

University of North Carolina at Asheville
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Minutes, April 28, 2011 (3:15pm)

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, L. Atkinson, K. Brown, S. Capone, P. Catterfeld, J. Dunsmore, G. Heard, H. Holt, B. Hook, B. Judge, C. Galatioto, E. Katz, J. Konz, K. Krumpke, L. Langrall, M.L. Manns, P. McClellan, R. Nelson, P. Nickless, R. Pente, R. Ridenour, R. Roig, N. Ruppert, A. Shope.

I. Call to Order and Announcements

Dr. Frank called the last meeting of the 2010-11 Faculty Senate to order at 3:17 pm and welcomed senators and guests. The organization meeting of the 2011-12 Senate will convene at the conclusion of this meeting.

Dr. Frank thanked Courtney Galatioto for a marvelous job on behalf of the students and for her service. He said the Senate is proud of her and wishes her the best of luck. Senators gave a round of applause.

The Chancellor was invited to the meeting today, but she is out of town. She sends everyone her greetings.

II. Executive Committee (EC) Report

Dr. Volker Frank reported for the Executive Committee.

Report on Campus Master Plan Process

Rob Nelson reported on the campus master plan. He said it has been a pleasure to spend time on campus and see the passion, love and respect everyone has for this campus and the effort shown to students.

In talking about a long range plan for the campus (1-10 years), we know that we probably are not going to have any general funds for facilities for the short term (4-5 years). There are plans to have an additional residence hall in addition to the one about to start construction because a University goal is to have 50% of students living on campus. This will require an additional 300 beds and 3-4 years of construction. The campus spent a lot of time talking about existing facilities and other resources to see how we can make the best use of those in the 4-5 year window.

There was a steering committee and a working group. Dr. Kormanik and Dr. Eggers are faculty representatives on the working group. They met six times and talked about lessons learned from the 2005 plan and our guiding principles. We asked a variety of folks on campus to give feedback on their perceptions of existing facilities, existing use, and what could be improved. We asked them how they think students may perceive that.

Mr. Nelson talked to faculty, staff, students, alumni, and the Visitor's Experience Group. There were two focus groups of faculty over the last couple of months. The only group he has not talked to yet is the Foundation Board. He made a report to the Board of Trustees in mid-April.

The working group and the steering committee will meet together May 19 to think about recommendations on the next steps. His guess is we may delay the long term (turn-key) plan and do more work internally. He will meet with the steering committee later, and will then report to the BOT in July, when the decision will be made.

Discussion

Dr. Larson asked what, if anything, surprised or interested Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Nelson said he had heard a lot of recurring themes. It was amazing that stakeholders did not necessarily focus only on their area with their concerns. The feedback was thoughtful and well defined. They particularly noted the conditions of our existing facilities as we have not been able to keep up with renovating and updating some academic facilities. There were a lot of concerns about the approach to campus, coming off WT Weaver Blvd. Another concern was where Admissions is located and the condition of the facilities. Parking was an issue for everyone. He heard a lot about peripheral properties (the property north of us, Chestnut Ridge, where the Forestry headquarters is located, and the Rhodes property). There were comments about whether we should have more pedestrian areas. He was surprised by comments about closing off some of the area by Highsmith and the dining hall. We had some competing issues: parking was one. Do you want pedestrian areas or do you want to walk further to park? Where do we focus development and maintain the open space for buffers?

Senate Chair - Reflections of the year

Dr. Frank highlighted major documents passed and areas of major discussion for the 2010-11 Faculty Senate, and challenges/opportunities for 2011-12. He encouraged senators to review the minutes so their memories will be fresh next academic year; this is an ongoing process and there is a lot of work ahead.

Major documents passed include:

Responded to the Senate mandate regarding Student Rating of Instruction, September 2010
 Resolution of Academic Freedom, October 2010
 Resolution on Externally Generated Initiatives on Campus, October 2010
 Revised Faculty Grievance Procedures, October 2010
 Editorial Changes to Faculty Handbook Section 2 and 3

Areas of major discussions:

Electronic Rating of Instruction
 Co-Governance
 Pharmacy School

Campus wide discussion, of which Senate was/is a part:

Budget
 Institutional Effectiveness
 SACS
 Diversity Action Council
 Campus Master Plan
 Faculty Assembly

Work ahead, challenges and opportunities:

Budget
 Proliferation of Committees, reports
 Substantive Changes to Handbook
 Review of Tenure and Promotions
 New Performance Model
 Diversity Action Council
 Faculty Assembly
 Co-Governance

Dr. Frank noted the importance of the Faculty Senate to find a balance in the change that we desire and hope to accomplish. He supports debate and analysis without reinventing ourselves.

Dr. Frank proposed that the Senate: 1) slow down in conducting its business by bringing discussions taking place in APC, FWDC and IDC/UPC to this body for deliberation; 2) become more collegial and engage in how we disagree and how we agree to move forward; and 3) use the Senate as a forum of ideas rather than predominantly a body of expediting business. This is a public institution and we need to become more entrepreneurial in our ideas and have more courage in discussing our ideas under new and old business.

Report from Faculty Assembly

Dr. Pamela Nickless reported on the March 25, 2011, Faculty Assembly meeting.

The focus of the meeting was Distance Education. There were presentations from faculty who teach on line courses, distance education staff who coordinate online degrees and staff at GA who are working on system coordination. The main focus was on online degrees and online delivery of classes.

Three main topics of concern to faculty:

1. Academic Oversight of courses and programs.
2. Work-load and evaluation of teaching.
3. Student outcomes – pedagogical concerns.

The main message from the faculty presenters was that creating quality online courses is time-consuming and often expensive. Experienced faculty reported that online instruction required more individual attention for students. Most individual attention took place over the phone during office hours. Distance education staff confirmed this tendency and added that the components of the programs that consistently received the highest ratings were the face-to-face interactions. (Some campuses conduct on-site training for new distance degree seekers.)

General Administration in Distance Education

In Fall 2007 online.northcarolina.edu was launched.

Inter institutional registration Fall 2008 – this is an electronic workflow between registrars. Home campus policies require a paper trail; students must pay tuition at the visited campus. They receive about 107 requests per semester from undergraduates at one institution wanting to take a course at another institution. This has not been advertised.

Of the 100+ requests, less than half actually took a course because—in many cases – the home institution would not approve the course to fulfill degree requirements.

Exam Proctoring Network 2010

General Administration began an Exam Proctoring Network in 2010 that will be system wide where physical exams are proctored. This creates a Proctor Administrator to coordinate. ECU has oversight for the entire system.

2008 Education Act – those who get degrees must be the ones who do the work. At present, secured log-in and passcode is okay but moving fast to a more rigorous method. The accrediting agent is the regulator – SACS.

E-Mentoring: Piloting for Fall 2011

ECU is developing this for their Professional Science masters (PSM) program.

Systematic ways to recruit and mentor students – should come up with a generic system.

New Department of Education Regulations

Programs offered in other states must meet state requirements of those states. There was much concern about this.

(Office of licensure of out-of-state programs is at GA. \$5,000 application fee and annual fee for renewal. On-line degree-granting programs must have a physical presence. NC rules on standards closely follow SACS requirements. There are only 28 or 29 licensed institutions in NC.)

Report on Non-departmental Specialty Funds

Dr. Ted Meigs explained that in 2007 the Senate expressed concern about the status of non-departmental specialty funds set aside for specific purposes and passed a resolution that the Vice Chancellor for Alumni and Development report annually on the status of academically related non-departmental special funds. The University Relations Advisory Committee sought this information. Claudel McKenzie kindly asked Julie C. Heinitsh, Director of Development, to produce the information as we no longer have a VC for Alumni and Development.

Highsmith Visiting Scholar Fund 995151

Endowment value as of Feb 2011: \$76,557

Person responsible: Jane Fernandes

Amount available for fiscal year 2011: \$3,659.20

Amount spent in fiscal year 2011: -0-

Amount available for fiscal year 2012: \$3,549

Ruth and Leon Feldman Professor Fund 995144

Endowment value as of Feb 2011: \$72,593

Person responsible: Jane Fernandes

Amount available for fiscal year 2011: \$3,932.38

Amount spent in fiscal year 2011: \$2,400

Amount available for fiscal year 2012: \$3,634

Ruth Feldman Outstanding Scholar Award 995001

Endowment value as of Feb 2011 \$45,705

Person responsible: Beth Bartlett

Amount available in fiscal year 2011: \$2,338.79

Amount spent in fiscal year 2011: -0-

Amount available for fiscal year 2012: \$2,198

Ruth and Leon Feldman Endowment Fund 995105

Endowment value as of Feb 2011: \$32,844

Person responsible: Beth Bartlett

Amount available in fiscal year 2011: \$1,901.36

Amount spent in fiscal year 2011: \$1,901

Amount available for fiscal year 2012: \$1,745

This is not endowed.

UNC Asheville Foundation Adjunct Faculty Fund 994126

Person responsible: Jeffrey Konz

Fund balance: \$5,992

Please note that the Feldman Outstanding Scholar Award is typically spent at this time of the year.

Dr. Kormanik wondered if the funds that had not spent money in 2011 (such as the Highsmith Visiting Scholar Fund) had plans to spend money in the next few weeks, and if not, he wondered whether the fund would earmark extra money for spending in 2012, or use the spending money for some other purpose. Mr. Bowen asked whether the unspent money would be rolled back into the principal balance for the endowment. Dr. Meigs will look into these questions and report back to the Senate.

III. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee

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

Second Reading

The following document was considered for second reading:

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

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. However, the policy should be placed in the handbook so that all faculty members and departments who propose new degree programs or concentrations are aware of the requirement and build this step into the timeline of approval and implementation of substantive curricular proposals. Depending on the scope of the program addition and/or modification, SACS requires between 3 and 6 months notification before implementation of the program or courses.

Dr. Reynolds asked who decides whether the scope is significant or minor. Does SACS ever say no?

Provost Fernandes said we are required by SACS to have a policy. Dr. Dunsmore, Director of Institutional Assessment, said SACS has specific guidelines that she will forward to Dr. Reynolds. SACS does occasionally say no, particularly if a school does not have the resources for a program; more commonly SACS wants more information. FWDC 10 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 7311S.

Closing remarks

Dr. Ettari thanked his colleagues on FWDC for all the work they have done this year. He said it had been an honor to be associated with them and a pleasure to work with them.

Dr. Ettari said chairing FWDC this year has ingrained in him more deeply the need for faculty to take ownership of this institution. Faculty need to drive the institution's identity, direction, and approach to serving students. If we do not drive decisions, others will. Also, when faculty ask questions they are often told the "what" but they are not told the "how and why." Faculty need this information in order to alter it if they deem it necessary. Thank you for your support.

IV. Institutional Development Committee/University Planning Council Reports

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

Institutional Development Report

Highlights of the April 8, 2011 IDC meeting:

- The IDC meeting was used for review and planning. One of the ongoing activities of the committee will be to review the output of key surveys (key will be defined by recommendation from Institutional Research and/or Institutional Assessment and by circumstances at the time). In those situations where faculty should be informed or where this is shared responsibility, key information will be carried forward to the Faculty Senate. Included in the surveys to consider next year is the ILS work done by Kim Brown. ILS Program Assessment Survey will wait until there are clearer goals. The sophomore and senior surveys that are given every three years are logical candidates for review.
- The committee had agreed earlier that there should be a faculty member on the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, and the chair brought the idea before the Faculty Senate last month where there was no disagreement.

Sense of the Senate Resolution

Proposal to have faculty representation on the Institutional Effectiveness Committee

Effective date: Immediately

The Faculty Senate, using a list of candidates provided by the Faculty Welfare and Development Committee, will appoint a full-time faculty member to serve as a voting member of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee. This person will serve a two-year renewal term.

Rationale: IDC bring this forward at the request of the Director of Institutional Effectiveness. It is important to have faculty representation on the Institutional Effectiveness Committee to maintain communication and provide input.

The Sense of the Senate Resolution passed as amended without dissent and became SD7411S.

- The committee briefly discussed the Queer Conference (formerly the GLBT Conference) and the continuing campus discussion of partner benefits. Future meetings may call on Keith Bramlett or Amy Lanou for information.
- There was discussion of Senate Bill 575 and the concern that SPA staff would lose job protection should the bill pass. We all had an opportunity to meet with Mr. Fleming, the new vice president of Human Resources at General Administration. He has met with representatives of the faculty and staff to discuss what is known and not known about the effect of the potential transfer. Currently the Office of State Personnel (OSP) has responsibility for SPA employees. Under this bill, SPA employees will become part of the group that is under General Administration and will be subject to the BOG. The exact shape this will take has not been defined. Mr. Fleming was reassuring in wanting to be an employer of choice. He pointed out an advantage of being EPA is in flexibility. The personnel issue was only one part of a larger bill. Ms. Nelms asked why this was included in a bill with other issues that campuses would readily approve. Mr. Fleming said that was the work of the legislature.
- The severity of budget cuts were a continuing concern and Dr. Russell spoke for the idea that shared pay cuts to preserve campus positions should be considered as a possibility.
- UNCG has declared that the 2011-2012 year will be one of curricular flexibility while they review their current curriculum. That approach to the situation that is anticipated during the 2011-2012 school year might be of value to UNC Asheville.

Ms. Nelms thanked members Kevin Morehead, Eric Gant, Lorena Russell, Gary Nallan and Ted Meigs. She also thanked Dean Gwen Ashburn, Jessica Dunsmore and Archer Gravely.

University Planning Council (UPC)

Highlights of the April 22, 2011 UPC meeting:

- Ms. Nelms convened the final regularly scheduled UPC meeting of the year. Chancellor Ponder acknowledged the loss of our valued staff member, Jill Yarnall, whose work in public relations has been exemplary and asked for a moment of silence. In a budget update, she said budget negotiations are expected to be more positive as we move forward. It's still early in the process and based on early tax returns, the shortfall is not getting any worse. The Senate budget is expected to be ready in May and the legislative conference is expected to produce a budget that will be considered by the Governor. The university is well positioned for this year, but the cuts made so far may not be sufficient for next year. Chancellor Ponder reported that UNC Asheville's former SGA President and UPC member, Courtney Galatioto, has been named UNC Association of Student Government delegate of the year. In response to a question about the proposed 15% budget cut, Chancellor Ponder noted that we could lose as many as 13 faculty positions. She announced that the new UNC-GA VP for Human Resources, William Fleming, will visit campus to attend Chancellor Ponder's meetings with staff and faculty, where they will discuss the proposal to move responsibility for managing staff from the Office of State Personnel to UNC-GA. Mr. Fleming will answer questions from the UNC-GA perspective. She also reported that despite the negative budget situation, she was able to report to the UNC Asheville Board of Trustees many positive UNC Asheville accomplishments this year. Dr. Russell suggested that there was considerable campus support for across-the-board salary cuts in lieu of additional position cuts. Chancellor Ponder noted that the path to that option was in gaining maximum management flexibility, and this would be a good question for William Fleming next week.
- In her final meeting as UPC Vice-Chair, Ms. Nelms spoke on the need for shared responsibility for communication. She charged continuing members to make UPC as effective as possible. In reflecting on some of our accomplishments such as the Resource Allocation document and the Strategic Planning Benchmarks, she noted that our strength was in shared conversations among faculty, EPA non-faculty, staff, and students. UPC members have a responsibility to listen and carry forward information to our constituencies. She urged UPC members to contact either the chair or vice chair to add agenda items that impact the whole campus.
- Chancellor Ponder spoke about the possible need for summer meetings and noted that we might need UPC advice to help in a crisis budget situation. Any summer meetings will have at least a 48 hour advance notice and will include outgoing, continuing, and incoming members. Members were asked to monitor email during the summer.
- N.B. Some of the wording of this report is taken from the minutes of the UPC meeting: <http://www.unca.edu/node/2583>

V. Academic Policies Committee

Mr. Rob Berls reported for the Academic Policies Committee.

Second Reading

The following documents were considered for Second Reading:

[Passed APC by 3 to 1 vote]

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

Mr. Berls said APC had a split vote on this proposal so that the Senate would discuss it. He spoke on behalf of the Music department, which was unable to attend the meeting. Currently courses 111-129 (performing ensemble courses) may be repeated for credit and students may earn no more than 8 hours of credit per course. This document changes the number of hours in aggregate which may count toward graduation requirements from 8 to 20 hours.

Dr. Mills said she was concerned about the great increase in the number of graded courses from 8 to 20 hours. She noted that these courses are not S/U.

Dr. Sidelnick said the change will encourage more students to participate in ensembles during their time at UNCA. High levels of participation benefit both the students and the university. Often students do not continue in ensembles beyond the 8-hour limit because they feel it is unfair to invest time and effort into a course for which they do not receive full credit.

Mr. Berls added that this does not change the number of hours in the major and the courses have the same standard of rigor. Ms. Shope said this allows the students to receive additional credits by substituting their free elections. Ms. Nelms noted that these students could take all of their elections in their major.

Dr. Reynolds made a motion to approve APC 71. The motion was seconded by Dr. Russell. APC 71 passed and became Senate Document 7511S.

[Unanimously approved by APC]

APC 60: IST: Change requirements for International Studies Concentration
APC 60 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 7611S.

APC 61: Change description for INTS 365
APC 61 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 7711S.

APC 62: Change Requirements for the Asian Studies Minor
APC 62 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 7811S.

APC 63: Add new course, CHEM 109, The Food of Chemistry
APC 63 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 7911S.

APC 64: Delete CHEM 144, 234, 235 and 415; Adjust major requirements based on deletion of CHEM 415
APC 64 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 8011S.

APC 65: Remove MATH 365 as a required course in B.S. Concentration in Chemistry
APC 65 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 8111S.

APC 66: Remove CHEM 428 & 435 from requirements for B.S. Concentration in Biochemistry, & add CHEM 413
APC 66 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 8211S.

APC 67: Replace CHEM 435 with CHEM 437 in requirements for B.A. Concentration in Biochemistry
APC 67 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 8311S.

APC 68: Change requirements for declaring a Major in Chemistry
APC 68 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 8411S.

APC 69: Replace CHEM 234 with CHEM 231 as a requirement for the minor in Chemistry
APC 69 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 8511S.

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 70 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 8611S.

APC 72: Change course descriptions for ART 112, 212, 303
APC 72 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 8711S.

APC 73: Add new course, ART 403, Drawing IV
APC 73 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 8811S.

APC 74: Add new sculpture courses, ART 250 and ART 350
APC 74 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 8911S.

APC 75: Change descriptions for ART 240, 340, 440
APC 75 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 9011S.

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 76 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 9111S.

APC 77: Renumber PSYC 225 to PSYC 324, changing description
APC 77 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 9211S.

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 78 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 9311S.

APC 79: Delete PSYC 463 from curriculum
APC 79 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 9411S.

APC 80: Change descriptions, prerequisites, and/or semesters offered for PSYC 307, 310, 312, 332, 345
APC 80 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 9511S.

APC 81: Change Requirements for Major in Psychology
APC 81 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 9611S.

APC 82: Change Requirements for the Minor in Psychology
APC 82 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 9711S.

APC 84: Change narrative description of Psychology major
APC 84 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 9811S.

APC 85: Change description of Psychology with Teacher Licensure
APC 85 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 9911S.

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.

An editorial change was made under Anthropology with Teacher Licensure: Replace "... at least 12 of which must be in *Sociology*." With "at least 12 of which must be in *Anthropology*." APC 86 passed as amended without dissent and became Senate Document 10011S.

APC 87: Sunsetting Courses
 The following courses will be taught in the next year and were removed from the sunset list: LIT 355, LANG 465, IST 253, and IST 263. APC 87 passed as amended without dissent and became Senate Document 10111S.

APC 88: Increase credit hours available for Special Topics Courses in Language (LANG) and Literature (LIT)
APC 88 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 10211S.

APC 89: Change the Number of Topical Clusters in which ENVR 130 can be Included (Revision of SD1704S)
APC 89 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 10311S.

Mr. Berls thanked members of APC Brian Schaffer, Kitti Reynolds, Sophie Mills, Mark Sidelnick and Surain Subramaniam, Alica Shope and Sandra Gravely for their patience, and for their work in reviewing 90 proposals.

VI. Administrative Reports

Academic Affairs

Report on activity of the Position Allocation Committee (PAC)

Provost Fernandes reported in 2008 the duties of the Position Allocation Committee were restructured ([SD8508S](#)):

- To make recommendations to the Provost regarding the allocation of faculty lines to academic departments and programs according to a three-year allocation plan that the committee is to develop and continually update.
- To develop and annually revise faculty hiring guidelines.
- To consider which responsibilities originally delegated to the Council of Chairs could be profitably assumed by the Position Allocation Committee.
- To report annually to the Faculty Senate the three-year allocation plan, changes in hiring guidelines and suggestions as to how the Position Allocation Committee can be a more effective faculty voice.

The PAC has completed some of these duties but not all of them. In the past two years PAC has met to discuss faculty searches for tenure track and lecturer positions and has made recommendations about positions to be searched for, but each year since 2008 the budget environment has severely restricted the ability to predict very effectively if and when positions will be filled.

PAC has not developed a three year plan. There has been annual work: in the spring the committee reviews the department requests and prioritizes them. In the fall, depending on the budget situation for that year, we authorize positions based on the priorities and rankings. While we have never come close to filling all of the requests, we have been able to make some very good hires. This spring PAC reviewed 21 requests for tenure track positions and is in the process of ranking these requests in order of priority. Dr. Fernandes's report included searches that were successful the past two years and the lecturers that were reviewed and approved. The full report is available:

[http://www2.unca.edu/facultysenate/2010-11/04.25.2011%20FINAL%20Memo%20to%20Faculty%20Senate\[1\].pdf](http://www2.unca.edu/facultysenate/2010-11/04.25.2011%20FINAL%20Memo%20to%20Faculty%20Senate[1].pdf)

Discussion

Dr. Kormanik had questions about the procedures by which decisions are made concerning, for example, reappointment of tenure track positions. The process described in the Faculty Handbook involves the PAC, search procedures, identification of individuals in under-represented groups, and attempts to diversify. Faculty have been very involved in all of these procedures, but recently some tenure track appointments have been made which have bypassed the search process, the PAC, the identification of need, and lines. He asked Dr. Fernandes to speak to the rationale of these appointments and questioned whether this indicated a change in our process and procedures.

Dr. Fernandes asked for an example. Dr. Kormanik said he was hesitant to speak of personnel decisions. He asked whether any individuals had been appointed to tenure track lines that did not go through the search process in the past year and a half.

Dr. Fernandes said she did not believe that was the case. She asked Dr. Kormanik to talk to her after the meeting. Every position that she knows of has been the result of a search with a search committee and an interview process.

Update on focus group discussion

Dr. Mary Lynn Manns thanked senators for their input during the recent focus group discussion. She will give a full presentation at the faculty meeting on Monday. Since the last meeting our IAIR model (inquire, act, impact, reflect) has been changed to IEAR (inquire, engage, act, reflect). The goal is not only for the student to have the experience, but also to enhance students' critical thinking skills.

VII. Old Business

Dr. Meigs asked Provost Fernandes if there were any plans for the Highsmith Visiting School Fund. Dr. Fernandes said at one time Dr. Moseley was working on a plan with the Chancellor but lacked sufficient funds to do anything significant. She does not have plans for the fund now, but she is happy to know that it is available.

VIII. New Business

Dr. Frank thanked everyone on the Senate for this year's work. He thanked Sandra Gravely for her outstanding work that is a major source of trust and confidence. He thanked the Executive Committee Linda Nelms, Gary Ettari, Rob Berls and Jane Fernandes: it has been a privilege to work with you and it has been productive for us to meet and brainstorm ideas. He thanked the senators that are stepping down: Lorena Russell, Bruce Larson, Linda Nelms, and Mark Sidelnick. Senators gave a round of applause.

On behalf of the Senate, Mr. Berls thanked Volker Frank for all of his work as Senate chair. On a personal note he thanked Volker for his willingness to mentoring him as a new faculty member. Senators gave a round of applause.

IX. Adjourn

Dr. Frank said the organization meeting of the 2011-12 Faculty Senate will convene in five minutes. He adjourned the meeting at 4:55pm.

Respectfully submitted by: Sandra Gravely
Executive Committee