

University of North Carolina at Asheville
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Minutes, February 9, 2012

Members: R. Berls, R. Bowen, 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.

Excused: G. Boudreaux, M. Burchard, G. Ettari.

Visitors: G. Ashburn, K. Bramlett, E. Katz, J. Konz, K. Krumpe, L. Langrall, B. Larson, P. McClellan, D. Miles, D. Miller, R. Payne, R. Pente, R. Ridenour, A. Shope.

I. Call to Order and Announcements

Dr. Volker Frank called the meeting to order at 3:18 pm and welcomed senators and guests.

II. Executive Committee Report

Dr. Frank reported for the Executive Committee.

Diversity Action Council

Mr. Keith Bramlett and Ms. Deborah Miles reported on four areas of priority for the Diversity Action Council (DAC) in response to a 2010 climate survey of faculty, students and staff.

Equitable Benefits for All Employees

Keith Bramlett gave an overview of investigation of same sex domestic partner benefits options. Beginning in fall 2010, the Diversity Action Council directed committee members to problem solve a way to offer same sex domestic partner benefits to UNC Asheville employees. At various stages of the process the following individuals were involved: Keith Bramlett, Savannah Siethal, Jewell Gist, Karla Picarillo, Chris Dahlquist, and Deborah Miles. Along the way it was learned:

- The State of NC is a self funded system administered (not funded) by Blue Cross/Blue Shield.
- The State Legislature decides who are the family members of state employees and are therefore eligible for health benefits. Currently, only legally married couples within the State of NC are eligible for coverage (State Statute chapter 51). Same sex partners are not legally able to marry hence are not eligible as family members for coverage (though children of a state employee are eligible).
- One problem solving method suggested would enable the UNC System to create a self funded system but was ruled unallowable in an opinion rendered by the Office of the State Attorney General in March, 2002. This ruling states that 1) this would be a form of competition with the state plan and is therefore unallowable 2) that UNC employees are some of the healthier employees. Removing them from the system would increase the health care costs of other employees which would increase the state costs and was therefore unallowable.
- Committee members met in video conference with Brian Usichon with the UNC General Administration to determine what issues could be taken up by GA rather than addressed by UNC Asheville alone. This UNC collaboration would give us more "buying power" than by trying to address this issue as a single small institution. Brian Usichon also sent us all rulings related to this issue including several comparison charts conducted by Faculty Welfare committees in 2007 and 2008.
- Committee members met with Dr. Shane Snowdon from University of California at Berkeley when she was on campus for the Queer Conference in March. Dr. Snowdon advised us to contact Lambda Legal, a national organization working for the equal rights of the GLBTQI community. Dr. Snowdon shared the strategies of the University of California system (which is a self funded system and not connecting to the state system). Dr. Snowdon also suggested creating a statement that would be a visible footprint of the history of this issue in the UNC System, to inform new employees of the efforts made to have this amended, and to express regret that we are unable to offer an equitable benefit.

- Lambda Legal researched the issue and recommended lobbying state legislators for changes in the wording of the statues along with focusing on what could be offered internally (life insurance options, one cards, etc.)
- Committee members called other campuses to investigate strategies other campuses were taking to provide equitable services to all domestic partners.
- The University Senior Leadership, Faculty Senate, Human Resources, and Student Senate were engaged to list this concern as a high priority in conversations with the state legislature and General Administration.

Improving the Experience of Transfer Students

Keith Bramlett reported on the following transfer student initiatives:

- **Transition Advising:** Recognizing the uniqueness of every Transfer student's prior educational experience, OneStop invites all transfer and 2nd degree students to sign up for individual advising appointments with trained OneStop advisors prior to the start of the semester. Appointments begin in November for spring transfers and in April for fall transfers. This Transitional Advising program began in November 2010. Advisors cover a list of topics with each student in their 1 hour appointment: using OnePort, reviewing transfer credit and consulting with the transfer credit coordinator, if needed, using DegPar, signing up for Orientation, campus resources, etc. OneStop Advisors have met with over 300 incoming transfers since the program started. Our next challenge is to increase the number of incoming transfers that participate in the program.
- **Advising Outreach** – At the request of SGA, the OneStop advisors staff a drop-by advising table in Highsmith, Lipinsky lobby, and the library. These are periodic and occur primarily in the weeks prior to registration.
- **QuickStart** -- Advising sessions in the summer to guide small groups of transfers, admitted after June Orientations, through OnePort, DegPar, and reviewing their transfer credit evaluations online.
- **Revamping embark Orientations.** We continue to use surveys from transfer students to revise orientations.
- **Reviewing equivalencies for transfer coursework:** The Registrar's office is beginning conversations with academic departments regarding how transfer coursework is evaluated. It would be beneficial to transfer students to receive direct equivalencies, i.e. Math 241 rather than Math 2XX – departmental elective.
- In 2009, the Registrar's office created the ability for Transfer students to have access to OnePort to view their Transfer Credit evaluation and DegPar as soon as they were admitted. The evaluation of credits appears within 1-2 weeks of acceptance.

Recruiting a Diverse Faculty

Deborah Miles reported on recruiting a diverse faculty. An initiative of the Diversity Action Council includes an intentional effort to recruit a diverse faculty using researched based best practices. To that end, a committee has been established. Members include Ed Katz (chair) Evelyn Chiang, Keya Maitra, Deborah Miles, Lorena Russell, Surain Subramaniam, and Anita White-Carter. An important resource for the committee is the website used by the University of Virginia which assists search committees on best practices <http://www.virginia.edu/vpfrr/resources.html>.

Hiring for 2010-11 included a careful review by the committee of the job postings to reach out to candidates with secondary specialties that reflect an interest and commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. Both the candidate pool and the eventual hires for the positions had a significant increase in the number of candidates coming from people of color. Of the 8+ hires, at least 4 new faculty are part of underrepresented demographics.

This year a second best practices initiative was added. Committee members were asked to make telephone calls to department chairs at Historic Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU's) in and out of North Carolina along with two other institutions with high percentages of students of Asian or Latina communities in other parts of the United States. This approach was also aimed at increasing our capacity to network with current or former students, or colleagues, who were looking for a position similar to current (or future) openings at UNC Asheville. Part of this initiative, then, is also about relationship-building for the future.

Instituting Professional Development

Deborah Miles reported on instituting professional development. In May, 2011, 30 faculty and staff attended a three day training with the National Multicultural Institute (NMCI) organized by Chris Dahlquist in Human Resources. The "Diversity Workers" had a follow up meeting and sent initial recommendations to the Diversity Action Council. DAC

is reviewing those recommendations to set priorities, committee responsibilities, and timelines. The recommendations include diversity training that would be both intensive and episodic. One plan calls for intensive 2 day training for 120 people a year until 75% of the faculty/staff is trained. Another plan includes a certification process where there are levels of training that staff/faculty and students can achieve.

In addition, the Intercultural Center, through efforts of Lamar Hylton, is offering Diversity Dialogues this semester with 33 people in attendance at the January session.

The overlapping members of the Faculty Senate and DAC are Surain Subramaniam and Greg Kormanik. Developing shared initiatives between Faculty Senate and DAC would exponentially double the impact. This could also include retention efforts in the Faculty Welfare committee or training on how to be respectful and inclusive of underrepresented students in the classroom.

Dr. Frank thanked Mr. Bramlett and Ms. Miles for the informative reports and for the reality check on the limitations we may have in terms of being part of a public state system in our health care choices. We need to continue to work on this issue as citizens, but we can also pursue options to pressure our own system to work on this and senators should pay close attention to what we are doing system wide.

Update on Curriculum Review Task Force

Dr. Frank referred to Mr. Bramlett's report and said the Curriculum Review Task Force is looking at transfer students and how that affects our curriculum. He described the task force as being over the infancy and honeymoon phase and into the teenage years of rebellion and passion. More focus and greater synchronization is needed and they will be working very forcibly in the weeks ahead. Some committees, particularly the Sustainability Committee are ahead in terms of data collection and in bringing new ideas. The Steering Committee is beginning the final phase. The departments will be involved to a greater degree in the next weeks. This is a formative and a transformative process, but it is also a collective process and we are painfully aware that we need to live up to the challenge. The committees remain energetic and vested in the issue.

Dr. Ruppert asked if abstracts or summaries were available. Dr. Frank said no, this is a work in progress and conclusions have not been reached. Anyone with questions is asked to contact any point person of the task force: Volker Frank, Mark Gibney, Patrick Bahls, Jessica Dunsmore, Jeff Konz, Pat McClellan, Jane Fernandes.

Elections

Dr. Reed Roig said as he observes the election process, the work appears to be going smoothly. There was some concern about male versus female representation not only on the Committee of Tenured Faculty but also on the Faculty Senate. Dr. Boudreaux reported to FWDC that women are nominated but they almost always turn down the nomination and therefore are not bolded on the ballots. His review indicates that a person has a better than 80% chance of getting elected if their name is bolded on the ballot. It is not a process of getting nominations, it is a process of getting women to accept the nominations.

Mr. Bowen said nominations are still open for the Hearings Committee (Feb. 27) and for the Faculty Grievance Committee, Faculty Assembly and Academic Appeals Board (March 12).

III. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee Report

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

First Reading [Unanimously Approved]

FWDC 8: Dean's Evaluation of Program Directors

FWDC 9: Proposal to Establish the Inquiry Arc Advisory Committee as a Standing Committee

Second Reading:

The following documents were considered for second reading:

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

Mr. Bowen said since discussion last month he has not received any comments/suggestions on editing FWDC 2.

Dr. Reynolds asked for clarification on two merit evaluation categories: accomplished and superior.

Mr. Bowen said "accomplished" refers to significant accomplishment in one particular area whereas "superior" refers to significant accomplishment in more than one area – one of which is teaching. FWDC 2 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 2412S.

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](#))

In a friendly amendment Section 3.4.4 was edited as follows: delete "should complete" and replace it with "completes". FWDC 3 passed as amended without dissent and became Senate Document 2512S.

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

SACS requires that we have this committee. The current ad hoc committee feels that with the maturing of UNC Asheville's institutional effectiveness process, a standing committee composed of members directly involved with the effectiveness process in their Vice Chancellor area along with the faculty involved in assessment would function more efficiently and effectively. In particular, this will give faculty a larger voice in the process.

Dr. Sabo said the IEC will review several areas but there is no provision for the publication of their findings. Perhaps the IEC could give an annual report to the Senate Executive Committee. In the application of policies and as it makes decisions on specific cases, the IEC will actually be writing policies. It is essential that these be public.

Mr. Berls suggested that the IEC give an annual report to the Faculty Senate.

Provost Fernandes said the minutes are online, but an annual report would give more detail and she supported the idea.

Dr. Reed, Dr. Hook and Mr. Bowen noted that all standing committees are already supposed to write annual reports. The reports are on the committee web site and they are public record.

Dr. Sabo and Mr. Berls countered that there are minor committees that have a big impact but only on a certain area. Institutional Effectiveness and the University Planning Council are campus wide and could have a major significance. We need a written annual report to the Senate for a better understanding of what's going on as well as for our institutional memory.

Several friendly amendments were made and withdrawn. Provost Fernandes said the annual report would be more helpful in September or October after work is completed and the new director and others have time to review it.

Mr. Berls made a friendly amendment to add a sixth bullet: "The Institutional Effectiveness Committee shall submit a written report to the Faculty Senate at the first Faculty Senate meeting of the academic year."

Dr. Sabo asked if it would be wise to specify what we are interested in knowing in the report, such as "including policy decisions, significant findings and changes in procedures".

Mr. Bowen said as a body we can certainly tell the IEC what information we want before they come to the Senate.

Dr. Kormanik said a report needs to go to the Faculty Senate in September and then we can determine its disposition. The Executive Committee could request more elaboration rather than specifying what should be in the report. A lot of committees are supposed to report to the Senate and we need to get that information to the Senate.

Dr. Frank said over time no one will remember what the Senate is talking about today. We could include language that reminds the IEC that the Senate would like perhaps a preliminary report, so the Senate will know what to do with it and have the option to correct it, send it back, and look at it again.

Dr. Hook asked, "How can you correct a committee report?" He said he was bothered by this discussion. The Senate might send a committee's report back for revision if it is somehow unsatisfactory! The faculty that we choose will bring faculty representation to this committee. We will trust them to do the work. He understood the need for institutional history, but he objected to the tenor of the discussion.

Dr. Sabo said the IEC is dealing with assessment and learning outcomes issues that we have debated widely as an institution. Anything that is dealing with the pursuit and the judgment of those should be widely disseminated and the report should be detailed. The Faculty Senate should do everything it can to ensure everyone is open and good reports are a way to do this. He also agreed with Dr. Frank -- institutional memory easily disappears. This is not mistrust.

Bruce Larson said after one iteration people will have a better sense of exactly what is being put forth in terms of content. Perhaps after that first iteration there would be an opportunity for people to be clearer about what is expected in the future.

Mr. Berls withdrew the friendly amendment and made the following motion: "The Institutional Effectiveness Committee shall submit a written report to the Faculty Senate at the first Faculty Senate meeting of the academic year to report on its activities." Dr. Kormanik seconded the motion which passed. FWDC 7 passed as amended without dissent and became Senate Document 2612S.

Update on Review of Tenure and Rewards System

FWDC and the Provost's Cabinet reached an agreement on the meaning of engaged scholarship and how we evaluate it. There had been concerns from faculty members about rigor and there is now agreement on what we are looking for. We have come to an understanding that scholarship differs from scholarly activity. We are still working on institutional values versus departmental values.

IV. 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 – February 3, 2012

1. Chancellor Ponder convened the first UPC meeting of the semester and noted the varying start times on our schedule.

She reported that the 2012 Legislative Short Session officially starts in May, but guided budget advice will be completed before the session opens. The UNC Board of Governors will meet next week and the Planning and Budgeting Sub-Committee is expected to ask for authority to submit proposals directly to the Legislature. Mr. Pierce has been asked to submit a proposal for how we might use \$1M in recurring funds, should that be allocated to our campus.

As a second piece of good news, Chancellor Ponder reported that the Spangler Foundation, which previously announced suspending funding for endowed professorships, has decided to continue the program for small, special mission campuses.

In response to an especially challenging competitive admissions environment, we have added scholarship funding this year.

UNC Asheville's attorney is working with WCU's attorney to work out the details of WCU relocating their graduate programs elsewhere. The timing of the exit is set to make the space used by WCU available for use this summer.

Chancellor Ponder spoke about the Asheville-Citizen Times' highly critical reporting of the Men's Basketball conference tournament controversy and reported that we have achieved a "win-win" solution.

She noted that the "Seriously Creative" TV spot that ran during the UNC Asheville – UNC-CH basketball game recently has received a CASE award and praised our marketing and communications team for their good work.

During a round-robin discussion of social sustainability, a concern was expressed that curriculum review discussions have become very emotional. Chancellor Ponder suggested that we should set the standards for civil discourse and share more information in advance about these meetings.

2. Dr. Fernandes gave an update on our preparations for the SACS on-site visit scheduled for March 27-29. UPC members were provided with a roster of Reaffirmation Committee members and a detailed itinerary. UPC received advice on interacting with team members and the importance of everyone on campus having a basic understanding of our QEP Inquiry ARC Project. Dr. Larson informed UPC that the visiting team will focus on the QEP project, seven items found to be not in compliance last Fall, mandatory SACS items, and federal requirements. Dr. Dunsmore reported that it was very positive that SACS was not going to send a finance evaluator and emphasized how important it was for everyone to have some knowledge of the QEP Inquiry ARC project.

3. Mr. Pierce presented an [overview of University budget planning](#). From 2009 to 2011, our state appropriations as a percentage of general fund revenues declined from 75% to 71%. On a per-student basis, state support dropped about \$1,500 per FTE. We have an approximate 3-1 ratio of budget cuts to tuition increases. Our tuition and fees remain the lowest in our peer group and Kiplinger ranks us as #45 nationally among their list of "best buys". In 2011-12, we had a cut in state appropriations of \$4.5M and gained less than half of that back in tuition increases. For 2012, UNC Asheville requested a \$500 tuition increase with the support of students and our Board, but President Ross decided to limit increases on all campuses to 10 percent, reducing our request to \$310 for undergraduate instate students. President Ross's proposal goes to the Board of Governors next week for review. Mr. Pierce stated that despite these challenges, we have followed the UPC Budget Planning Guidelines and protected the academic core. To illustrate, he noted that expenditures for instruction have increased as a percentage of the budget, Institutional Support (administration) has remained constant, but Physical Plant has declined slightly during this period.

Report on Institutional Development Committee meeting – February 2, 2012

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

Guests: Jessica Dunsmore, Gwen Ashburn, Archer Gravely.

1. Sophomore Survey

IDC finished a review of the 2010 Sophomore Survey. We focused on both positive and negative survey results. Of interest were the positive results for financial aid services and the public safety. Students feel safe on campus but were dissatisfied with the availability of information on campus crimes. We recommend an increased dissemination effort on crime information for students and faculty. Students appear to be content with academically-related campus activities but less so with co-curricular campus activities. Students were also dissatisfied with weekend activities (a recurring theme) and opportunities to interact with people from a range of racial/ethnic or cultural backgrounds. We noted that the increasing residential student body will probably improve some of those results. The Sophomore Survey data are results from one year and Dr. Sabo suggested that we evaluate data from several years to determine if trends exist. IDC recommended to Archer Gravely to generate the trend data, starting with noted areas of negative values for 2010.

2. Senior Survey

The results of the 2010-2011 Senior survey were discussed. This survey is done every semester and the results are listed for the five previous years plus the current year which allows for trend analysis. The data are also compared to system-wide data. We compare favorably with the system-wide averages in academic advising, and staff of financial aid, health service and business/cashier offices. We compare less favorably system-wide with technology services, developing computer skills, the ability to function as a team or work with people of diverse backgrounds, registration, food, counseling, residence life, and recreation services, and community service opportunities. The UNC Asheville trend analysis showed a decreased satisfaction with internet services, and health and counseling services. Improvements were noted with hours of operation of computer labs and access to trained IT staff, working with people with diverse backgrounds, and the staff and services of financial aid. IDC recommends that the data be separated by 4-yr students and transfer students to distinguish potential differences of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Archer Gravely agreed to rework the data to do so.

3. Continued Discussions on Previous IDC Topics

IDC continued a discussion of the MLA Program and the Asheville Graduate Center. In 2007 IDC introduced a document to Senate that established criteria for additional masters programs. Although this document was not passed by Senate, IDC is planning to frame the debate about graduate programming at UNC Asheville in upcoming meetings. We are concerned that the loss of financial resources from the departing WCU graduate degree options may prompt the university into seeking alternatives without a thorough discussion. We are also concerned about the approval process for and transparency of graduate certificates within the MLA as suggested by Associate Provost Katz at our last meeting. IDC will invite Dean Krumpe to a future meeting for an update on the Pharmacy program and the joint UNC Asheville/UNC 8-yr medical degree. It appears our discussion on the resource implications of curriculum changes through the efforts of the Curriculum Review Task Force will be postponed until next year.

Discussion

- Dr. Moorhead asked Dean Krumpe if there was an update on the joint UNCA/UNC 8-year medical degree.
 - Dean Krumpe said there was not because we are having a different meeting with those people next Friday related to this topic.
- Dr. Sabo added to Dr. Moorhead's report. In response to a question at the UPC, the Chancellor said they were in the process of negotiating what the agreement with Western Carolina University (WCU) would be. In response to a concern that Western Carolina would begin teaching undergraduate courses in Asheville, the Chancellor said that is not the plan but that is certainly important and will be central in her negotiations with them. The implication is that they will not compete with us in Asheville in undergraduate programs, although she specifically said with the possible exception of the nursing program – something that they have that we do not have.
- Dr. Frank asked who addresses these concerns, other than reporting on areas of concern on the Sophomore Survey and the Senior Survey.
 - Dr. Moorhead said last month Jessica Dunsmore described how some units are responding to notable issues through Trac Dat. IDC's goal right now is to ensure they see enough data to make sure we can analyze it.
- Mr. Bowen said we also survey graduate students – it will be an important one to add in the data base.
 - Dr. Moorhead said he could not recall reviewing that data in the last three years.
 - Provost Fernandes said we do have a recent survey of graduates that will help to inform some of our work. The data is in but they may not have finished analyzing it.
 - Dr. Moorhead said there is also a faculty survey that Archer Gravely is assembling that will eventually come through IDC. It will go through an administrative review as well.

V. Academic Policies Committee Reports

Mr. Rob Berls reported for the Academic Policies Committee.

First Reading [Unanimously approved by APC]

Mr. Berls commented on the first reading documents. In the Literature, Drama and Economics proposals there are substantive changes to the curriculum dealing with reorganization and resources. The Art proposals create more options for their students. They do not increase the number of hours toward graduation. The AFST proposals add classes that are integral to the education of these students. He applauded AFST for this initiative.

APC 35: Change LANG 260 from a 3- to a 4-hour course

APC 36: Add new course, LANG 498, Oral Presentation in Creative Writing

APC 37: Change LIT 324, American Literary Tradition from a 3- to a 4-hour course

- APC 38: Delete LIT 241. Replace with LIT 240.
Delete LIT 242. Replace with LIT 329.
Delete LIT 354. Replace LIT 325.
Delete LIT 356. Replace with LIT 326.
Delete LIT 358 and LIT 360. Replace them with LIT 328
- APC 39: Add new courses to Literature: LIT 327, LIT 334, 335, 364, 369, 440, 492
- APC 40: Delete LIT 352 and LANG 323. Replace with LANG 352
- APC 41: Change requirements for the Concentration in Creative Writing
- APC 42: Change requirements for English with Teaching Licensure
Change requirements for Creative Writing with Teacher Licensure
- APC 43: Change narrative under Concentration in Literature
Change requirements for the Concentration in Literature
- APC 44: Change requirements for Minor in Literature
Change requirements for Minor in Creative Writing
- APC 45: Add new course, ART 338
- APC 46: Delete ART 328, The Photograph as Document
- APC 47: Change titles and course descriptions for ART 227 and 327;
Delete ART 427 and replace it with ART 337;
Delete ART 428 and replace it with ART 437
- APC 48: Add ART 227 as an option to ART 210 and 220 in B.A. requirements for Studio Art major
- APC 49: Add B. F.A. portfolio review of student work to determine continued enrollment in B.F.A.
Change description for ART 490-492 to reflect the inclusion of the portfolio review
- APC 50: Remove Intermedia as a concentration in the B. F. A. degree
- APC 51: Add new courses, AFST 334, 364, 433
- APC 52: Change course descriptions and/or credit hours for AFST 130, 330, 430, and Special Topics
- APC 53: Change requirements for the Africana Studies Minor;
Add courses to the list of elective options for AFST minor
- APC 54: Delete DRAM 123, 124, 210 and 314
- APC 55: Change descriptions for DRAM 105 and 106
- APC 56: Add new course, DRAM 145, Play Reading
Add new course, DRAM 223, The Visual Texts
Add new course, DRAM 318 Applied Theatre
- APC 57: Change credit hours for DRAM 490
- APC 58: Change title of DRAM 212; Change title of DRAM 415
- APC 59: Delete DRAM 102, Public Speaking
Replace with new course, DRAM 213, The Art of Public Speaking and Presentations
- APC 60: Delete DRAM 103 and 104, Voice Production I and II;
Replace w/ new course, DRAM 113, The Expressive Voice and Body
- APC 61: Delete DRAM 244 and 245, History of the Theatre I and II
Replace with new course, DRAM 240, Survey of Theatre History
- APC 62: Add new course, DRAM 346, Theatre History Investigations
- APC 63: Delete DRAM 317, Creative Drama for Teachers, Grades K-6;
Replace with new course, DRAM 319, Creative Drama
- APC 64: Delete DRAM 325, Costume Construction
Delete DRAM 331, Structural Design for the Stage
Delete DRAM 334, Stage Sound Application
Delete DRAM 336, Stage Lighting
Replace with new course, DRAM 324, Theatre Technology Investigations
- APC 65: Delete DRAM 432, Scene Design
Delete DRAM 434, Stage Sound Design
Delete DRAM 437, Lighting Design
Delete DRAM 440, Costume Design
Replace with new course, DRAM 425, Design Investigations
- APC 66: Delete DRAM 362, Principles of Directing I;
Replace with new course, DRAM 316, Directing for the Stage
Delete DRAM 462, Principles of Directing II;
Replace with new course, DRAM 416, Directing Investigations

- APC 67: Change narrative description for Drama; Change major requirements for Drama;
Change minor requirements for Drama
- APC 68: Change the narrative for Economics;
Change General Economics to Major in Economics and edit text for major requirements;
Delete the following concentrations in Economics:
Concentration in Environmental Economics
Concentration in International Economics
Concentration in Monetary Economics and Finance

Second Reading [Unanimously approved by APC]

The following documents were considered for second reading:

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

This course was previously taught as a special topics course. It helps students fulfill the civic engagement student learning outcome for political science and the university. APC 17 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 2712S.

The math proposals have several class reorganizations and changes to the minor.

- APC 18: Change course description for MATH 366

APC 18 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 2812S.

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

APC 19 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 2912S.

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

APC 20 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 3012S.

- APC 21: Changes to Concentration in Applied Mathematics

APC 21 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 3112S.

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

APC 22 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 3212S.

- APC 23: Changes to Mathematics Minor

APC 23 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 3312S.

- APC 24: Change Criteria for Awarding Latin Honors

This proposal makes it more equitable for transfer students who have felt disenfranchised by our honors awarding system. The Diversity Action Council addressed these ideas in its report. The proposed change to a 60 semester-hour requirement for Latin honors eligibility stems from the fact that 48% of UNC Asheville graduates from December 1996 and May 2011 entered the university as transfer students. Many of these students fulfill the university's graduation requirements by completing fewer than 75 semester hours, in part because some have already completed associate degrees at the community college level. A reduction in the semester hours required for Latin honors eligibility from 75 to 60 brings this award criterion in line with the graduation requirement that students complete at least 60 semester hours at a 4-year institution.

If this change were applied to all 1291 graduates in the last four regular semesters (December 2009-May 2011), an additional 56 (4.3%) students with between 60 and 74 semester hours and a cumulative grade-point average of at least 3.60 would have received Latin honors. A total of 306 (23.7%) students with at least 75 credit hours actually received Latin honors during this period.

Dr. Sabo said we claim to be a unique institution, particularly the ILS, but this basically says the entire program (freshmen to seniors) is not much different than what everybody else does. That disturbed him, but he was not sure that it is an argument to vote against it because of the equity issue. He asked what the consensus was at APC.

Mr. Berls said APC discussed the history of Latin honors within this institution – it has gone from 60 semester hours to 72 – and those changes were not made to correct an inequity or disenfranchised population. This is unique because it addresses concerns of transfer students. This document comes from the Latin Honors Committee and it has been under discussion for nearly two years. APC approved this proposal unanimously.

Dr. Meigs said he finds comfort in knowing the students who complete 60 semester hours at UNC Asheville will be taking the upper-level courses. They will prove their mettle in the 300 and 400-level courses.

Dr. Sabo said UNC Asheville is known for its ILS program and transfer students do less of that work. He asked if transfer students typically take our 124, 214, 324 cycle. Do they typically transfer in their humanities sections?

Ms. Shope said transfer students typically have transferred in HUM 124 and 214. They are required to take HUM 324 and 414 or LS479 in the articulation agreement.

Dr. Reed said if these students can prove that they can perform at this university for the required 60 semester hours then they deserve to be honored.

Dr. Kormanik asked how the benchmarks are established for Latin honors. Is it a fixed benchmark or does the benchmark represent the top 10% getting some level of Latin honors?

Ms. Shope said it is a fixed benchmark.

Dr. Hook said the question is: Do we feel like these students who have earned a 3.6 GPA across all the courses at UNC Asheville deserve to be recognized for the work they have done? Those that believe the honor is being diluted need to explain what that is.

Dr. Sabo said there is a difference between a 3.85 with 62 hours -- and 3.85 with 120 hours. Classes at the introductory level are tougher and he suspects that grades are lower in the 100 and 200 level classes. The way we used to calculate honors was we based the cut-offs on the average GPA's from the last three or four years. So 1% could be a 3.94 one year, but could be adjusted the next year.

Dr. Hook said that is not what we are voting on.

Dr. Meigs said Dr. Sabo's point is well taken. We want to avoid people being able to bury their core past performance, but he felt pretty good about 60 semester hours.

Mr. Berls called the question. APC 24 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 3412S.

The ATMS proposals are reflective of the new federal requirements for meteorologists and create added distinction between the climatology and weather forecasting concentrations.

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

APC 25 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 3512S.

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

APC 26 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 3612S.

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

APC 27 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 3712S.

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

APC 28 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 3812S.

Similarly to the AFTS program, with the growth of the RELS program, these classes strengthen the program and make the courses available to interested students. RELS is doing very well with a minimum number of faculty.

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

APC 29 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 3912S.

APC 30: Change course description and credit hours for RELS 313;

Change course title, description, and credit hours for RELS 330

APC 30 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 4012S.

APC 31: Add new courses, RELS 389 and 398

APC 31 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 4112S.

APC 32: Change course description for RELS 490

APC 32 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 4212S.

APC 33: Change the requirements for the major in Religious Studies

APC 33 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 4312S.

APC 34: Change the requirements for the minor in Religious Studies

APC 34 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 4412S.

Dr. Sabo said the original proposal for the Religious Studies laid out a timeline for the hiring of additional faculty based on the growth of the program. He asked Dr. Payne if they were searching for a faculty member this year.

Dr. Payne said there was a proposal before the Position Allocation Committee (PAC) but he did not believe it has met yet. He submitted a proposal to PAC last year as well.

VI. Administrative Reports

Academic Affairs

Head Librarian Search

Dean Jeff Konz said he met with the senior staff of the library, Anita White-Carter, Barb Svenson, and John Myers and talked about the composition of the search committee, their thoughts on the library staff and the position description. Based on their recommendations there have been modest revisions in the position description.

The search committee will be composed of: Sam Schuman (representing community interest), Bill Spellman who has a good understanding of libraries and the liberal arts as the COPLAC director, John Myers and Brandy Bourne will represent the library staff, there will be one student, and there will be three faculty members. He met with the Senate Executive Committee to talk about how the faculty members will be selected. The EC talked about having diversity in the faculty on the basis of program area and research methodology. Dr. Frank will collect names of nominees to serve on the search committee.

Dr. Frank said ten faculty members have already expressed interest in serving on this search committee. The deadline to submit interest is February 16, 2012.

Dean Konz said the position description will be sent to General Administration for review because of minor modifications but we will request permission to post and advertise the position in the next couple of weeks. The goal is to start reviewing applications in mid-to-late-March.

Dr. Subramaniam said in light of the report from DAC and in our intention of looking at issues of diversity among our faculty and staff, he wondered if it would be wise to have a representative of DAC on the search committee.

Dean Konz said it is possible one of the faculty representatives could also be on DAC. The advertisement will follow the model we established for faculty searches to broaden the pool as much as possible.

Dr. Subramaniam said it would be a good move in the right direction to be intentional about our desire to look at the diversity initiatives in a critical position such as this.

Dr. Reynolds said ENVR just went through a search and the language is pretty clear that we are looking to have a good, diverse pool of applicants. She did not believe it was necessary to have someone from DAC on this committee because of the language stipulated in the advertisement.

Update on SACS on-site visit

Bruce Larson distributed three documents: (1) members of the visiting team that will be with us March 27-29, 2012 from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools; (2) a list of standards that the visiting team will evaluate on-site; and (3) a preliminary itinerary.

The SACS visit, which will encompass some compliance-related work but mostly QEP-related work, provides us with an opportunity to host ten of our colleagues from colleges and universities throughout the SACS region.

Student Government

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

- Renee Bindewald is at a Board of Governors meeting with other student body presidents from across the state. She hopes to have an opportunity to speak about student tuition and fees.
- Elections for the next student government will start the last week of February. Faculty may encourage students to vote but may not endorse a specific candidate.

VIII. Old Business

There was no Old Business.

IX. New Business

There was no New Business.

X. Adjourn

Dr. Frank adjourned the meeting at 5:15pm.

N.B. Portions of the minutes are from the UPC meeting: <http://www.unca.edu/node/3486>

Respectfully submitted by: Sandra Gravely
Executive Committee