

University of North Carolina at Asheville
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Minutes, January 19, 2012

Members: R. Berls, G. Boudreaux, R. Bowen, M. Burchard, G. Ettari, V. Frank, E. Gant, B. Hook, G. Kormanik, T. Meigs, S. Mills, K. Moorhead, K. Reynolds, R. Roig, N. Ruppert, B. Sabo, B. Schaffer, S. Subramaniam; J. Fernandes, A. Ponder.

Visitors: K. Brown, S. Capone, P. Catterfeld, E. Katz, J. Konz, K. Krumpke, ML Manns, P. McClellan, P. Mitchell, R. Nelson, R. Pente, R. Poulter, R. Ridenour, A. Shope.

I. Call to Order and Announcements

Dr. Volker Frank called the meeting to order at 3:17 pm and welcomed senators and guests.

II. Approval of minutes:

The minutes of November 3, 2011, were approved as revised.

The minutes of December 8, 2011, were approved as distributed.

III. Executive Committee Report

Dr. Frank reported for the Executive Committee.

Comments from Chancellor Ponder

1. Chancellor Ponder (along with chancellors from NC State and NC A&T) had an opportunity to speak to the Board of Governors about the consequences of budget cuts and the urgent need for additional resources both from the General Assembly and from proposed and approved tuition increases. Tuition increase is our second choice. The primary way that the University of North Carolina should be funded is from the General Assembly but we need to continue to get that balance right. President Ross shaped a framework for the university's balance on access, pressure on the General Assembly, and giving campuses what we need. She asked the Board of Governors for only two things: to hear and approve President Ross' proposal, and to reject the stereotype of slacker faculty because that has nothing to do with the experience at our university.

2. Just before the holidays the chancellor became aware of the potential of Western Carolina University moving its programs from UNC Asheville and AB Tech Enka campus. She alerted the vice chair of UPC/chair of IDC, and the chair of the Faculty Senate. That intent now is to consolidate their offerings in the Asheville area and to render some operational efficiencies starting in the fall. We are entirely supportive of their plans, which include enhancing their service to the area. WCU administration has suggested that WCU wants to do this under the leadership of its new chancellor after he has done some strategic planning. She assured the Senate this has nothing to do with any dissatisfaction and complaints.

This opens opportunities for us that were not possible under our commitment to be respectful hosts of the WCU courses. The Asheville Graduate Center will be able to work quickly to enhance and expand affiliations with other campuses. We will continue to work and probably accelerate our commitment to the UNC Eshelman School of Pharmacy; continue and accelerate a discussion with UNC Chapel Hill's Medical School on an 8-year medical program that would include the four year baccalaureate at UNC Asheville and four years of medical school at UNC Chapel Hill.

There is already interest in partnering with, or getting the advice of, UNC Chapel Hill working with our Department of Health and Wellness to see if we can co-host or design a Masters in Public Health. It would be an appropriate strength to build on our sciences and Health and Wellness. Discussion that included Appalachian State University, which already offers courses on our campus, was rich and full of possibilities. NC State University is continuing to be very pleased with their work with us on climate and on engineering at the undergraduate and graduate level.

We also have had conversations with the President of AB Tech, and their Vice President and our Provost will meet this semester to see if there might be additional ways to eliminate barriers to progress for excellent students who complete AB Tech and move into the four year program at UNC Asheville. One exploratory conversation would be to see if AB Tech arts and sciences might offer some of their evening courses in the space being vacated by WCU to facilitate the move of AB Tech's great students into our own curriculum.

Chancellor Ponder invited faculty's seriously creative responses to this opportunity as we as a university think about how we serve and who we are. There may be other graduate programs that we would offer or partner with in their programs or certificates.

Probably the most worrisome element for us is that since we agreed to host WCU's programs many years ago, and reaffirmed it in 2005 when Chancellor Mullen and President Broad were with us, there has been a consistent revenue stream from WCU courses and attendance here. The combination of the lease payment and student fees has helped us offer and deliver the rest of our program and that revenue will disappear abruptly and take years to replace. President Ross is working with us to make sure there is an appropriate transitional approach to that funding.

Summary of Discussion

- All of WCU's courses will move off of our campus. The nursing program at the AB Tech Enka campus will also move and the Enka campus will also lose some revenue, but they have need for that facility.
- In the current year, the combination of lease payments and students fees is about \$535,000 per year. That does not include parking fees or the revenue to our dining venues. We estimate less than \$600,000.
- Conversations with UNC Chapel Hill's Medical School on an 8-year medical program have not progressed beyond what has been reported at IDC and the Senate. The Chancellor said there will be a mutually beneficial acceleration of that conversation to see if there is something good to be doing together. This will give us an opportunity to continue more affiliations with UNC Chapel Hill and NC State.
- The possibility of offering an MA in Public Health through our Health and Wellness Department is in the information gathering stage and has received enthusiastic encouragement. The Dean of the Medical School at Chapel Hill has talked with Dean Keith Krumpe and with some of our local medical school pilot partners. Dean Krumpe said the Health and Wellness program was asked about their interest in this and we are scheduling a meeting with our health-oriented partners in the School of Medicine, MAHEC and the UNC Eshelman School of Pharmacy to ask what they would like to see. Chancellor Ponder said she brings these suggestions at a very preliminary stage and encourages faculty to think about how we can proceed wisely with the opportunities before us.
- Dean Ed Katz and Gerard Voos, director of the Asheville Graduate Center, would be eager to engage in a conversation with departments about a master's degree program or certificate. Most of the capacity in terms of space is in the evening and shared space. This gives us a prompt, an invitation to consider this.

3. Chancellor Ponder said that Big South's policies state that the top seed and the highest remaining seed get to host the championship game in the men's basketball tournament. Our conference has been difficult to work with on this issue and there has been considerable public criticism of our athletic director and of our chancellor. If our men earn the opportunity to host, we have formally appealed the decision to the President of the conference and the CEO of Big South. We await the decision which along with any progress will be on the campus web site.

Summary of discussion

- We are reimbursed for leasing the Kimmel Arena for the tournament.
- Dr. Reynolds said on behalf of our faculty that the Chancellor has our support and is doing a great job.

Campus Master Planning Process

Rob Nelson reported on the campus master planning process. The Chancellor set up two committees, the steering committee and the working group. Gregg Kormanik and Dee Eggers serve on the working group.

Interviews and public meetings were held last spring with all of the identified stakeholders: faculty, Institutional Development Committee, staff, students, Asheville Alumni Council, Visitor's Experience Group, and Parents Council. From this input we developed guiding principles for the master planning process. We are working internally with our own resources before we hire professional design firms and other consultants.

The guiding principles are reflective of what this campus is. Mr. Nelson has been coming here and working with us since the 1980's. His son graduated from UNC Asheville last year. But he feels that for the first time we are putting a lot of these principles (values) into place that should guide decisions made when allocating funds for infrastructure, repairs, and new construction.

First, anything that we do should reflect our mission as a public liberal arts institution. Second, it should enable undergraduate research. Third, the experience on campus should be to have interdisciplinary interaction and to have buildings with multiple functions where students are interacting with faculty across the various disciplines. Other guiding principles are economic, social and environmental sustainability.

The plan for this summer was to do a RP and bring in a design firm and other consultants to start producing this plan, but we decided it was not the right time due to money constraints. One thing to consider when we think about facilities and infrastructure is growth. Do we have enough space? Do we have the services needed in housing, dining and recreation? We have deficits in student recreation. But we are building a new residence hall, and dining is passing. We know we are not in a crisis on new growth and we do not have a new academic program that needs space. We know our next general fund project will be Carmichael Hall, probably followed by a residence hall.

Discussion

- Dr. Sabo noted the considerable funds spent on the last master plan and asked if Mr. Nelson was trying to integrate this plan with the last plan.
 - Mr. Nelson said he has tried to take a different approach where we do a lot of the work internally. Ten years ago the plan did not accurately reflect where the institution was or where it was going which has become clearer in recent years. That previous plan will be the basis of some of the infrastructure work and construction that would carry over and save money. If you recall that was during the bond referendum; everyone thought there would be two phases and the plan was focused on growth and new buildings. It is much more important today to think about what our values are, how we use existing space, and how to make the campus functionally compatible. For example, is Admissions in the right place?
- Dr. Hook asked how much is the budget for this plan?
 - Mr. Nelson said depending on how many parts we buy it could be \$300,000. That is one reason we deferred going forward. We can do this in phases from the inside-out rather than the former outside-in plan.
- Dr. Burchard asked what guiding principles are being used to guide these decisions, and who is the author of those principles.
 - Mr. Nelson said the working group was the principle author. The guidelines went through the steering committee and twice through the Board of Trustees. The mission statement and the strategic plan approved a couple of years ago are evident in the guidelines.
- Dr. Sabo said he would like assurance these are the standards by which we make judgments. Guiding principles should be used to make decisions, but he worried about arbitrary deviations from them because it is convenient or less expensive. He would like to have them on a formal record so we can refer to them as we evaluate decisions.
- Dr. Frank asked if a decision had been made about moving the Alumni Office to the MAHEC building.
 - Mr. Nelson said he did not know – space allocation is someone else’s decision.
 - Dr. Gant said this was brought up at UPC and someone was going to contact Dr. Frank. Dr. Frank said he has not been contacted.

The guiding principles, approved by the Board of Trustees on 09/30/11, are on the web site:

http://www.unca.edu/sites/default/files/Campus_Master_Plan/11-2011_CMP_Guiding_Principles_Approved_Version.pdf .

Alternate to replace Gary Nallan

Dr. Frank reported that Gary Nallan sent the Executive Committee a request to resign from the Faculty Senate effectively immediately. The EC supports his request but regrets his decision. Dr. Nallan served on the Faculty Senate from 2004-2007. In 2005-2006 he chaired APC, and in 2006-2007 he chaired the Faculty Senate. Dr. Nallan was elected to the Senate again in 2010 and has served since that time. Two alternates were unable to serve and Bill Sabo is the next alternate. Dr. Frank welcomed him as a new colleague on the Senate.

IV. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee Report

Mr. Rob Bowen reported for the Faculty Welfare and Development Committee.

FWDC has begun the process of reviewing the Tenure and Rewards System working with the Provost’s cabinet.

Faculty elections begin soon and we need to encourage faculty to become involved and active in the Senate. The Senate is composed primarily of males; it would be nice if we had more representation across different backgrounds.

First Reading [Unanimously Approved]

FWDC 7: Proposal to establish the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) as a Standing Committee
(Faculty Handbook Section 10.3)

Second Reading:

The following documents were considered for second reading:

FWDC 2: Merit Categories for Annual Evaluation of Faculty (Faculty Handbook 3.4.3)

FWDC 3: Annual Evaluation of Chairs and Program Directors (Faculty Handbook Sections 3.4.4; 3.3.4.; 3.3.5)
(Revision of [SD5507S](#), [SD07706F](#); Faculty Handbook [10.4.4](#))

FWDC 2 and FWDC 3 were initially held up in the Executive Committee because of work being done by the Review of Tenure and Rewards System group that will affect FWDC 2. There will absolutely be changes. For instance, engaged scholarship will change how we evaluate faculty. The consensus of FWDC was that a lot of work went into this document and FWDC 2 will provide a more concrete idea of faculty evaluation. The document is accompanied by an example of the new evaluation form that will not be in the Handbook but it is available for you to peruse.

FWDC 3 addresses annual evaluation of chairs and program directors. Currently there is no annual review of their work until it becomes time for their reappointment. This is a top down review however.

Discussion of FWDC 2 and FWDC 3

Several senators commented on the evaluation forms the administration developed to implement FWDC 2 and FWDC 3. The evaluation forms do not fall under the Faculty Senate's purview. Mr. Bowen noted that the forms were presented to chairs and all faculty for commentary last semester. They are included today as supportive material for the FWDC documents and in the spirit of transparency.

Dr. Moorhead spoke on Irene Rossell's behalf. Dr. Rossell had concern over the new merit evaluation categories because: (1) renaming the categories did not make distinctions between the categories clear, and (2) the categories served to label the person being evaluated rather than the person's performance. She thought we should be focusing on the quality and the nature of our work, and suggested rather than having categories that we redefine the existing categories better.

Dr. Subramaniam said, speaking on behalf of our colleagues working in university programs, he appreciates the fact that we will have a more deliberate attempt to formally recognize the administrative aspects of what our faculty colleagues are doing. He believed a more reasonable way of evaluating a program director would be to have two different deans evaluating the work and the Provost responsible for the final grading. Otherwise it puts the onus on a program director to have to make the case as an appeal.

Dean Jeff Konz recommended that Senators send suggested changes to the evaluation forms to Mr. Bowen and the administration would consider them. Mr. Berls said a week before the next Senate meeting, the chair of FWDC can send the comments to senators for review, and amendments may be made on the Senate floor. Dr. Kormanik commented that at one time the Senate had a parliamentarian – we need one so we can do this in an official way.

Dr. Kormanik moved to send FWDC 2 and FWDC 3 back to FWDC for amendments and to return for second reading at the February 9th meeting. Mr. Berls seconded the motion.

Dr. Moorhead said he knew a lot of work had gone into FWDC 2, but it is strange given the potential change to a document that is currently under review. Dr. Reed said the EC suggested that we hold these. FWDC's consensus was that these were positive changes: reorganizing the categories and specifically emphasizing teaching and building more consistency across campus in how those categories were applied. It made sense to do that now rather than wait until later. FWDC did not know how long the process would take that is under revision.

Dr. Meigs asked what the rationale was to change from three categories to four. Mr. Bowen said he would have to ask the administration about this change. Dean Konz said the chairs in particular wanted to have a broader set of choices. Essentially the chairs are choosing between merit and high-merit. Very few people not doing their jobs are recommended for no merit.

Dr. Meigs asked what percentage across campus received high merit. Dean Konz said there are differences across program areas. There was a time when we had quotas in place but that is no longer the case. He will look up the information Dr. Meigs requested.

The motion passed unanimously.

FWDC 4: Supplemental Pay Policy (Faculty Handbook Section 2.9.4)

In 2005, the Board of Governors mandated that every campus must have a supplemental pay policy (UNC Policy Manual 300.2.13) which has the following elements: Description of the types of assignments which warrant supplemental pay; Procedures for requesting overload pay; Limits on overloads or on the amount of pay, if in place; and Limits on length of assignments warranting supplemental pay. This document defines categories of activity for which faculty may receive supplemental pay beyond their base salary. FWDC 4 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 1212S.

FWDC 5: Proposal to Eliminate the Library, Information Resources & Technology Committee

When the Library, Information Resources & Technology Committee was formed Jim Kuhlman was in charge of the Information Technology Services (ITS) resources as well as the library. ITS had been a separate committee before being rolled into the Library Committee. That committee has not met since last December. FWDC 5 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 1312S.

FWDC 6: Proposal to establish the Library and Instructional Technology Committee as a Standing Committee (Faculty Handbook 10.4.4)

FWDC 6 calls for the re-creation of a committee composed of faculty and students to advise in the areas of information content, accessibility, services, and instructional technology. FWDC plans to submit a proposal to again establish an ITS Committee but will defer this work until they can seek advice from the new Director of ITS.

In a friendly amendment to correct an omission in the proposal, the following was added under Duties: "The University Library Committee advises the University Librarian, the Provost & Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Faculty Senate on broad policies relating to the libraries and library services. Such advice may include but should not

be limited to budget, collections, services, facilities, as well as the use and needs of instructional technology both in the classroom and as remotely accessed.” FWDC 6 passed as amended without dissent and became Senate Document 1112S.

Nominee to ILS-Writing Committee

FWDC postponed its recommendation for nominee to ILS-Writing Committee until the February meeting.

V. Institutional Development Committee / University Planning Council Reports

Dr. Kevin Moorhead reported for Institutional Development Committee and University Planning Council.

Report on University Planning Council meeting – December 9, 2011

1. Chancellor Update

The Chancellor provided an update on the latest Board of Trustees’s meeting. Cissie Stevens, the new Chair of the Board of Trustees, has obtained unanimous support from Trustees to contribute \$25K annually for scholarships. The Board authorized the new astronomy lab and observatory for Chestnut Ridge. We have signed a lease agreement for the MAHEC property as a back up to full purchase in about a year. The Board also approved the campus Tuition and Fee recommendations for next year. The Board announced a gift of \$25K per year by Carey and Charlie Owen to establish the Anne Ponder Scholarship Fund.

UPC discussed the transportation options for students needing counseling or health services after these services move to the MAHEC property. A specific model for transportation services will be worked out.

2. SACS off-site team review update

Bruce Larson and Jessica Dunsmore provided information about the SACS Off-Site Team report. UNC Asheville was found to be non-compliant in seven areas. Five of the seven areas are either minor, deal with on-line learning, or have already been resolved. UNC Asheville will also have to respond to recent changes made to existing SACS standards including four new federal standards. A report is due in February to address the issues.

3. Proposed change in Undergraduate Education benchmark

UPC approved the Provost’s proposal to replace the current strategic plan benchmark on undergraduate education, currently using the NSSE survey self-reported data on student satisfaction, with results of the Collegiate Level Assessment (CLA) test. The CLA test is administered every four years and compares an objective measure of value-added student learning for 1,200 colleges and universities. The target is to exceed the expected level of performance based on SAT scores.

4. Proposed change in economic sustainability benchmark

UPC discussed a proposed new benchmark on economic sustainability based on the percentage of total university funding by state funds. UPC decided to modify the benchmark to use actual state appropriations as a benchmark for economic sustainability, with a target of increasing funding each year.

N.B. Part of this report is from the UPC meeting: <http://www.unca.edu/node/3296>

Report on Institutional Development Committee meeting – January 12, 2012

Members: Kevin Moorhead, Gregg Kormanik, Ted Meigs, Eric Gant, Melissa Burchard.

Guests: Jessica Dunsmore, Gwen Ashburn, Archer Gravely.

1. Sophomore Survey

IDC members continued with a review of the 2010 Sophomore Survey. Three areas were covered: the library, IT services, and the dining hall. Students are not satisfied with the library hours of operation and want longer hours. IDC is concerned about the reduction in library resources, including a loss of positions, and how resource reductions may be contributing to related student concerns. Jessica Dunsmore described how administrative units such as the library are responding to notable issues through Trac Dat. The library is developing surveys to solicit student input on how to improve conditions.

Several issues were noted for information technology as well. Students are dissatisfied with hours of operation of university computer labs and availability of equipment and software to meet their needs. The most notable issue is the availability of wireless access on campus. We recommend that an annual update on wireless access be provided to UPC.

UNC Asheville is below system averages for dining hall services. A potential problem is the lack of food options on campus for using one card. Other universities have more on-campus and off-campus options for using a one card system. The dining hall is also developing a survey instrument as part of Trac Dac to solicit student feedback on how to improve conditions.

IDC also discussed in general terms the limitations of this type of survey and how to respond to student concerns.

2. Update on the MLA and Asheville Graduate Center

Dean Ed Katz provided an update on the MLA program. Dr. Katz is the acting director for MLA and he is planning to staff the program with an associate director with reduced responsibilities (relative to past MLA directors).

Dr. Burchard suggested that the extra workload for Dr. Katz was probably not good for him or the institution, but Dr. Katz acknowledged that alternatives are limited with our current resource base. Students that enroll in courses in the MLA generate additional state appropriations that are placed in the general fund. The MLA program has strong enrollment and is evolving as a program. In the past couple of years new classes with higher enrollment have been added, fewer seminars and tutorials are offered, cross-listed undergraduate/graduate courses are no longer offered, and efforts are in place to reduce the flux of students coming and leaving the program. Future directions of the program include strengthening the program to make it more sustainable, explicitly stating qualifications for enrolling (such as a minimum GPA) and more explicit deadlines, and considering options to the capstone project.

Dr. Katz is committed to recruiting and developing linkages to mid-level faculty to improve the sustainability of – and leadership for the program. To do so, money will be available from the MLA operating budget and Asheville Graduate Center revenues for departments to hire adjuncts to replace faculty willing to teach in the MLA program. The state appropriations for funding graduate education makes the MLA program very favorable for UNC Asheville. The possibility exists to expand the MLA program by developing other focus areas for the degree. A simple way to do so is to offer a certificate comprised of fewer courses (model of four) to initiate a potential degree program and to gauge the interest for such programs. The approval process for certificates or programs is not difficult, requiring an approval by General Administration and SACS notification. Dr. Katz reiterated the need to recruit new faculty to participate in the program and for new graduate council members. Dr. Katz suggested the possibility of providing summer development money for faculty to develop new certificates of graduate education.

Dr. Gerard Voos provided an update on the Asheville Graduate Center. Several changes have taken place over the past year including the transfer of certain programs (i.e. the correctional program) to other administrative units. Several programs within the Asheville Graduate Center (AGC) are growing and generating funding for the university. Notable programs are the Great Smokies Writing Program, substitute teacher training, test preparation, a new AP institute, and a summer writing institute. Writing programs, in particular, are very popular.

IDC discussed the possibility of developing a graduate certificate in writing to gauge the interest in developing a MFA program in writing. Lenoir Rhyne is planning to offer a MA program in writing in Asheville. Net revenues for all programs of the AGC last year were \$850,000. A large portion of that revenue goes into the general fund. The AGC also generates funding through the guest university programs. WCU and ASU have several graduate degree options at UNC Asheville.

IDC discussed the resource implications of losing the WCU programs if WCU decides to move to another location. The WCU graduate programs are a significant portion of the overall generated funding through the AGC. There is not enough information to determine the ultimate outcome of the potential change.

3. Health Adventure Property

To be on record, IDC wants to be involved in the planning process of how the health adventure property will be used. IDC also recommends that the neighborhood around the property have an opportunity to participate during the planning process.

Discussion

Dr. Ettari said the potentialities regarding graduate programs made him nervous because he believes we should not be in the business of graduate education. He asked if there was any cohesive response from IDC after receiving this information.

Dr. Moorhead said there will be follow up discussion, particularly in light of the comments Chancellor Ponder made today.

Dr. Meigs said in the Sophomore Survey there were several entities on campus where students had expressed dissatisfaction. He pointed out that the students' opinions of the helpfulness of staff in those entities were not a problem compared to the UNCA average.

Dr. Ettari asked if there had been any discussion about either improving the dining services – or alternatively – bringing in businesses from off campus as other schools are doing (Taco Bell, Pizza Hut).

Dr. Moorhead said there might be better success given our limitations on campus to collaborate with neighborhood entities to use our One Card.

Dr. Frank expressed concern over Dr. Katz's plan to use money from the MLA operating budget and Asheville Graduate Center revenues for departments to hire adjuncts to replace faculty willing to teach in the MLA program. Dr. Frank said this could be the beginning of us reinventing ourselves. We just heard the Chancellor tell us that we are interested in establishing other graduate programs. We are going through the curriculum revision, talking about sustainability and in the long term not being able to have adjuncts. Now there is a possibility that we are bringing adjuncts back through the back door. What will that do to other graduate programs that we are currently thinking about? It was his understanding that adjuncts are going to be gone for quite a while. Now are we bringing them back just for the MLA? It could be the beginning of a reinvention of UNCA and he was not sure that would be the right thing.

Dr. Katz explained that General Administration does not give seed money for new positions for new programs. To get new programs we have to generate SCH that can bring in faculty lines. To do that, we need to generate more activity, more options and opportunities in the MLA. We can spend the operation budget on programming but that will not generate SCH. To attract the mid-hire and junior faculty into MLA because that is the future of the program, he needs to be able to assist departments in their offering of the undergraduate curriculum. It is a choice that one has to make if we want to generate the SCH that will result in positions. That is how the other schools do it – they hire adjuncts or lecturers to replace faculty when they are beginning to develop a new program.

Dr. Frank said that is cheating. Dr. Katz's exception makes perfect sense perhaps at one level – but it circumvents and cheats sustainability. He encouraged the administration to think about sustainability and how we can create that if indeed we should move away from adjuncts.

Dr. Katz disagreed. We have fewer adjuncts but we have not eliminated them. We make choices based on our goals. His goal for MLA program is for it to grow and generate more and new courses with more and newer faculty who have not yet had an opportunity to teach in the program. Faculty that we bring in, just like the faculty at other institutions, teach both graduate and undergraduate courses. The graduate SCH generates faculty lines at a higher rate with fewer SCH. We have been making choices that hamstring our ability to offer what we do in the undergraduate program as well as the graduate program. We should make choices that are advantageous rather than disadvantageous to the university.

Dr. Sabo agreed with Dr. Katz – this is a question of choices. The choices have to be clarified: what are the options, what are the costs, what are the benefits. They need to be clear in a way that senators can assess them and weigh them. It might be wise to structure a discussion in the future by setting up some parameters through IDC. There is a Senate document that could be used to construct that discussion.

Provost Fernandes said whatever we do, we have to have sustainability in mind because we do not know when we will recover from the current circumstances. The MLA does not have enough faculty of its own, so how do you propose that MLA be sustainable?

Dr. Frank said this is a perfect example of the challenge of sustainability in what we do as an institution with limited resources. It relates to the question: To what degree and how does MLA relate to us as an institution? The challenge is to come up with a sustainable solution that may not refer back to adjuncts because we have said that adjuncts have a unique place. These are different times and we better be aware of the different logic that we apply to decisions today and tomorrow so that it is consistent and thus also has a better chance of representing sustainability.

Dr. Ettari said there is an association between a graduate program and the money it generates. Is it possible to see the breakdown of where the money goes?

Dr. Katz said it goes into the general fund that we use all over campus. We do not track individual departments. However one can see very clearly from Institutional Research the categories of different departments and programs we have including masters, and the appropriations they bring in per SCH and how the different categories fund faculty lines at different rates of student contact hours.

Mr. Berls said he will make the document that Peg Downes brought to the Senate (as MLA Director) available.

Dr. Burchard said if we are going to have a discussion about the possibility of developing graduate programs or certificates then the entire faculty need to be aware of that. IDC can frame a discussion with guiding principles to make it productive. Dr. Hook spoke in favor of this approach.

VI. Academic Policies Committee Reports

Mr. Rob Berls reported for the Academic Policies Committee.

First Reading [Unanimously approved by APC]

APC 17: Add new course, POLS 337, ReStorying Community

APC 18: Change course description for MATH 366

APC 19: Delete MATH 341, renumbering it to MATH 441; Delete CSCI 381, renumbering it to CSCI 441

APC 20: Delete MATH 352, renumbering it to MATH 452

APC 21: Changes to Concentration in Applied Mathematics

APC 22: Add CSCI 182 as an option for the Computer Science Requirement in the Math major

APC 23: Changes to Mathematics Minor

APC 24: Change Criteria for Awarding Latin Honors

APC 25: Reduce the credit hours for ATMS 205, Weather Analysis

APC 26: Change course description and prerequisites for ATMS 405, Meteorological Statistics

APC 27: Change requirements for the Concentration in Weather Forecasting in ATMS

APC 28: Change requirements for the Concentration in Climatology in Atmospheric Sciences

APC 29: Change course descriptions RELS 215 & 420; Change title & description for RELS 387

- APC 30: Change course description and credit hours for RELS 313;
Change course title, description, and credit hours for RELS 330
- APC 31: Add new courses, RELS 389 and 398
- APC 32: Change course description for RELS 490
- APC 33: Change the requirements for the major in Religious Studies
- APC 34: Change the requirements for the minor in Religious Studies

Mr. Berls said APC 24 is in conjunction with a lot of commentary coming to us from transfer students and nontraditional students. This document makes Latin honors more equitable.

Second Reading [Unanimously approved by APC]

The following documents were considered for second reading:

APC 7: Add Academic Credit for History International Baccalaureate Exam.
APC 7 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 1412S.

APC 8: Add new course, HIST 309, History of the Old South;
Add new course, HIST 391, The History of the Atlantic World, 1492-1820.
APC 8 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 1512S.

APC 9: Add HIST 309 and 391 to list of elective options for Africana Studies minor.
APC 9 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 1612S.

APC 10: Restore HIST 349 to the catalog.
APC 10 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 1712S.

APC 11: Require Instructor's Permission to Register for HIST 250, The Historian's Craft.
APC 11 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 1812S.

APC 12: Delete ENVR /ATMS 331, Principles of Air Pollution;
Replace ENVR 331 with ENVR 381 in the elective options in the Earth Science concentration.
APC 12 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 1912S.

APC 13: Add new course, ENVR 312, Effects of Air Pollution on Ecosystems listing it as an option
for Ecology Concentration students.
APC 13 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 2012S.

APC 14: Add new courses, ENVR 311, 410, 411;
Add Mineral Processing as an option for students in the Earth Science Concentration in ENVR.
APC 14 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 2112S.

APC 16: Add concentration in K-12 Health and Physical Education to the HWP major;
Add K-12 Health and Physical Education to licensure areas.
APC 16 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 2212S.

APC 15: Academic Calendars: 2013-14, 2014-2015.

Mr. Berls summarized the calendars. We will have an instructional day on Labor Day. Classes will end before Thanksgiving; the Undergraduate Research Symposium will be held the Monday after break; Tuesday will be a Reading Day, and final exams begin on Wednesday. This is in response to getting in the grades at the very end and pushing the semester all the way up until the week before the holiday weekend. APC 15 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 2312S.

Congratulations

Mr. Berls congratulated Alicia Shope on receiving the Distinguished Staff award for professional staff. He thanked her for being an invaluable ex officio member of APC. The senators gave her a standing ovation.

**VII. Administrative Reports
Academic Affairs**

Chief Information Officer

Provost Fernandes said Jeff Brown will become our Chief Information Officer effective February 15. He was the best candidate who emerged out of a pool of about 50 candidates for this position. Please congratulate him and work well with him. She is looking forward to continuing the hard work that ITS staff do.

Plan for Head University Librarian

Ms. Virginia Moreland will serve, on an interim basis, as UNC Asheville's Head University Librarian effective February 1, 2012 through May 31, 2012. As the former director of the library at Lenoir-Rhyne University, and the former director of the McCain Library at Agnes Scott College, "Ginny" has a great deal of experience that she can lend us as we begin the process of searching for a new Head Librarian.

We will conduct a national search for the new Head Librarian and Dean Jeff Konz will organize the search and conduct the interview process on Provost Fernandes' behalf. The Faculty Senate has been asked to nominate faculty senators to be part of the process. She hopes to have someone on campus before the start of fall semester, perhaps by July 1. Dean Konz will search information on the process and how we may all participate.

QEP update

Dr. Mary Lynn Manns reported that we now have a plan in place with many exciting opportunities for faculty. SACS has given us a gift. SACS says allow the faculty to choose a topic that will improve student learning on their campus and give the faculty the money to make it happen. We know how the plan will affect students – it will improve their critical thinking skills, but how will it affect faculty:

- Participation is optional.
- There are stipends, grant funds, travel money and other resources for faculty who wish to participate.
- No one is going to tell faculty how to teach. Professional development will be primarily in the form of interdisciplinary learning communities in which faculty will dialogue with each other to develop strategies for improving students' critical thinking skills. We will be learning from each other. Eventually, we want to document our successful practices so we can share our successful critical thinking pedagogy with each other.

Student Government

Highlights of Ryan Ridenour's report from the Student Government Association (SGA):

SGA in collaboration with other student government associations in the UNC system is launching a risk management program in the new few weeks. It is a series of on-line lectures and workshops from Student Affairs division, Residence Life and Student Government aimed at risk management issues we should be aware of to better help the campus community. Examples include social health and time management.

VIII. Old Business

There was no Old Business.

IX. New Business

Dr. Frank encouraged everyone to participate in the upcoming elections. He will speak to the chairs and program directors about elections because they can talk to their faculty about weighing the pros and cons of serving not only on the Faculty Senate but also in other committees. He will encourage chairs to come up with ways to help the entire institution to not only improve participation but also greater representation. We do not want to ignore the issue of diversity – we want to have constructive engagement on that issue.

X. Adjourn

Dr. Frank adjourned the meeting at 5:58pm.

Respectfully submitted by: Sandra Gravely
Executive Committee