

University of North Carolina at Asheville
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Minutes, April 7, 2011

Senate

Members: R. Berls, G. Boudreaux, R. Bowen, G. Ettari, V. Frank, G. Kormanik, B. Larson, K. Moorhead, L. Nelms, K. Reynolds, L. Russell, B. Schaffer, M. Sidelnick, S. Subramaniam.

Excused: T. Meigs, S. Mills, G. Nallan.

Absent: E. Gant.

Visitors: G. Ashburn, S. Capone, P. Catterfeld, C. Cloninger, R. Dunning, L. Han, H. Holt, E. Katz, J. Konz, M. Koven, K. Krumpke, M.L. Manns, P. McClellan, S. Reiser, E. Tomberlin, R. Ridenour, A. Shope.

I. Call to Order and Announcements

Dr. Frank called the meeting to order 3:20pm and welcomed senators and guests. Provost Fernandes is out of town at a conference.

II. Approval of minutes

The minutes of March 17, 2011, were approved as distributed.

III. Executive Committee (EC) Report

Dr. Volker Frank reported for the Executive Committee.

Faculty meeting with President Ross

An open meeting with President Tom Ross was held on March 30. The Executive Committee requested that faculty meet alone with President Ross and the request was granted. Highlights of the meeting follow:

- The major concern raised was how the economic situation will affect higher education, the UNC system, and UNC Asheville. President Ross is keenly aware of the dire situation and he anticipates next year to be another tough year, with better times following next year.
- President Ross was asked where he sees UNC Asheville in its unique status within the system. He reassured us that he understands UNC Asheville. He wants faculty to know there is a place for a public liberal arts university.
- Regarding shared governance, President Ross promises to be open and transparent in policies.
- President Ross recommended campuses seek ways to collaborate on projects with other UNC schools.
- President Ross pointed out how much he enjoyed speaking with Dr. Meigs's students. He was impressed with our students and their explanations of what they were doing in very complicated research. In a larger context, he understands the need for having small classes or more time so that professors involved in research can have time to spend with their students on these projects.
- President Ross charged us to be advocates on our own behalf. We need to invite local legislators to campus. We need to educate the public and the legislature on what is at stake for the liberal arts and for the university. If we do not raise our voices, no one else may do it for us.
- President Ross was approachable and open to different perspectives and views. He came to listen to us. After telling us about his background and his understanding of the liberal arts and how it was important to him, he said: "What do you want to say to me?"
- When asked if we would be given more time to respond than we occasionally had with our former president, President Ross said if the legislature was involved, no; they set the timing for responses. But he tried to be sensitive to the fact that faculty input is not quickly garnered.
- It was a good meeting, but we need to have realistic expectations of what President Ross can do.

NCAA Division I Recertification

Dr. Herman Holt gave a brief presentation on the progress on the NCAA Division I Recertification for Athletics. The steering committee will submit a report to the Board of Trustees at its next meeting and will submit the report to the NCAA on April 29, 2011. This is the last chance for commentary or questions that senators may have regarding the process. Senators received a handout on steering committee membership, subcommittees, the status of the subcommittee reports, and the timeline for certification. During the self study process we found that we meet the operating principles set forth by the NCAA.

IV. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee

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

Alternate Faculty Conciliator

Dr. Pam Laughon is the faculty conciliator for 2011-12. The Senate approved a slate of full-time tenured faculty nominees for Alternate Faculty Conciliator for SGA's consideration:

Cathy Pons, George Heard, Noah Allen, Jeanne McGlenn, Greta Trautmann.

Election Results

Dr. Greg Boudreaux reported on the election process and invited faculty to give suggestions on how to make improvements. Dr. Ettari thanked everyone involved in the election process; it is very work intensive and everyone appreciates it. The election results follow:

Committee of Tenured Faculty 2011-13:

Humanities: Robert Dunning
 Natural Sciences: David Clarke
 Social Sciences: Tracy Brown

Post-Tenure Review 2011-13

Humanities: Greta Trautmann
 Social Sciences: Leah Mathews

Faculty Senate 2011-14

Brian Hook, Gregg Kormanik, Nancy Ruppert,
 Melissa Burchard, Mark Sidelnick, Rob Bowen.
 2011-12 Alternates: Megan Wolfe, Reed Roig, Leigh Atkinson

Hearings 2011-13:

Humanities: Sophie Mills
 Natural Sciences: Lorraine Walsh
 Social Sciences: Jeanne McGlenn

Grievance 2011-13:

Assistant Professor: Melodie Galloway
 Associate Professor: Kathie Garbe
 Professor: Steve Patch

Academic Appeals Board 2011-13:

Alice Weldon
 Tracy Brown
 2011-12 Alternate: Karen Cole

First Reading

The following document was distributed for first reading:

FWDC 10: Reporting Substantive Curricular Changes to SACS (Faculty Handbook 5.4.2)

This document places language in the Handbook reminding all departments and members of the faculty that substantive curricular changes must be reported to SACS prior to implementation. This document does not propose a change in policy, as substantive changes have always needed to be reported to SACS for notification and/or approval.

Second Reading

The following documents were considered for second reading:

FWDC 4: Revision to Reassigned Time for First-time MLA Teaching (Faculty Handbook 3.1.4.1.1)

FWDC 4 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 2611S.

FWDC 5: Clarification to Post-Tenure Review Procedures (Revision of SD0709F, Faculty Handbook 3.7)

FWDC 5 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 2711S.

FWDC 6: Removal of Administrative Withdrawal of Students who have not Fulfilled Prerequisites (Faculty Handbook 3.1.4.3.4) (Revision of SD0589F)

FWDC 6 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 2811S.

FWDC 7: Proposal to Establish the Key Center Advisory Committee as a Standing Committee

FWDC 7 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 2911S.

FWDC 8: Editorial Changes to Section 2 of the Faculty Handbook

Ms. Nelms asked for clarification on the use of "Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs" in FWDC 8 and in FWDC 9. Dean Konz said Dr. Fernandes' formal title is Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. An explanatory clause was added to the summary [underscored]: All references to "VCAA" or "Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs" have been changed to "Provost and VCAA" or "Provost and Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs" to reflect the formal title of the Chief Academic Officer. FWDC 8 passed as amended without dissent and became Senate Document 3011S.

FWDC 9: Editorial Changes to Section 3 of the Faculty Handbook

Two changes were made. On page 31, section 3.6.3: was edited to read: "Any costs associated with the mediation will be paid by Academic Affairs." As in FWDC 8, an explanatory clause was added in the summary to clarify Dr. Fernandes' title. FWDC 9 passed as amended without dissent and became Senate Document 3111S.

Faculty Handbook

Dr. Ettari commented on the ongoing editing of the Faculty Handbook. The Faculty Handbook informs us about issues regarding faculty and policy. It is important to state that we are the owners of this Handbook. If there are procedures or policies faculty find troubling or think should be changed, then this body is here to enact those changes. It is also important to say that much of the Faculty Handbook involves procedures that various members of the campus community are supposed to follow, and it behooves us as faculty to think about the consequences when procedure is not followed. There are certain things in play, such as the Hearings Committee and Grievance Committee, and he wanted to remind everyone that the Faculty Handbook is ours and we have the power to make the changes that we think are necessary.

Dr. Frank said the fact that the Senate may be approving the Handbook is an approval of an editorial perspective. Substantive changes may or may not be necessary as a result of deliberations from this and other bodies.

V. Institutional Development Committee/University Planning Council Reports

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

University Planning Council (UPC)

Highlights of the April 1, 2011 UPC meeting:

- Chancellor Ponder commented on President Ross's recent visit and observed that he seemed to have affection for our campus. Provost Fernandes was pleased to report that President Ross seemed to understand our mission and that our current teaching loads were unreasonable. Chancellor Ponder informed UPC of two UNC-GA legislative proposals on regulatory relief and reform that would reduce the level of bureaucracy in purchasing, construction processes, and other areas. This proposal raises the dollar amount that requires state-level approval and expedites the approval process. UNC-GA is also seeking to relieve the Office of State Personnel (OSP) of the responsibility for managing UNC staff employees. President Ross has stated that based on the experience with UNC hospitals and the community college system, staff will be better off managed by the University than OSP. UNC-GA has a new Vice President for Human Resources and he is willing to visit UNC Asheville to discuss this proposal. UNC Asheville's HR Office and CSAC will coordinate the details of the visit. On the positive side, this proposal would move more control to a campus level. On the negative side, it is not clear whether protections will be lost in that move. Independent of the GA, a bill in the NC House has been introduced that would remove the benefit of re-employment rights for state employees reduced in force. Opposition to the bill seems to be running ahead of meaningful discussion of the bill with UNC.
- Mr. Nelson gave UPC an update on the campus master planning process. He noted that the master plan is a Board of Trustee responsibility. Our last plan, now out-of-date, was completed in 2005. We are now in the conceptual phase and "doing our homework" before we bring in professional designers and architects in the next phase. The working group includes two faculty members (Dr. Kormanik and Dr. Eggers) and two students. Mr. Nelson stated that the working group has held numerous forums and focus groups with faculty, staff, students, and alumni, and that he will provide a report to the Faculty Senate in late April. The master planning process has focused on: (1) the use of existing space; (2) condition of space; and (3) need for space in the future. The working

group is also studying the use of the open tracks of land north and south of campus and parking. He noted that we will have conflicting goals. With the state revenue situation we probably won't see any new buildings soon and the only buildings on the horizon are new student residence halls. This is the time to take stock of where we are in having the right people and functions in the optimal location. Dr. Krumpke is currently doing a space utilization study for Academic Affairs. For the remainder of the meeting, Mr. Nelson invited UPC responses to the following master plan questions:

- What improvements are needed to our existing campus and our current use of space to better reflect UNC Asheville's strategic vision and to ensure a quality education for our students?
- What aspects of the UNC Asheville physical campus do you value and feel are most important preserve [this could be a building, a view, an experience, a custom, a 'look,' etc.].
- What do you believe students value most about our physical campus?
- What do you find difficult, cumbersome, confusing or unhelpful about the physical campus?
- What do you believe students find difficult, cumbersome, confusing, or unhelpful about the physical campus?
- If you could change one fundamental thing about our physical campus, what would that be? [examples: location, architecture, number/size of buildings, overall building/classroom design, transportation options and routes, the visitor experience, infrastructure issues, signage, lighting, process for allocating space, residence halls, where functions are located on campus, dining facilities, use of green space for research/informal use, social spaces/pathways, etc.].

For more information about the master planning process see: <http://www.unca.edu/about/strategic-plan/campus-master-plan>.
N.B. Some of the wording of this report is taken from the minutes of the UPC meeting: <http://www.unca.edu/node/2532>.

Institutional Development Report

Highlights of the March 24, 2011 IDC meeting:

NSSE Survey

A great deal of information comes to the campus through surveys. While faculty has access to these surveys on University websites, IDC feels that it would be helpful to hear a brief report to the senate on selected surveys.

The NSSE Survey is a nationwide survey administered to freshmen and seniors. Because of its breadth, our Institutional Research office has broken out the areas where we are perceived by our students as particularly strong or particularly weak in relation to peer institutions, aspirational institutions and respondents to the survey.

The Student/Faculty Interaction area stands out as a strength, which is entirely in keeping with our aims. An area that freshmen scored low is Enriching Educational Experience—referring to out-of-class educational opportunities. An area that seniors scored below our aspirations is Supportive Campus Environment; specifically, there were concerns in relationships with other students and administrative personnel and in receiving support for non-academic responsibilities and social development.

This survey can be seen at <http://www2.unca.edu/ir/survey/nsse/nsse2000.pdf> with significant differences both positive (green) and negative (salmon) highlighted.

Faculty on Institutional Effectiveness Committee

Dr. Jessica Dunsmore, Director of Institutional Effectiveness, requested that the committee provide feedback on having a faculty presence on the Institutional Development Committee. The IDC strongly supports this but did not have a recommendation for how that representative would be selected. Subsequent discussions lend support to the idea of the position being a Senate appointment.

Concerns for faculty appointed to administrative positions

Given the recent events in the Masters of Liberal Arts Program and the Graduate Center, IDC discussed reasonable expectations for faculty who are tapped for administrative roles on campus. These faculty include deans, department chairs, program chairs, and other administrative personnel. A document will be introduced for discussion under New Business.

GLBTQ Conference

Ms. Nelms attended a plenary session of the GLBTQ Conference and heard a presentation of Health Care Issues on behalf of the Faculty Senate. It was an interesting and informative session, but the portion she attended did not include any information on methods of extending benefits to committed partners.

VI. Academic Policies Committee

Mr. Rob Berls reported for the Academic Policies Committee.

First Reading [Unanimously approved by APC]

APC 60: IST: Change requirements for International Studies Concentration

APC 61: Change description for INTS 365

APC 62: Change Requirements for the Asian Studies Minor

- APC 63: Add new course, CHEM 109, The Food of Chemistry
- APC 64: Delete CHEM 144, 234, 235 and 415; Adjust major requirements based on deletion of CHEM 415
- APC 65: Remove MATH 365 as a required course in B.S. Concentration in Chemistry
- APC 66: Remove CHEM 428 & 435 from requirements for B.S. Concentration in Biochemistry, & add CHEM 413
- APC 67: Replace CHEM 435 with CHEM 437 in requirements for B.A. Concentration in Biochemistry
- APC 68: Change requirements for declaring a Major in Chemistry
- APC 69: Replace CHEM 234 with CHEM 231 as a requirement for the minor in Chemistry
- APC 70: List CHEM courses students may not use as upper-level electives in the B.S. Concentration in Chemistry of the Environment, and the B.A. Concentration in Chemistry
- APC 72: Change course descriptions for ART 112, 212, 303
- APC 73: Add new course, ART 403, Drawing IV
- APC 74: Add new sculpture courses, ART 250 and ART 350
- APC 75: Change descriptions for ART 240, 340, 440
- APC 76: Renumber PSYC 308 to PSYC 208, changing description;
Renumber PSYC 317 to PSYC 214, reducing credit hours and changing description;
Renumber PSYC 390 to PSYC 290, changing description
- APC 77: Renumber PSYC 225 to PSYC 324, changing description
- APC 78: Add 1-hour laboratory component to PSYC 321, 327, 333, 344, 368;
Change course numbers to 362, 329, 334, 342, 366 respectively
- APC 79: Delete PSYC 463 from curriculum
- APC 80: Change descriptions, prerequisites, and/or semesters offered for PSYC 307, 310, 312, 332, 345
- APC 81: Change Requirements for Major in Psychology
- APC 82: Change Requirements for the Minor in Psychology
- APC 84: Change narrative description of Psychology major
- APC 85: Change description of Psychology with Teacher Licensure
- APC 86: Remove Anthropology as a concentration in the major of Sociology; Add major in Anthropology;
Add major in Anthropology w/concentration in Teacher Licensure;
Update requirements for declaring a major in ANTH or SOC; Clarify the requirements for the minor in both Anthropology and Sociology when the student majors in the other area.
- APC 88: Increase credit hours available for Special Topics Courses in Language (LANG) and Literature (LIT)

APC 87: Sunsetting Courses

APC removed the following courses from the sunset list: LIT 355, LANG 465, IST 253, IST 263.

APC 89: Change the Number of Topical Clusters in which ENVR 130 can be Included (Revision of SD1704S)

APC 89 allows ENVR 130 to be in four clusters. This is the only course that has been given an exception to SD1704S which limits courses to three clusters. APC determined that ENVR 130 can handle the extra load.

[Passed APC by 3 to 1 vote]

APC 71: Removal of the 8-hour limit for repeating music ensemble courses

Second Reading: [Unanimously approved by APC]

The following documents were considered for Second Reading:

APC 19: Change the grading on EDUC 211 to Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory

APC 19 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 3211S.

APC 20: Changes to the 9-12 Social Studies Licensure Program

APC 20 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 3311S.

APC 21: Change titles and descriptions for EDUC 317, 322, 325, 340, 344, 388

APC 21 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 3411S.

APC 22: Add EDUC 215, 219, 220 and 326

APC 22 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 3511S.

APC 23: Delete EDUC 318 and EDUC 345

APC 23 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 3611S.

- APC 24: Editorial Changes to K-6 Licensure Program
APC 24 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 3711S.
- APC 25: Replace EDUC 314 with EDUC 320 for K-12 Art Licensure
APC 25 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 3811S.
- APC 26: Change required Art courses for Art with Teacher Licensure
APC 26 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 3911S.
- APC 27: Changes to Language Arts and Social Studies requirements for Middle School Licensure
APC 27 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 4011S.
- APC 28: Add ART 401, B.A. Seminar II; Change title of ART 400 to reflect addition of new course;
Add ART 401 to required courses for B.A. in Studio Art and Teacher Licensure;
Replace ART 400 with 401 as course that satisfies competency requirements for B.A. Art students
APC 28 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 4111S.
- APC 29: Reduce the number of required hours for the B.F.A. in Art
APC 29 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 4211S.
- APC 30: Change LS 479 from 3 credit hours to 4
APC 30 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 4311S.
- APC 31: Change oral and computer competencies in Art History from ARTH 480 to ARTH 484,
Senior Research Seminar I
APC 31 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 4411S.
- APC 32: Allow total of 8 units to count for Studio Art minor for the Art History concentration and adjust
required courses
APC 32 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 4511S.
- APC 33: Replace PHYS 402 with PHYS 310 in course requirement for Physics with Teacher Licensure
APC 33 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 4611S.
- APC 34: Adding concentration in Physics with Comprehensive Science Licensure
APC 34 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 4711S.
- APC 35: Add new course, ANTH 338, Anthropology of the 'New' Old Europe
APC 35 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 4811S.
- APC 37: Add new course, MMAS 144
APC 37 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 4911S.
- APC 38: Renumber MMAS 342 to 242
APC 38 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 5011S.
- APC 39: Change prerequisites for MMAS 222, 322, 450
APC 39 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 5111S.
- APC 40: Delete the Foundation, and Aesthetics and Social Awareness areas in MMAS
APC 40 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 5211S.
- APC 41: Add STAT 185 as an option for the Math requirement in MMAS
APC 41 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 5311S.
- APC 42: Remove CSCI 344 and MMAS 332 as options in the Interactive Design emphasis area in MMAS;
APC 42 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 5411S.

- APC 43: Change to Major and Minor requirements in MMAS
APC 43 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 5511S.
- APC 44: Add new course, MCOM 387, Issues in Film Study;
 Add new course, MCOM 497, Senior Seminar for Commercial Media
APC 44 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 5611S.
- APC 45: Delete MCOM 345 and replace with MCOM 346;
 Change title, credit hours and prerequisites for MCOM/LANG 367
APC 45 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 5711S.
- APC 46: Change title, credit hours, and prerequisites for MCOM 327, 329;
 Change titles, credit hours and descriptions, for MCOM 351, 353
APC 46 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 5811S.
- APC 47: Add new workshops for Commercial Media, MCOM 302 and 304
APC 47 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 5911S.
- APC 48: Delete MCOM 311; Add S/U grading and allow for repeats in MCOM 301;
 Change title and description for MCOM 313
APC 48 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 6011S.
- APC 49: Delete VMP 305; Add repeat option for VMP 303; Change title and description for VMP 307
APC 49 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 6111S.
- APC 50: Change credit hours and prerequisites for MCOM 341, 369, 421, 483, 498
APC 50 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 6211S.
- APC 51: Change credit hours and prerequisites for VMP 331, 359, 385, 437, 493
APC 51 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 6311S.
- APC 52: Change core requirements for Mass Communication Majors
APC 52 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 6411S.
- APC 53: Change Concentration Requirements for Mass Communication Major
APC 53 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 6511S.
- Minor [proposals considered minor by APC]**
- APC 54: Change Requirements for Mass Communication Minor
APC 54 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 6611S.
- APC 55: Changes in Mass Communication Program Description
APC 55 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 6711S.
- APC 56: Delete VMP 207 and 209; Add/reinstate VMP205
APC 56 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 6811S.
- APC 57: Delete MCOM 384, Contemporary Views of American Media;
 Delete VMP 333, Broadcast Workshop;
 Delete VMP 439, Media Production Techniques;
 Delete VMP 485, Advanced Screenwriting
APC 57 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 6911S.
- APC 58: Delete Concentration in Communication Research in Mass Communication
APC 58 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 7011S.

APC 59: Change requirements for declaring a major in Mass Communication
APC 59 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 7111S.

[Passed APC by 3 to 1 vote]

APC 36: Change the name of Multimedia Arts and Sciences to New Media

Mr. Berls asked colleagues from Multimedia Arts and Sciences and the Art Department to make brief comments before the Senate began its discussion of APC 36.

- Dr. Han said the Multimedia Arts and Sciences (MMAS) program was established in 1998 when it was one of the first undergraduate multimedia programs in the U.S. Over the past 12-13 years the program matured. Originally it was considered an interdisciplinary program put together by many departments on campus: Drama, MCOM, CSCI, ART, PHYS, and LIT. In the past few years they revisited their curriculum. The department has worked hard to create a top-notch program in what is a rapidly changing field. When MMAS was established Multimedia was the term used at that time. With change, New Media became the dominate, understandable term in the field. Prospective students and parents asked what MMAS is. The more current term, New Media, clarifies what is happening now.
- Dr. Dunning said the Art Department wants to clarify its concerns for the Faculty Senate. The purpose of this all along has been to work together and collaborate. The Art Department is concerned that the Multimedia definition over the years has shifted and the shift has been more toward Fine Art. The documents on the Multimedia website use art in the different tracks and concentrations. There is an overlap and a concern that there will be two separate Art departments. That is our chief concern. The Art Department teaches New Media. For the record, New Media is considered to be a genre of Fine Art – it is like a concentration with Fine Art. New Media is housed in the Art Department most of the time. We see the title New Media being confusing for both current students and in-coming students. Our most recent hire has focused on New Media in our department.

Discussion

- Dr. Kormanik noted that MMAS is a very expensive discipline and has been from the outset. Will these changes in any way jeopardize the CIP level of funding?
 - Dean Krumpe said MMAS is moving from a computer science oriented CIP code to a more art oriented CIP code, but it is staying within the same category 3 funding level – that will not hurt the resources at the university. If, however, it moved in the direction of a category 2 or a category 1 funding level it would cost the university resources.
 - Dean Ashburn urged all to think carefully before taking New Media away from being a science approach. When the program was instituted, it was categorized as computer science.
- Recent hires within the Art Department were excited about the interdisciplinary aspect of their work at the university. Mr. Tomberlin expressed concern that APC may reject his new curriculum to teach a class in Art and Technology that uses computers.
 - Dean Krumpe spoke as both a member of APC and of the natural science program area. There is plenty of precedent on this campus for departments to teach courses with similar names and similar content. It is the nature of our institution and it will occur more frequently as we continue to push the envelope of interdisciplinary collaboration and have faculty from different disciplines focusing on the same subject.

Mr. Bowen moved to approve APC 36. Dr. Russell seconded the motion. APC 36 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 7211S.

Dr. Frank said both departments expressed a concern for students. There is an opportunity right now in the design of new web pages where a department can explain itself to students. This would help students and will lay the foundation for more collaborative projects, which again would benefit our students and our faculty.

VII. Administrative Reports

Academic Affairs

QEP focus group discussion

Dr. Mary Lynn Manns led a focus group discussion on the draft Quality Enhancement Plan and senators completed a questionnaire. Highlights of discussion are as follows:

- Concern that the QEP plan will overlap with undergraduate research and the community engaged scholar.
 - There will be a collection of courses that will initially start as a global/cultural understanding cluster. Alternatively, it could be a series of 3 topics in phase I: cultural understanding; civic engagement; global understanding. In the cluster of courses the students will do the IAIR project and be assessed on critical thinking and written communication.

- Instructors will need IRB training. Will it be part of the process?
 - Faculty development training will be offered in summer 2012.
- How will this cluster of courses be worked into the curriculum in terms of the existing ILS structure and Intensives?
 - This will start with one cluster.
- How will that impact or be subsumed under the rest of the school curriculum?
 - SACS wants a general plan for the future, a small focused phase I. After phase I is implemented, it will be assessed and evaluated. The plan can then be changed if that is the best route for us.
- The Topical cluster approach will be restrictive and time intensive for students.
 - This will initially involve one cluster and one project with a small number of students. The faculty involved in the cluster will ultimately make decisions and own it.
- Concern about student enrollment. If there are three courses or more in a cluster and there is a project coming out of the cluster, there has to be more incentive for students toward graduation.
 - We are discussing with students how best to market this. The IAIR will not involve more work for students, but it is a different way to learn.
- What is the financial impact? Have you done any cost estimates in terms of faculty time and resources?
 - Because this is a SACS requirement, money has been set aside for it. We do not know how much money has been set aside. We know resources will be required for a QEP director, faculty development, incentives, e-Portfolio software and server, and marketing.
- Some IAIRs are happening naturally on campus now. What is the benefit of self-containment?
 - With self-containment, we can follow and assess these students over time. Critical thinking improvement requires more than one course.
- A problem with clusters is that students can take a course their freshman year and then take a second course in the cluster their senior year. Given that three and a half years have passed, how do students make the connections? If you want to follow these students do you envision this to be three consecutive semesters?
 - We do not know how students will actually go through the cluster. We are open to suggestions.
- What if under the Curriculum Review the clusters are removed from the graduation requirements?
 - The QEP team will monitor the Curriculum Review decisions. Phase I can occur even if the clusters disappear.
 - The cluster as a concept of organizing curricular experience for students will continue on whether it is a requirement for all UNC Asheville students or not. Even if the Curriculum Review Committee were to decide that clusters should no longer be a part of our curriculum, the concept that some students on our campus might benefit from having a more connected learning experience will remain.
- Dr. Frank said since the issue of clusters has been discussed and he is on the Curriculum Task Force, he wants to say for the record that there is a possibility that clusters may disappear. He does not want it on the record that clusters, however they are defined, will not disappear because that is not the agreement he has with Provost Fernandes. Everything is on the table. However, if this were to occur it would not jeopardize the QEP plan.

Student Government Association

President Courtney Galatioto reported that Greenfest will be this Friday and Saturday. The theme is "Get back to your Roots." SGA wants to simplify Greenfest this year and engage others on campus.

Ms. Galatioto said this will be the last time she will meet with the Faculty Senate. The President elect is Renee Bindewald. Ryan Ridenour will likely be attending these meetings next year. It has been fun working with you. The Senate gave her a round of applause.

VIII. Old Business

Curriculum Review Task Force

Dr. Larson asked for an update on the Curriculum Review Task Force. Dr. Frank said the group will meet April 22nd to finalize the committees' membership and to appoint point persons; work will occur over the summer.

Changes needed to SRI online Form

Dr. Moorhead reiterated concern expressed last fall that the online Student Rating of Instruction needs to have a feature to disable some questions on the survey. For example, questions regarding Diversity Intensive courses should only appear in courses that have a DI designation.

Dr. Larson said when the recent SRI form was approved a provision was made to reassess it next academic year. Dr. Ettari said FWDC will craft a document for the Senate's consideration before the faculty evaluations for the 2011-12 academic year. Ms. McClellan asked FWDC to review the entire document rather than make piecemeal changes.

IX. New Business

Policies and Procedures

Concerns for faculty appointed to administrative positions

Ms. Nelms introduced a document for discussion in response to recent events in the Masters of Liberal Arts Program and the Graduate Center. IDC discussed reasonable expectations for faculty who are tapped for administrative roles on campus. The document follows:

Preliminary document 1

Faculty appointed to administrative positions (including deans, department chairs, and program directors) should:

1. *Have annual reviews of their performance in their administrative role. (Department chairs could include relevant information in their Faculty Record.) Input should be sought from the constituencies they serve.*
2. *Be consulted by the relevant Dean and the Provost before significant changes are made in the description of the position, in the resources allowed to achieve its outcomes, and in the leadership.*
3. *Have access to the resources available to other faculty, including University Counsel and the Faculty Welfare and Development Committee.*
4. *Have an opportunity for promotion if their service and scholarship warrant it. (This applies to administrative positions that do not include class time for the administrator.)*

Preliminary document 2

Faculty appointed to oversight committee (such as the MLA Advisory Committee, the Undergraduate Research Advisory Committee, etc.) should:

1. *Be provided information regarding significant changes in the focus of the program, the resources allocated to the program, and the leadership of the program in time to provide advice and insight to the decision makers.*
2. *Should have an opportunity to review contract and job description changes prior to their enactment.*

Following discussion, Dr. Kormanik made a motion to refer Preliminary documents 1 and 2 to FWDC. Dr. Russell seconded the motion. Dr. Kormanik said his reason for referring these documents to FWDC is because sections will be allocated to different positions in the Faculty Handbook or other places, and this will require specific documentation, adding definitions, and a review of current policies and procedures. The motion passed.

Establishing new Executive Committee on April 28

Dr. Frank asked senators to consider the membership of the Executive Committee that will be elected April 28th.

X. Adjourn

Dr. Frank adjourned the meeting at 6:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted by: Sandra Gravely
Executive Committee