

University of North Carolina at Asheville
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Minutes, February 14, 2013 (3:15 pm)

Senate

Members: M. Burchard, S. Mills, T. Meigs, R. Bowen, D. Eggers, M. Galloway, E. Gant, B. Hook, S. Kaplan, G. Kormanik, C. McKnight, B. Miller, K. Ray, R. Roig, N. Ruppert B. Schaffer, S. Subramaniam; J. Fernandes.

Excused Absence: B. Hobby

Visitors: G. Ashburn, P. Catterfeld, E. Katz, J. Konz, K. Krumpe, P. McClellan, D. Race, H. Samuels, A. Shope

I. Call to Order, Introductions and Announcements

Women, Gender and Sexuality Studies student video:

Dr. Burchard announced a new tradition of beginning Faculty Senate meetings with celebratory news from our UNC Asheville community.

For this meeting, Dr. Burchard highlighted the Women, Gender and Sexuality Studies students who have made a video where students and alumni of the program talk about the accomplishments of their program and how useful their degrees are to the community. They are planning to make a short interview segment out of this for Youtube.

The students are making the video in response to the Governor's comments regarding Women and Gender Studies students.

Dr. Burchard believes that students and alumni should do more to spotlight our programs and showcase the great jobs our alumni have and how useful their liberal arts degrees have been in getting those wonderful jobs.

Curriculum Review Task Force: ([Curriculum Review Principals and Summary](#))

Representatives of the Curriculum Review Task Force are coming to the next Faculty Senate meeting (March 21, 3:15 p.m. in Ramsey Library's Red Oak Room). They are available to Faculty Senators for questions and discussion of the proposed revisions.

In preparation for this session, Dr. Burchard encourages everyone to review all the taskforce's documents including all the proposals and alternative proposals as well as the Moodle site's archive of documents.

II. Approval of Minutes

- [January 24, 2013 Faculty Senate Minutes](#)
Approved without dissent.

III. Student Government: Mr. Harry Samuels

[SGA Minutes from January 30, 2013](#)

Harry Samuels, Student Government Senator and Executive of Sustainability, is speaking today in place of the regular representative, President Ben Judge.

SGA is gearing up for Students' Elections that will be taking place in a few weeks.

In regards to the Strategic Plan, SGA has not met since its passage and has not had an opportunity

to gather feedback yet.

In regards to the Curriculum Review, students are generally in favor of the proposal, but some students express concern in regards to the Humanities and Natural Science requirements. Dr. Miller asked that specific details of the students' concerns in regards to the Curriculum Review be presented to the Faculty Senate at our March meeting. Dr. Miller relayed that it is important to the Faculty Senate to know what the students think.

IV. Executive Committee Report: Dr. Melissa Burchard

The Executive Committee Letter to President Ross:

(In response to the passage of the Strategic Plan)

Dr. Meigs mailed out to the Faculty Senate a letter that was one and a half pages, drawn up by the Executive Committee in conference with the Chancellor and the Provost. The Executive Committee discussed how the Faculty Senate could send a statement outlining certain points that are specific to UNC Asheville regarding the Strategic plan.

The Chancellor's advice was to send the letter to President Ross rather than to the Board of Governors who have already approved the strategic plan. The plan, now out of the hands of the Board of Governors, is beginning the implementation phase which is under the authority of President Ross.

The letter, as currently drafted, discusses three points:

- Preservation of the liberal arts mission of UNC Asheville
- Potential harm of a standardized core curriculum to the UNC Asheville's educational mission
- Maintenance of our promise to "offer multiple pathways to student learning" to the prospective college students of North Carolina

The Executive Committee sought the Faculty Senate's advice on how to proceed:

- Have a straight up and down vote to ratify this current document to send on the behalf of the Faculty Senate, or
- In interest of time, the Faculty Senate trusts the Executive Committee to rewrite the document given their suggestions. The letter remains an Executive Committee letter and will be signed by the Executive Committee's Faculty Senators.

Dr. Meigs welcomed suggestions.

Dr. Eggers likes and supports the letter. She suggests that the letter could be stronger with specific examples to back up the points as illustrated by the [Letter by the Chapel Hill Executive Committee to Governor McCrory](#).

Dr. Kaplan asked what we were seeking in our letter. From his reading of the letter, we are seeking that President Ross understands UNC Asheville's unique mission. However, in his view, the letter lacks actionable means of follow-up.

Dr. Meigs says the letter lets President Ross know what the faculty believes. The benefit of the letter gives the Chancellor or the Provost's arguments more impact in their work with the General Administration because the faculty have voiced a statement.

Dr. McKnight pointed out the reason our letter is addressed to President Ross rather than the governor is these are two different and separate issues which need to remain separate. Our letter is in response to the strategic plan itself not the governor's comments. The strategic plan has moved from the Board of Governors to the authority of President Ross for implementation. Chapel Hill's letter is responding to Governor McCrory's comments that he made on a radio program.

At this time, the consensus of the Faculty Senate is we do not send a copy of the letter to the governor nor send a separate letter to him. The Faculty Senate reserved the right at a later date to send a letter to the governor.

Dr. Ray, who watched President Ross speak on [North Carolina Now TV program](#) (UNC-TV), said President Ross did not talk about the uniform core curriculum but he emphasized seamless transfer from the community college into the UNC college system. Whether the uniform core curriculum and the seamless transfer from community college are different concepts, it is hard to make that out. However, we choose to err on the side of stating where we stand to President Ross as he is defining what they mean.

Dr. Miller suggested adding appropriate wording to say how the change to an uniform general education requirement system would be detrimental to the education of UNC Asheville students.

Dr. Galloway asked if there are historical precedents. She also asked if we need to apply for an exception or exemption. Are there procedures we should be aware to follow?

Dr. Fernandes has not heard of any application for exception.

Dr. Kormanik suggested that a Sense of the Senate Resolution motion is made to endorse the sending of a letter to President Ross with changes.

Dr. Meigs relayed that his priorities in sending a letter is to have as a good impact as possible on President Ross, seek proper input by faculty senators, and yet, get the letter to President Ross as soon as possible, preferably before Faculty Senate meets in March.

In light of the agreed urgency, Dr. Kormanik made a motion (Dr. Eggers seconded) to send a letter as a Sense of the Faculty Senate to President Ross, trust the judgment of the Executive Committee to write the letter and provide Faculty Senate with the final version of the letter. If Faculty Senators wish to provide input, they were instructed to forward their input to Dr. Meigs by Friday, February 15.

Motion Approved without Dissent.

Faculty Senate Chair's remarks regarding the passing of the strategic plan.

Dr. Burchard feels that the passing of the strategic plan has two major implications.

The first major implication is that the input from the Faculty Assembly and the system's faculty-at-large was essentially disregarded. This implication that should not be overlooked and should put faculty on their guard because it is another move in the direction of shrinking shared governance and lessening faculty power in general. Dr. Burchard finds these events very disconcerting and that faculty needs to be very aware of this trend.

The other major implication is that the faculty needs to be proactive in reviewing the strategic plan to seek out the opportunities which are a benefit to UNC Asheville as we enter the implementation phase.

Curriculum Review Task Force

Members of the Curriculum Review Task Force will be attending the Faculty Senate meeting in March. In preparation for that meeting, Dr. Burchard called attention to the Board of Governors' approved changes in January to the Policy on Monitoring Teacher Workload (400.3.4):

- [Old version 400.3.4](#)
- [Newly approved version 400.3.4](#)

Dr. Burchard had Ms. Sellers forward this to the Faculty Senate for many reasons:

- Dr. Burchard wants the Faculty Senate to be very aware that the Board of Governors is approving policies that weaken faculty control.
- If you compare the two documents, two important discussions have been removed: One on how to measure faculty workload as a whole and the other about why department chairs and deans are the appropriate persons to monitor and apportion faculty workload.
- Dr. Burchard wanted to bring the senators' attention to revisions that look to be a speed-up in their workload overall. The old document clearly puts teaching load in context as a major part of faculty workload as a whole, but as a part that can be amended when other instructional services or research responsibilities become more than "normal," whatever "normal" is. In the new document, these other parts of the workload are clearly considered as "in addition" to the teaching workload. As a result, the new document does not have any provision for course reduction in response to the overall workload. The older document's language speaks specifically of compensating for extra heavy workloads by reducing course loads. The new document speaks only of rewarding all aspects of faculty workload.

Dr. Burchard encourages the Faculty Senate to be proactive in becoming aware of what changes are being made at the Board of Governors and the General Administration level to discern the ways that make sense to our mission in order to conform to requirements without sacrificing our institutional values and the quality of our instruction.

Given the Curriculum Review Task Force is coming to our next meeting to talk about our curriculum review, Dr. Burchard hopes that the Faculty Senate prepares for that meeting by looking again at the CRTF documents.

Faculty Assembly

The Faculty Assembly Chair believes that letters to President Ross and petitions will still have some value. Dr. Burchard believes that writing to President Ross is something we can continue to do on an ongoing basis to keep UNC Asheville's unique mission before the General Administration and our interest in the governing policies.

Dr. Ray asked Provost Fernandes if she knows when President Ross will meet with the Chancellors regarding implementation of the strategic plan and how the faculty will know.

Provost Fernandes said that President Ross meets with the Chancellors approximately every two months either at Chapel Hill or via video conference. He has already met once with the Chancellors regarding the implementation of the strategic plan. Chancellor Ponder will inform us when she knows. Dr. Fernandes has a meeting on February 26 and 27 and she expects to hear then about the implementation. When Dr. Fernandes knows, she will tell the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Burchard said that Faculty Assembly meets next week and our representatives will let us know if we learn anything there.

Dr. Fernandes asked if Faculty Assembly ever heard why there was such an urgency to pass the strategic plan without taking two months to review all the input received. Dr. Burchard replied as far as she knows that the Faculty Assembly was never given a justification for the passage without consideration of the faculty's input. Dr. Fernandes said she has not heard nor understands why it was so urgent to pass the strategic plan.

Dr. Ray said that President Ross said that he wanted a strategic plan in place to share with the

new legislature. President Ross said that normally strategic plans are put together quietly through the staff. When UNC Tomorrow was put together, there was a broad discussion across the state about what should be included and so President Ross understands why there might be frustration around this strategic plan passage in light of how UNC Tomorrow was put together.

V. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee Report: Mr. Rob Bowen

First Reading

[FWDC 4 / IDC 2](#): Program Procedure Changes ([Faculty Handbook 5.4.2 Program Changes](#))
Document Implements [SD0512F \(IDC 1\)](#)

Tenure, Reward and Promotion Documents.

FWDC has completed their version of Section 3 of the Handbook which includes Faculty promotion, tenure, evaluation, scholarship, service and engagement. FWDC has submitted it to the Provost's Cabinet Counsel for commentary, and as soon as they get that back, they will see what changes they have to make to that document before it comes to the senate. The intention right now is to have it on the senate agenda for first reading in March. This gives them time to pass it.

Mr. Bowen brought FWDC 4 to the attention of the Faculty Senate and said that there will be another document following this one fairly soon. That document will be the procedure dealing with certifications.

Faculty Elections: [Timeline](#)

Dr. Roig reported that one Faculty Committee election is going on now: the Committee of Tenured Faculty. At 2:30 p.m. today, there had been 116 votes cast from a registration of 207 eligible voters. He does not have records of past elections to know whether this is typical or atypical voter turnout.

Nominations are closed for the Faculty Senate and the Post Tenure Review (PTR) elections. He has only 5 nominations for Faculty Senate. For PTR, he has 3 nominations, all from the Social Science and none from the Humanities. This year there will not be an election for Natural Science representation for both positions are filled.

Constitutional Issue

Dr. Roig also brought up that issues with this year's elections suggest it is time to review and amend the Faculty Senate Constitution. The two major issues were noted where more precise wording is needed:

- Eligibility for voting
- Practice/Process of Annual Faculty Elections

For the changes to the Constitution, FWDC will work out general wording for elections to avoid the need for future amending of the Constitution. The detailed procedures for running the election will be moved to the Faculty Handbook. Mr. Bowen concurred saying the Constitution ratification process does not allow for the quick changes needed to policies and procedures.

Questions/Discussion:

Dr. Meigs asked about a faculty member who is ineligible to vote because of a past Family Leave Factor. He asked how hard it would be to have a provision for this faculty member be eligible to vote.

Dr. Roig said that the Faculty Handbook says the Executive Committee has the right to determine all eligibility issues. Dr. Roig is only aware of one currently ineligible faculty member due to those criteria. He feels this situation could be presented to the Executive Committee and they could put the faculty member back on the eligible voting list. Dr. Meigs asked the Faculty Senate Chair and the other Executive Committee members for a ruling.

The Faculty Senate Secretary confirmed this was an Executive Committee call (See [Faculty Handbook 10.2.1 Election Procedures](#) in the last sentence of paragraph 2). Dr. Burchard asked the Executive Committee members if they saw any reason for not allowing someone to vote in current elections who was on Family Medical Leave but is now currently working. All Executive Committee members did not have an objection. Hearing no objections, Dr. Burchard, on behalf of Executive Committee, told Dr. Roig that this person is eligible to vote.

VII. Institutional Development Committee/University Planning Council Reports: Dr. Ted Meigs

UPC Meeting Highlights: [UPC January 30, 2013 Minutes](#)

Dr. Meigs gave the highlights of the UPC January meeting:

- From the Chancellor's briefing, it was reported that it has been four years since the last BOG-required Chancellor Evaluation. This process will be completed before June 30. The evaluation will be a combination of surveys, interviews and focus groups.
- Chancellor Ponder closed by noting that media-inflated rumors about the loss of tenure in UNC do not match the substance of actual Board of Governors conversations.
- Seventeen members of the Advancement Staff attended the UPC meeting. It was noted that 87% of the Advancement staff are either new to UNC Asheville or in a new role at the University. They have achieved 81.2% of the fundraising goal of four million dollars. They also have a goal to raise \$300,000 for scholarships.
- Concerned about the rising costs for students to attend UNC Asheville, IDC learned that a health insurance premium costs \$1,400.00 annually in addition to a \$300.00 deductible. Before 2012, premiums were half at \$700. That is a major hit and IDC wants to keep an eye on that situation for there are 1,000 UNC Asheville students enrolled in that plan.

IDC Business from their February 7th meeting:

FWDC 4/IDC 2

FWDC and IDC have been working together to get ready the documents for the Faculty Handbook in order to implement IDC 1 ([SD0512F](#)).

FWDC 6

A document will be coming to the Faculty Senate as FWDC 6 regarding other items in relation to certificates. Archer Gravely found a Chapel Hill document that IDC decided to review first before bringing FWDC 6 up for First Reading.

Additional Meeting with STAMATS

STAMATS are the survey contractors that the UNC Asheville Board of Trustees asked to put together a survey to engage opinions on the potential development of graduate programs at UNC Asheville. IDC met with STAMATS for a second time after the initial meeting to gather information from them about their techniques for getting people to respond. STAMATS said the survey would be in

the form of an email. A letter from the administration would precede the email to give people a heads up to this survey.

They are going to look at five different groups: attending students, faculty, staff, alumni and the community. IDC asked to know who in the community would receive the survey.

IDC also asked that the survey questions be balanced. For example, if they ask about which departments or programs would a graduate program be beneficial, they should counterbalance with a question asking from which departments or programs would a graduate program be problematic or deleterious. IDC wants the survey to be a fair representation of views. STAMATS emphasized their role is primarily to gauge need and interest. STAMATS said they would provide detailed descriptions of how other universities are performing who have undertaken similar transitions to various graduate programs.

They also asked that STAMATS let IDC look at the survey instrument before it goes out which should be soon for the project completion date was March 29. Dr. Meigs will distribute what he receives to the entire Faculty Senate.

[The 2012 National Survey of Student Engagement \(NSSE\) results](#)

Upon review and discussion of the enrollment reports from Archer Gravelly, IDC is putting together a document of recommendations for curriculum review based on the topics discussed in the NSSE survey.

VIII. Academic Policies Committee Report: Dr. Sophie Mills

Dr. Mills said APC has not met yet this semester so there are not any Second Reading documents. APC will meet next Thursday.

First Reading

- [APC 38:](#) Change the title and description of PHIL 313
- [APC 39:](#) Change of the opening narrative of Philosophy Department
- [APC 40:](#) Change the demonstration of competency in Philosophy
- [APC 41:](#) Remove computer competency requirement from Biology, Classics, Computer Science, Drama, Economics, Environmental Studies, Health and Wellness, Management, Physics, Political Science, Psychology, Religious Studies, Sociology and Anthropology; [Appendix A](#)
- [APC 42:](#) Change title and description of EDUC 314
- [APC 43:](#) Change description of EDUC 456
- [APC 44:](#) Delete the following MCOM courses: 301, 302, 304, 313, 327, 329, 341, 343, 346, 351, 353, 367, 369, 380, 382, 387, 388, 390, 421, 460, 482, 483, 484, 497, 498;

Delete the following VMP courses: 303, 307, 331, 359, 385, 437, 493
- [APC 45:](#) Add new courses: MCOM 295, 395 and 495, and VMP 295, 395 and 495
- [APC 46:](#) Change credit hours and description of MCOM 104;
Change title, credit hours and description of MCOM 201;
Change credit hours and description of MCOM 451;
Change credit hours and description of MCOM 490;
Change credit hours and description of MCOM 492;
Change credit hours and description of VMP 205

- [APC 47:](#) Change the major and minor requirements for Mass Communication, and the process for declaring a major in Mass Communication
[MCOM Timeline for completing the Major](#)
- [APC 48:](#) Moving to Four (4) Digit Course Numbers
- [APC 49:](#) Change in the Academic Standing Policy: Academic Warning, Suspension, and Dismissal

Dr. Mills presented the documents up for First Reading and highlighted the MCOM documents not as a matter of concern but of the interest in the streamlining from an old curriculum to a new curriculum where all courses are four credit hours, which like the curriculum reform, might be quite an interesting exercise. There are two documents for consideration with quite broad implications across the curriculum: APC 48 and APC 49.

APC 48 is a document about moving from three digit course numbers to four digit course numbers. Apparently, some departments have nearly run out of numbers so this number apocalypse needs to be corrected. Dr. Kaplan said that the Math Department assures that there are plenty more numbers available.

APC 49 is possibly the most significant document as it changes policies for suspension, dismissal and academic warning. APC 49 tries to align our policies with the policies of Financial Aid.

Questions/Discussion:

Dr. Roig noted that there is a stampede to remove Computer Competency from the majors when in this day and age Computer Competency is of major importance. Dr. McKnight said that is the deal: it is so inherent to education that you do not need to ask whether you can use a computer any more when you come to the end of the program.

Dr. Miller added that he is not worried about students' computer competency as much as he is worried that students do not know how to add, subtract and multiply, and he is very serious about that. Dr. Ray and Dr. Meigs brought up that on the NSSE survey that our seniors scored low on the quantitative (in other words the seniors do not feel they have received a good experience in that area). Dr. Meigs says it is good that they have this insight.

Dr. Burchard had a question about APC 49. Dr. Burchard understands the strategic plan that was just passed talked about standardizing academic standing. Has APC 49 been checked for alignment with the strategic plan? Dr. Miills said she believes that Ms. McClellan has coordinated this. Ms. McClellan said there will be other proposals coming through to get UNC Asheville in alignment with the strategic plan. She believes all the policies to assess academic policies and recommendations of policy set very clear expectations that students are going to graduate and we will help them get there. The students will not be able to fail or repeat courses easily.

IX. Administrative Reports - Dr. Jane Fernandes

Dr. Fernandes had one update about the Board of Governors' ongoing tutorial relating to tenure. She was asked to name a representative for the tutorial on post-tenure review. Dr. Bill Miller will be representing UNC Asheville at the Board of Governors' April 11th meeting. Provost Fernandes knows Dr. Miller will do a great job because he has been a long-standing chair of the Post-Tenure Review Committee and has been on the Committee of Tenured Faculty. She is sure he will update us on how that goes.

Dr. Fernandes will keep Faculty Senate informed when she returns from the CAO meeting at the

end of February regarding the Strategic Plan implementation.

XI. Old Business

Dr. Hook has been reading [the Strategic Plan](#) and on pages 104 and 105 he noticed two interesting charts. One shows the five-year history of spending per degree. Over the entire system, there has been a 12.1% decrease in spending per degree. Only three schools had an increase in spending and UNC Asheville was one of them. We have the second highest increase of 9.3% of spending per degree. Dr. Hook is not particularly concerned, but he is interested in knowing why. Dr. Hook is interested in knowing how they have gone down and we have gone up. Have they done it entirely by tuition increases?

Dr. Meigs offered that we have historically had salaries that are behind the other institutions and maybe UNC Asheville getting caught up has been a factor in those figures.

Dr. Hook says that they state that they include spending on instruction and student services, academic support, institutional support, and operation and maintenance of the physical plant. Dr. Hook would like to know at the next Faculty Senate Meeting specifically why UNC Asheville has increased so much compared to the other institutions. The only institution that has went up that much was Elizabeth City State and they went up 12.7% per degree.

The other chart shows a five-year history of a number of degrees produced and we have the smallest increase in degrees produced 1.1% whereas overall the system is graduating 17.5% more degrees over five years.

Dr. Hook is also concerned about our own curriculum review where we are just now getting representatives to come to us in March. Dr. Hook himself feels this process is slow and he does not know where we stand and what the timeline is.

Dr. Burchard said that the timeline is that documents will not be able to go through on the curriculum review until next year. Dr. Ray stated that it was understood from the beginning of the CRTF work that changes would not be in operation until FALL 2014.

Dr. Fernandes is under the impression that there will not be changes from the curriculum review next year and that nothing happens until the following year, if anything, because we haven't decided yet.

Dr. Hook said that the process needs to be made clear.

Dr. Burchard reminded Faculty Senate that she asked the CRTF to come in the fall and they said they were not ready. March is as soon as they have told Dr. Burchard they are ready.

Dr. Burchard hopes that when CRTF comes that they will be able to answer these questions for us. Many members of the Senate expressed that it is highly advisable that they do answer these questions.

In order to be fair to Dr. Frank and the task force, Dr. Kormanik suggested to Dr. Burchard that she gives the task force the list of questions the task force is expected to have answers for the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Subramaniam expressed that he feels what Dr. Hook is eluding to is the sense of the unease among the rank of the faculty due to the process to have the "credibility stamp" put on there. He believes Faculty Senate needs to have some conversation around that.

Dr. Kormanik said that Dr. Mills may be able to speak to that but his understanding is a document no matter how it is generated will go to APC and Faculty Senate for approval. That is the official process APC, Faculty Senate and administration.

Dr. Mills reported that CRTF is meeting next Thursday to probably work on the process [meeting was cancelled].

Dr. Mills said that there is a possibility of an up or down faculty-at-large vote. That is what is unclear and Dr. Mills has asked for clarification and so far she has not received it.

Dr. Subramaniam asked if we do that, then how we would do it. Do we have processes in place for us to draw from or do we need to discuss this and decide?

Dr. Kormanik said his position is that may be up to the CRTF internally to figure that out. However, the formal process is APC, Faculty Senate and then on to the administration.

Dr. Subramaniam said he does not think his position is the same as Dr. Mills' view. He wonders where is the proper authority to determine how to gather the faculty-at-large consensus. If there is the possibility of a full faculty vote on this, where would the procedures come? Why not have Faculty Senate creating those procedures?

Dr. Kormanik said there are procedures for the faculty as a whole to consider issues as specified in the handbook.

Dr. Meigs said that he believes the Faculty Handbook has a provision that if the faculty does not like a vote of Faculty Senate, they can flip with a certain percentage vote. It is not clear to him how they mobilize to do that, but they can do that.

Dr. Roig asked when ILS was implemented what was the process. Was that just APC and then Faculty Senate?

Dr. Mills confirmed that was the process, but she noted that ILS process was such a different process where there were endless consultations with faculty and a different model. Dr. Mills believes in this case that the model process used to pass the ILS would not be wise. She believes all members of the faculty need to have a chance to have a say and think about all the implications before putting the proposal through such a narrow channel. She doesn't know if that would be an appropriate model.

Dr. Hook agreed that that is the issue, that this process has been going through this narrow committee for so long and now there is talk about taking it to the faculty as a whole for an up and down vote which is not how academic decisions are to be made.

Dr. Miller asked is it an up and down vote or a sense of the faculty as a whole? Dr. Hook said that is the issue - we do not know any of this.

Dr. Katz recalled the details from when he was part of the curriculum review process. When he was part of that process, the committee had two APC members on the committee who would be writing up the documents over the summer. Then it went to APC as a whole and from there to the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Burchard shared that when she talked with Dr. Frank that he asked her if it should come to APC or Faculty Senate. She told him that she did not feel it was time to take it to APC but she was not comfortable at all with Faculty Senate doing an ad hoc vote on the proposal. Her understanding is they will be bringing the proposal to Faculty Senate for discussion and questions purposes only in March. At that time, Faculty Senate will not be voting on it.

Dr. Burchard said that CRTF will be here in March and to prepare for a slightly longer meeting. Dr. Burchard encourages the Faculty Senators to gather a sense from the faculty around them what they think and their concerns that would be useful to our discussion.

XII. New Business

No New Business.

XIII. Adjourn

Dr. Burchard adjourned the meeting at 5:00pm

Respectfully submitted by: Lisa Sellers
Executive Committee