

University of North Carolina at Asheville  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
Minutes, April 5, 2012

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

Excused: K. Reynolds.

Visitors: S. Capone, P. Catterfeld, J. Konz, K. Krumpke, L. Langrall, B. Larson, ML. Manns, P. McClellan, P. Mitchell, L. Nelms, R. Pente, R. Ridenour, A. Shope.

**I. Call to Order and Announcements**

Dr. Volker Frank called the meeting to order at 3:16 pm and welcomed senators and guests.

**II. Executive Committee Report**

Dr. Frank reported for the Executive Committee.

The Chancellor will visit us at the April 26<sup>th</sup> Senate meeting and Robert Straub from the Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee will also join us.

**III. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee Report**

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

**Nominees for Alternate Faculty Conciliator**

The Senate approved the slate of nominees for Alternate Faculty Conciliator. The SGA will choose the alternate from the slate. Greta Trautmann is the 2012-13 Faculty Conciliator.

Afaf Omer  
Bill Sabo  
Rob Bowen  
David Hopes  
Nancy Ruppert

**Election Report**

Dr. Boudreaux said that Reed Roig will send the election results to the campus community.

Dr. Boudreaux thanked Ken Wilson from Institutional Research, Adam Reagan from IT Services, Reed Roig as co-election coordinator, and Sandra Gravely for their work to make elections work smoothly.

Dr. Frank thanked Dr. Boudreaux on behalf of the Senate for his years of service to ensure elections were run properly. The Senate gave Dr. Boudreaux a round of applause for his dedicated service. Dr. Frank thanked Dr. Roig for his willingness to work on elections next year.

**First Reading [Unanimously Approved]**

FWDC 12: Replacing Guiding Concepts with the Strategic Plan (Revision to SD3201S) (Faculty Handbook 1.3.3)  
FWDC 13: Defining Departments and Programs (Faculty Handbook 1.4.3.4-5)

**Second Reading [Unanimously Approved]**

The following documents were considered for second reading:

FWDC 10: Clarification of Post-Tenure Review Procedures (Faculty Handbook 3.7.2.7E)  
FWDC 10 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 8212S.

FWDC 11: Preface to the Faculty Handbook (Faculty Handbook 0.0)

**Discussion**

- Dr. Burchard said if procedures are just being reported – who is approving them?

Dean Jeff Konz said procedures – such as hiring – typically come from Academic Affairs. Any procedural changes in the Handbook need to be reported from Academic Affairs to FWDC. Senate approval is not required as long as they are consistent with the policies we have in place.

- Dr. Burchard said she was troubled to realize that the Faculty Senate did not have any authority over the procedures that appear in the Faculty Handbook.

Dr. Roig gave as an example the annual review process we looked at recently. The process of annual review is defined in the Handbook but its implementation is up to Academic Affairs in consultation with FWDC. The Faculty Senate did not have the authority to approve the form.

- Mr. Berls asked why “policy” and “procedure” were not defined in the document.

Dr. Hook explained that this is an attempt to clarify something that previously has been completely unclarified.

Provost Fernandes said clarification is important, but when talking about policies you imply that the Faculty Senate has jurisdiction over policy. Many policies in the Handbook are Board of Governors’ policies.

- Dr. Kormanik said the procedures are not clear. Since the Faculty Handbook is a joint effort, we both have a say if there are policies and procedures and this document accomplishes that except for editorial corrections. What may be editorial to some may not be editorial to others. The last sentence reads: “... editorial corrections can be sent directly to the Chair of FWDC and the Editor of the Faculty Handbook.” This does not include FWDC as a body.

- Dr. Kormanik made a friendly amendment to the third sentence under 0.0 Preface, to delete “members of the faculty” and replace it with: “both the faculty and the administration should consult ...”

Dr. Burchard made a motion to accept Dr. Kormanik’s friendly amendment. Mr. Bowen seconded the motion.

The motion passed.

- Dr. Frank explained that he sent a request to FWDC to add “the Executive Committee” as a friendly amendment so that more than one person would have oversight over policy or procedural changes. His concerns were three-fold: why is oversight being given to the Chair of FWDC and not to the Executive Committee? Or to the Chair of the Senate and FWDC? The other two reasons relate to institutional memory: Senate minutes from 2004 and a Senate document in 2005 made specific notation of Handbook editorial changes and said the Chair of the Faculty Senate was involved because s/he works closely with the Senate secretary. At a minimum the Executive Committee or the Chair of the Faculty Senate and FWDC as a body should be included. FWDC rejected his request and he wanted to Senate to consider it.

- Dr. Frank made a friendly amendment to the second sentence in the last paragraph to read: “All suggested changes to the Faculty Handbook should be sent to the Chair of FWDC who, in consultation with the Executive Committee and Academic Affairs liaison to FWDC, determines whether a revision represents a change in policy, a change in procedures, or is editorial in nature.”

Dr. Hook urged Senators not to approve this amendment. FWDC is charged with faculty welfare and he felt very strongly that the Executive Committee must have better use of its time than to worry about whether a change is editorial in nature. It is a movement in the wrong direction by making it a protracted process.

Dr. Burchard said it would not take a huge amount of time for the EC to look briefly at something to see if it agreed with FWDC. She would be happier not making the change Dr. Frank has suggested if we had clear definitions of the terms: policy, procedure, and editorial revision.

Dr. Hobby pointed out a problem with the sentence structure.

Mr. Berls suggested addressing the amendment before moving on to Dr. Burchard’s and Dr. Hobby’s concerns.

Dr. Boudreaux said when FWDC discussed this he agreed that we should worry about workload issues, but it is now clear that the definitions are murky and he supported the amendment.

Mr. Berls made a motion to accept Dr. Frank’s amendment. Dr. Burchard seconded the motion which passed by a vote of 9 to 8.

- Dr. Hobby said the entire sentence needs to be rewritten and the terms need to be defined. As the document currently reads the changes are not implemented by anyone and it is ambiguous.

- Mr. Bowen asked for a motion to accept the document as amended. Dr. Hook made the motion. The motion was seconded by Dr. Roig.

Dr. Hook noted that changes will occur to the Handbook whether policy or procedures are defined or not.

Dr. Kormanik said with all due respect to his colleagues on FWDC, he will vote to send this back to committee. We are not ready to accept this document as it is currently worded and FWDC has heard the Senate’s concerns. Regarding the sentence structure, sources other than Academic Affairs seek changes in the Handbook.

Dr. Meigs said perhaps we should restate what has been suggested: that FWDC consulting with the Executive Committee decides where the bar is set. Or, we could say that both policies and changes in procedures go through the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Burchard said no one is asking for a perfect distinction, but a working definition. We should not be using terms in our Faculty Handbook that we cannot define.

Provost Fernandes said if you cannot distinguish between a policy and a procedure then we do not need to make differences in the way that policies and procedures are approved.

Dean Konz said he was first author of the document. The distinction that he was trying to draw was that procedures implement the policies we approve. For example we had a policy on annual evaluation and there are procedures which implement those policies, such as the forms that were developed. Likewise we have policies on hiring; there are very specific procedures as to how a search is to be conducted which have historically appeared in the Handbook, but have never been passed by the Senate with a document. The Preface identifies how changes come into the Faculty Handbook – through the Chair of FWDC and now the Executive Committee. If there is a question as to whether something is trivial or not, it will come through the Senate. If there is a question as to whether something is a policy change or a policy implementation, it would likely come through as a Senate document.

- Mr. Berls called the question. The motion to approve FWDC 11 as amended failed by a vote of 7 to 9.

#### V. Institutional Development Committee / University Planning Council Reports

Dr. Kevin Moorhead reported for Institutional Development Committee and University Planning Council. The University Planning Council did not meet as the SACS on-site team was on campus.

##### Second Reading

The following document was considered for Second Reading:

IDC 1: Change in Membership of University Planning Council (Faculty Handbook 10.1.1)  
IDC 1 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 8312S.

##### Report on Institutional Development Committee meeting –March 29, 2012

Members: Kevin Moorhead, Gregg Kormanik, Ted Meigs, Melissa Burchard, Blake Hobby  
 Guests: Jessica Dunsmore, Gwen Ashburn, Archer Gravely

The IDC meeting was devoted to a discussion of the 2010-2011 HERI (Higher Education Research Institute) Faculty Survey. An executive summary (7 pages) of the report is provided on the web at:

[http://ierp.unca.edu/sites/ierp.unca.edu/files/surveys/heri/HERI\\_2011\\_summary.pdf](http://ierp.unca.edu/sites/ierp.unca.edu/files/surveys/heri/HERI_2011_summary.pdf)

The full report (89 pages) includes a detailed statistical analysis of all survey items by gender and comparison group:

[http://ierp.unca.edu/sites/ierp.unca.edu/files/surveys/heri/HERI\\_2011\\_tables.pdfnstitute](http://ierp.unca.edu/sites/ierp.unca.edu/files/surveys/heri/HERI_2011_tables.pdfnstitute)) Faculty Survey.

IDC recognized the value of the survey as quantifiable data on faculty responses to workload and working conditions, job satisfaction, systemic problems, and as tool for having important conversations on institutional climate. The survey is based on faculty responses from 417 colleges and universities and UNC Asheville is compared to public four-year baccalaureate and masters colleges and all public and private four-year institutions including doctoral/research universities.

IDC used the Executive Summary prepared by Institutional Research to guide our discussion. Archer Gravely suggested that any item of interest could be more fully examined within the full report, which includes more detailed statistical data, gender differences, and seven-year trends.

UNC Asheville compares favorably to other universities in many areas, and in particular to faculty commitment to teaching, scholarly productivity, civic mindedness, commitment to diversity, and interactions with students. IDC chose to focus on areas of concern and identify potential issues that should be addressed by the university, although we recognize that some of the issues are difficult to control (e.g. health benefits). The relationship between faculty and the administration needs to be improved. Faculty are concerned about a lack of shared governance, as reflected by survey responses to questions regarding faculty involvement in decision making and policy making processes, and a lack of openness. It is in the best interest of the institution to address those concerns. IDC recommends that the Executive Committee of the Senate and the Provost determine a path forward to address these issues.

UNC Asheville faculty reported significantly lower satisfaction in most of the dimensions of job satisfaction and higher levels of stress compared to other institutions. Sources of stress or areas of lower job satisfaction that should be addressed include committee work, institutional procedures, teaching load, opportunities for scholarly pursuits, and tuition remission for children/dependents. We recognize that current efforts of curriculum review may address teaching load issues that are a significant source of stress and contributing to lower job satisfaction at UNC Asheville. IDC recommends that the Faculty Senate review all committee work with a goal of reducing the number of committees on campus. We recommend that senate members and Department Chairs and Program Directors be exempt from additional committee work or that the university find ways to encourage the involvement of additional faculty in

committee work to better distribute the workload. IDC also recommends we investigate and develop a more favorable policy for tuition remission for children and dependents.

UNC Asheville scores significantly lower in the clarity of criteria for advancement and promotion but efforts are underway to address those concerns. Another potential issue to address is a low perceived value of creating or sustaining partnerships with surrounding communities. It was brought to our attention that it is difficult to get courses approved as service learning. The university should review those policies to determine if institutional barriers are precluding opportunities to expand service learning.

There are other potential issues that could be identified through the HERI report and given the historic trend data available within the detailed report, a more concerted effort by the institution to use the results for identifying strengths and weaknesses of the university would be a worthwhile endeavor. IDC initiated those conversations but the survey addresses many important aspects of faculty workload and perception and identifies potential issues that should be addressed. We hope our discussion will generate additional focus on the report.

#### **Discussion**

- The Senate discussed how to move forward on IDC's recommendations. Dr. Moorhead said this report serves as a wonderful baseline of information, both historical and current, and we should continue discussion on these issues.
  - Dr. Meigs said based on the survey, IDC discussed the lack of child care on campus and what it would take to make it a reality. It was pointed out that there had been initiatives in the past to try to make that happen and it died several times. He asked if it was the Senate's job to try to push forward a stance on this. Dr. Moorhead said that was a good question.
    - Dr. Frank said given that the semester is nearly over, this could be continuing work for the 2012-13 Senate.
  - Dr. Gant questioned why IDC received the survey results in late March if the survey was done over the summer and given to UNC Asheville in October.
    - Provost Fernandes said she did not know for sure. She gave it to IDC within six weeks of receiving it. We processed it as quickly as we could.

#### **VI. Academic Policies Committee Reports**

Mr. Rob Berls reported for the Academic Policies Committee.

Mr. Berls received comments about the documents for first reading and he encouraged senators to review them.

##### **First Reading [Unanimously Approved]**

APC 98: Change the Withdrawal Policy; Revise the entry under Academic Load

APC 99: Delete INTS 325, 345, 350

APC 101: Add new Asian Studies courses: ASIA 100, 101, 102, 201, 202, 301, 302, 303, 304

APC 102: Revisions to Asian Studies Minor description;  
Addition of courses to list of Asian Studies minor electives

##### **[APC approved: 2 to 1 vote]**

Mr. Berls said there was concern at APC about when this course would be offered as it is a gateway introductory course. A friendly amendment will be considered under second reading.

APC 100: Add new courses: INTS 201 and 301;

Add INTS 201 as option for intro course requirement in INTS concentration;

Add INTS 301 to the list of elective options in the International Studies concentration

##### **Second Reading [Unanimously approved by APC]**

APC 69: Change course descriptions and reduce credit hours for ACCT 301 and 302;  
Change course description for ACCT 416

APC 69 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 8412S.

APC 70: Delete ACCT 319 and replace it with ACCT 321 and 322

APC 70 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 8512S.

APC 71: Add new course, ACCT 200

APC 71 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 8512S.

APC 72: Add new courses, ACCT 341 and 411

APC 72 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 8612S.

APC 73: Change prerequisites for ACCT 320 and 340  
APC 73 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 8712S.

APC 74: Delete ACCT 330 and ACCT 412  
APC 74 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 8812S.

APC 75: Delete MGMT 325, 341, 381, 384, 482, 492  
APC 75 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 8912S.

APC 76: Add new courses, MGMT 343 and 361  
APC 76 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 9012S.

APC 77: Add new course, MGMT 201  
APC 77 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 9112S.

APC 78: Change description of MGMT 480; Add new course, MGMT 483  
 Delete MGMT 491; replace with MGMT 484  
APC 78 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 9212S.

APC 79: Change the title and course description for MGMT 489  
APC 79 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 9312S.

APC 80: Change prerequisite for MGMT 465  
APC80 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 9412S.

APC 81: Change prerequisites for MGMT courses  
APC81 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 9512S.

APC 82: Change description for Accounting major; Change requirements for Accounting major;  
 Remove Accounting concentrations  
APC82 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 9612S.

APC 83: Change requirements for the Accounting Minor  
APC83 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 9712S.

APC 84: Change requirements for declaring a Major in Management  
APC84 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 9812S.

APC 85: Change requirements for major in Management; Change courses within Management concentrations.  
APC85 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 9912S.

Dr. Burchard commented that the courses in APC 86, 87 and 92 are wonderful additions. She asked the Senate what its stand is in regard to new electives with the sustainability discourse on campus. The atmosphere has been that we cannot teach elective courses – we are only supposed to be teaching courses that are required.

Mr. Berls said the issue of the Curriculum Review Task Force dealing with sustainability has come up several times with colleagues. He has not received any guidelines so, as APC Chair, he has followed our standing procedures. Several of these courses have been 373s in the past and are coming up for 3-yr rotation. .

Dr. Schaffer added that APC considers the impact on resources when reviewing any proposal.

Dr. Ruppert said in some instances proposals address the strength of the faculty in the departments.

Dr. Frank said there is no intent to eliminate any electives that would be forthcoming from the Curriculum Review Task Force. There are specific guidelines in place and that is after a certain number of times a course is offered it must become a permanent record in the Catalog and departments should be able to produce a certain demand for the course can be offered. Those are two important guidelines and the task force is not about to change that.

APC 86: Add new course, EDUC 352, Introduction to West African Education  
 Add the course as an elective option in the Africana Studies minor  
APC86 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 10012S.

APC 87: Add new course, EDUC 346; Add EDUC 346 to 6-9, 9-12 and K-12 licensure requirements;  
Remove PSYC 100 from list of required courses for 6-9, 9-12 and K-12 licensure  
APC87 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 10112S.

APC 92: Add new course, ANTH 380, Zen Anthropology  
APC92 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 10212S.

APC 93: Change course descriptions for SPAN 110 and 120  
APC93 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 10312S.

APC 94: Add new course, SPAN 130, Spanish for Advanced Beginners  
APC94 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 10412S.

APC 95: Add SPAN 130 to the list of courses that will fulfill the Foreign Language requirement.  
Adjust the number of required hours for Foreign Language  
APC95 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 10512S.

APC 97: Remove EDUC 456 as an option for competency in Biology for teacher licensure students;  
Remove PHYS 131 as an option for upper-level Biology course in Concentration in  
General Biology for non-licensure students; Edit requirements for Biology with Teacher Licensure  
APC97 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 10612S.

**MINOR [Proposals considered to be minor by APC]**

APC 88: Change in prerequisites for PSYC 319  
APC88 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 10712S.

APC 89: Change course description for ARTH 484, Senior Research Seminar I to address oral and  
computer competencies  
APC89 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 10812S.

APC 91: Change course description for NM/CSCI 310 and NM/CSCI 410  
APC91 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 10912S.

**VII. Administrative Reports**

**Academic Affairs**

**QEP Update**

Mary Lynn Manns said that SACS was very impressed with our Quality Enhancement Plan and we are now moving forward with the plan. We will be finalizing the professional development for the first pilot group that will begin in May, will continue throughout the summer, and will be piloted in August.

The Senate gave Dr. Manns a round of applause for all of her work on the QEP these last two years. Dr. Manns said many people were involved in this project and she encouraged the Senate to thank everyone who worked on QEP. She said Lorena Russell will do a fabulous job on the implementation of the plan.

**SACS Update**

Bruce Larson said that out of the 100+ standards that we had to address we complied with all of them except for one. The one standard that we were not compliant with is of a relatively narrow focus and he is confident that by August 29, 2012, it will have been addressed successfully and then we will go on to the December annual meeting of SACS and we will be reaffirmed.

He thanked the Academic Policies Committee and the Faculty Senate. We would have had two recommendations had it not been for the actions taken in previous weeks. Roughly two and a half years ago the Provost gave him the opportunity to be involved in this work and one of the reasons he said yes was because he thought he would learn a lot more about our university. Indeed he did and it was uniformly positive. As he looks back over his experiences in working with the many people he had the honor to work with during that time, what has come through to him is how impressive we all are. The very interesting and supporting strengths that we have and what a joy it is to see people in their strengths and making use of them to their fullest. He thanked the Provost for giving him the opportunity to learn and he thanked the Faculty Senate for the work it has done directly and indirectly over the last two and a half years. "Thank you for allowing me to have an opportunity to use my strengths." The Senate gave Dr. Larson a hearty round of applause!

### **Discussion**

- Dr. Roig asked Dr. Larson to elaborate on the one standard in which we were not compliant.

Dr. Larson paraphrased Standard 3.5.4: Courses in a particular discipline will be taught by faculty in the discipline 25% of which has the terminal degree or its equivalent. The specific discipline that did not meet the standard is Accounting. In the 2010-2011 information that we provided, 18% of the discipline courses at that time were taught by people who had the terminal degree. We constructed the best argument that we could make in relation to the focus report. Basically the SACS on-site team reasserted that we were not in compliance with that particular standard. It is now the university administration's opportunity to develop a way forward to reach compliance with the particular standard. He has had some brief conversations with the chair of Management and Accountancy, Claudel McKenzie, and from his own perspective it is simply a matter of the terminal degree. In fact, when Dr. Love made his oral presentation at the brief exit conference last Thursday, he couched it in terms of not "an equivalent" but in terms of "terminal degree." The terminal degree was very important to our SACS on-site review team.

There is another standard 3.7.1 which answers the question: Is each individual faculty in a position to teach a particular course well? Basically, do you have the credentials to teach the course well – and we do in all of our courses throughout the university. It is not a question about the competence of any particular individual faculty member. It is simply a question of whether or not we meet that terminal degree standard with regard to the disciplines as a whole.

Dr. Larson explained the next stage: We have five months from March 29 to respond to the one standard that we did not comply with. He presumes that the university administration will want to respond to it.

### **Student Government**

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

- SGA hosted its annual Greenfest event this week. The main event was the clean-up of the 525 Broadway property we have acquired with over 150 students, staff and faculty volunteers.
- SGA has appointed an elections commissioner to look at the challenges we face and to try to rectify as many problems as possible so the in-coming freshmen elections in the fall will run more smoothly and we will have a more democratic process.

## **VIII. Old Business**

Dr. Burchard reminded Senators that FWDC said they would have a document to review by May regarding the proposed steps and timetable response to the Report on the Tenure and Reward System.

## **IX. New Business**

### **Security Cameras in Buildings**

Mr. Berls wanted the Senate to be aware that security cameras are being installed in almost all of the buildings this summer as a new security measure. He would like to ask Chief Boyce, or whoever is in charge of this installation, to report to this body so we know what is being implemented and how this is protecting us.

### **Untenured faculty**

Dr. Boudreaux said some time ago a letter circulated by the chairs of the Humanities division talking about whether untenured faculty should be allowed to chair important committees. FWDC did not want to say an untenured faculty member could not chair an important committee but, at the same time, these faculty members should know that they have a right of refusal.

Mr. Bowen said FWDC agreed that he, as chair of FWDC, would meet with the mentoring group and explain that right of refusal cannot be held against them – they have the right to say no. However this only addresses new faculty.

Dr. Kormanik said untenured faculty can chair a committee, but it would be good for FWDC to make a statement. We do not want to overburden our less than senior faculty and they should not feel pressured to chair a committee.

### **2012-13 Executive Committee**

Dr. Frank encouraged Senators on APC, IDC and FWDC to give some thought and share your perspective on the change in leadership before the next Senate meeting.

### **Retirement**

Dr. Frank announced that Sandra Gravely is retiring from the university effective June 1, after 28 years of service to the state of NC and 25 years as the administrative assistant to Faculty Senate. Senators gave Ms. Gravely a round of applause.

## **X. Adjourn**

Dr. Frank adjourned the meeting at 4:50pm.

Respectfully submitted by: Sandra Gravely  
Executive Committee