enough informed; we need to do more ourselves, to be and become informed. How much do we understand University budgets; how much do we understand human resources? Who reads the *Chronicle of Higher Education*? How much do we share ideas that come from sources such as the *Chronicle*? Do you share these ideas in your department, at department meetings? And what would be the right place for us to share these ideas and how could they be shared with faculty? Why can we not produce more collectively shared ideas about UNCA's role in higher education? The *Chronicle* is just one example. How much do we benefit from our UNC Faculty Assembly, and what do we do at UNCA to get better connected to our colleagues within the UNC system?

3) I am asking my colleagues, especially from FWDC and IDC, to consider over the next weeks how to become better at articulating where the shoe pinches and how we propose to change that.

In the end, just like there will be long term costs for administration if it does not hear us better and send clearer signals that they hear us, so there are long term consequences for faculty if we do not adapt, if we cannot change noise into silence, paradoxically. Do not misunderstand: silence does not mean no voice!

Our question is thus not whether co-governance is a myth or not. It is also definitely not a question or an issue of getting stronger to fight the administration. As I said in August, bureaucratization and rationalization are here to stay; it affects our colleagues in administration and faculty alike, though it does so in different ways. I do not wish to leave us with a deterministic scenario. While we find ourselves within larger, bigger, and stronger forces, we can shape ourselves in the process. This is what UNCA can do.

- Dr. Fernandes asked Dr. Frank what concerns and issues FWDC and IDC will consider.
- Dr. Frank gave three examples: 1) Although we knew dismissals were coming, this response is to how the dismissals came about, how people were informed; 2) The conversation we had today about the Graduate Center and the MLA was not an engaged conversation – we were talking past each other; and 3) Conversely, we had an engaged conversation today on the dance minor that was mutually received.
- Dr. Fernandes noted that the administration made a decision to abolish 29 positions; 7 had people in them. Those are “discontinuations of positions”; people were not dismissed. It is probably not possible for us to get to a co-governance model in personnel decisions. She said she was eager to work on the MLA and AGC programs and she really did not understand what the issues are. It is difficult to talk with each other when there is something unsaid. She asked for clarification.
- Dr. Kormanik said one concern is the leadership of the MLA program. He heard indirectly that the program will run itself, implying that it needs no leadership. He appreciates Dr. Fernandes saying the MLA does require good intellectual leadership appropriate for the program and that she will consult with its Advisory Council.
- Ms. Nelms said the two people who were in charge of these programs were highly respected. We can look at the programs and see that under their leadership the programs made contributions that probably helped many of us in ways we are not aware of. And now they are not there. One will not contribute to the university after this academic year. One of them hopefully will, but the contribution will not be in the same way. That is of concern. We had good leadership in these programs, we had effective leadership, and this is not assured as we move forward.
- Dr. Fernandes agreed we had outstanding leaders for both programs. She gives them every praise and accolade for their accomplishments and is very grateful to both of them. All things come to an end – people move on to other roles or new positions. We are in a position now of finding new leadership; new ways of leading the AGC and the MLA – that is an opportunity as well as a change.
- Dr. Frank encouraged more conversation, particularly in this body. We need to change the tone and engage more because everyone wants the best for UNCA.

X. Adjourn

Dr. Frank adjourned the meeting at 5:20 pm.

Respectfully submitted by: Sandra Gravely
Executive Committee