

**University of North Carolina at Asheville**  
**FACULTY SENATE MEETING**  
**Minutes, March 21, 2013 (3:15 pm)**

Senate

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

Excused

Absence: R. Bowen

Visitors: G. Ashburn, P. Catterfeld, V. Frank, L. Friedenber, A. Hantz, E. Katz, J. Konz, K. Krump, K. Maitra,  
P. McClellan, D. Race, H. Samuels, A. Shope

**I. Call to Order, Introductions and Announcements**

[Batman and Psychology: A Dark and Stormy Knight:](#)

Dr. Burchard called the Faculty Senate Meeting to order with a celebratory news item. She highlighted the "Batman" talk given by Dr. Travis Langley of Henderson State University. Dr. Langley probed the psychology behind this iconic hero considering whether he has a mental illness and is as insane as his foes.

This talk was sponsored by UNC Asheville's Psychology Club, the university's Psi Chi national honor society chapter and the Department of Psychology. It was free and open to the public.

**II. Approval of Minutes:**

- [February 14, 2013 Faculty Senate Minutes](#)  
Approved without dissent.

**III. Executive Committee Report: Dr. Melissa Burchard**

Student Government.

- [SGA Response to the CRTF proposal](#)
- [SGA Meeting Minutes February 6, 2013 \(02.06.13\)](#)
- [SGA Meeting Minutes February 13, 2013 \(02.13.13\)](#)
- [SGA Meeting Minutes February 20, 2013 \(02.20.13\)](#)
- [SGA Meeting Minutes February 27, 2013 \(02.27.13 -- not passed yet\)](#)
- [SGA Legislation and Minutes archive](#)

No one was present to give the Faculty Senate an update. The above links serve as an update of SGA activities.

Faculty Assembly.

[Faculty Advisory Committee on Strategic Directions Implementation \(FAC-SDI\)](#)

FAC-SDI is the group of faculty drawn from all of the campuses to work on implementing the Strategic Plan. This recently passed Strategic Plan is of great concern to faculty and administrators across the UNC system.

Response from UNC President Tom Ross to the UNC-Asheville Faculty Senate's letter.  
Faculty Senate Executive Committee's Letter to President Ross dated February 22, 2013  
President Tom Ross' Response letter dated February 26, 2013

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate sent President Tom Ross a letter, dated February 22, 2013, highlighting its concerns regarding the UNC system's Strategic Plan. The Executive Committee has received a reply from President Ross, which Dr. Burchard read to the Faculty Senate (see links above for the letter and Ross's response).

Dr. Burchard said this is a lovely letter; however, she is still concerned due to proposed budget cuts to the UNC system. She said this is a very positive statement from Tom Ross in support of UNC Asheville and its mission.

Dr. Meigs asked that the documents be made available to the entire campus community. The Faculty Senate agreed that these documents should be made available. You may find these documents on the Faculty Senate's website homepage. Both documents are marked "NEW" items:  
[www.unca.edu/facultysenate](http://www.unca.edu/facultysenate).

#### **IV. Update from Chancellor Anne Ponder**

Chancellor Ponder had five topics to bring before the Faculty Senate.

The Chancellor's fourth year evaluation. Since this is Chancellor's eighth year, this is her second evaluation. She knows the campus community has received communication from the Chair of the Board of Trustees, the Vice Chair of the Board (who is Chair of the Evaluation Committee), and the consultant who works with us on the process.

Jim Woodward is the same consultant used four years ago. Jim was the long-serving Chancellor at UNC Charlotte. He served as an interim chancellor at NC State. He also has done other chancellor evaluations including the ones at NC State and UNC Charlotte. At the invitation of the Board of Governors, he is also the author of a study on avoiding duplication of offerings in the system. That is a demonstration of his acumen and his diplomacy which will be helpful for us as we navigate our future.

The Chancellor encourages the faculty and staff to take the time to fill out the survey. The survey is organized in a technological way and is entirely anonymous. The information sent is received by Jim Woodward only in aggregation. He uses the survey responses to identify themes for discussion. Later this semester, Jim will come and meet with many members of the UNC Asheville campus.

After the survey is completed, a series of meetings are held: one between Jim and the Chancellor, one between Jim and the Chair of the Evaluation Committee, and a special meeting of the Board of Trustees. The final conversation is with President Ross, a member of the Board of Governors assigned by the Chair of the Board, the Chair of the Evaluation Committee, the Chair of the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor.

This is Chancellor Ponder's opportunity for significant self-reflection. It is an opportunity for the UNC Asheville community to advise Chancellor Ponder on how to be a more effective chancellor than she is now. She invites all to take that responsibility seriously as she certainly does so she can learn from the evaluation.

She asked if there are questions. There were no questions.

The UNC Asheville Community will hear the results of the survey at the beginning of the next school year for it takes the staff the entire summer to process all of them.

Praise for the Faculty. The Chancellor wants to reiterate her gratitude and praise for the faculty. The Chancellor praised the faculty's splendid dedication and their adventurousness. She said their work in the classroom and their brilliance is what makes UNC Asheville really special. She wants the entire

faculty to know that they are the envy of not only the state but of higher education. She wants to be sure that the faculty knows her gratitude and praise.

Praise for the Curriculum Review Task Force. The Chancellor praised the faculty who has worked on the curriculum revision over the last couple of years. Though the results at this point may not be the perfection imagined or the curriculum utopia, it is terrific work. The construction and the coherence of what the faculty have designed and negotiated in an intertwined way is something that Chancellor Ponder admires.

During her last update, the Chancellor said she does not trust anybody more than she trusts this faculty to create the curriculum we ought to offer. She has read the most recent rationale that was circulated a few days ago and she thought that it was well-argued and expressed.

She urges the faculty, as she has had in the past, to move forward when they can and as quickly as they can because of the importance of the coherence of our curriculum. The curriculum review is even more important now than it was a couple years ago when this process began due to two challenges.

Inside the university, we have endured cuts that made the current curriculum unsustainable for faculty, and it is not simple enough for students to navigate in a good and coherent way. The pressures of the past and present have raised the stakes for a streamlined but coherent curriculum. This is the internal challenge with which the entire faculty is too familiar.

The second challenge is an external one. Despite President Ross' very genuine endorsement our mission in his response letter, there are conversations at General Administration that tend to fragment or fracture an understanding of a curriculum as if it can be parted out. That is simply not the coherent shape of our curriculum because the design of our learning outcomes is intertwined and exists through all of the work that we do together. It is that coherence that will be needed for defensive purposes in the days ahead.

Specifically, there is formidable conversation about course equivalence or course transfer. Dr. Fernandes and the Chancellor have been very articulate about warning the General Administration of the dangers. They have talked about the dangers of homogeneity and how an efficient and consistent set of offerings in the university system is not to be perceived an actual component to quality. We think a common core curriculum is a bad idea for everybody, but it is especially a bad idea for us.

In the weeks and months ahead, Chancellor Ponder believes UNC Asheville will be at a stage to say to our critics and our opponents that we just finished a curriculum revision, and the authority for creating that curriculum belongs to our faculty right here.

That is why we need the completion of this excellent curriculum work and she urges the faculty to do that.

A Call to Advocate for UNC Asheville's Mission and Liberal Arts Curriculum. The Chancellor asks the faculty to advocate with her in the coming months as we navigate the external circumstances, especially at the General Administration – especially as the UNC System implements the strategic directions section on quality and efficiencies.

She is hoping we will be able to navigate those in good faith that leaves us with our special mission, a coherent curriculum and the unambiguous authority for this campus to do what it must do in terms of curriculum. We know best what our students need to learn and understand in terms of outcomes. Our performance is demonstrable and we have the evidence for all to see that we actually put together a curriculum that is effective. She will advocate for these ways at a drop of a hat.

The Chancellor had not heard of President Ross' response until now and would like to receive a copy because there are some useful quotations that she feels will be valuable in the coming days.

At the moment, she does not know what we may need to do. We may need to write letters, some of the faculty may need to come advocate with Dr. Fernandes and the Chancellor, we may need to hold

teach-ins in the General Administration lobby until the Vice President for Academic Affairs understands – the Provost proclaims, “I will be there!” The Chancellor acknowledges Dr. Fernandes as a brilliant and articulate advocate and just as tough as the faculty would want her to be.

The Chancellor seeks the faculty’s alignment and asks that they be ready to continue to talk regularly and to come if the Provost or the Chancellor asks them. They need the faculty’s presence, alignment, and voice behind our curriculum and our mission – she wants the faculty to be with her and she will be with the faculty.

**Questions:**

Dr. Hook asked what ideas the Chancellor has for ways to influence this process that is currently underway. Chancellor Ponder said there are two processes that are going on and they are monitoring them very closely at this point, and she would ask the faculty to monitor them also. The two processes have to do with identifying transferability of specific courses. One process is the transfer of courses from our campus back to the community colleges and the other process is transferring courses from the community colleges to our campus. She can imagine there are course by course alignments, but the report of these earliest conversations about that alignment does not match with the reports from the individuals who attended on the behalf of UNC Asheville. As a result, Chancellor Ponder is very skeptical that the structure will serve us well.

She suspects that the next group to go may meet in consultation with those who have already been and with the provost to consider an edgier participation that says “no” more frequently than “yes.”

The other study that is underway is attempting to identify a common 30 hour course and a common 60 hour course of general education. The Chancellor said that the concept of general education is something we are really good at and we actually know what that is. They are monitoring this study as well. She predicts this common general education core will not be a good idea at all for any of the UNC institutions. This is certainly not a good idea for UNC Asheville and we decline to have this apply. This is where she may need the faculty to be in the lobby of the General Administration to teach whoever comes by why that is so.

The Chancellor will know more after the next Board of Governors’ meeting which is April 11 and 12. Dr. Fernandes will be there, and Dr. Bill Miller will be there talking about post tenure review, as well as others. If the Chancellor is not heartened at that point, these issues may require the attention of the faculty after the end of the school year as the next Board of Governors’ meeting in June approaches.

Dr. Fernandes has briefed the department and program chairs on this topic and she already has talked with Ted Meigs who is the Vice Chair of the University Planning Council. This will be a topic at the next UPC meeting in the middle of next week.

She doesn’t know which tactics to recommend as the most effective at this time, but she does request alignment and forcefulness once a decision is made.

The Governor’s Budget. Although, the governor’s budget overall is not favorable for UNC Asheville and the UNC system, UNC Asheville was recognized significantly in the Board of Governors’ priorities where their budget did feature us both specifically as well as generally. In particular, there was a special mission appropriation of recurring dollars identified in the Board of Governors’ priorities. We know we have some friends on the Board of Governors and some interested members of the legislature who would like to make that happen for us.

The Chancellor wanted to remind the faculty where we are in the process. The proposed Governor’s budget is just that – a proposal. There are more steps to the process of which we will work both through the General Administration, the Board of Governors and with our friends in the legislature.

The Chancellor believes that the letter that the Faculty Senate sent to President Ross was a very important element in continuing to make our argument. She is grateful for it. She is very pleased that

President Ross has declared support for us. She will keep us updated. She imagines that right after the April Board of Governors' meeting that we will know more and she will hold a Chancellor's Briefing where faculty and staff are invited to hear an update.

The Chancellor said that the Faculty Senate does not have to take action; however, the Chancellor asked, if we need to fight, will Faculty Senate fight with her.

Faculty Senate responded yes.

**Questions:**

Dr. Mills asked if action is too premature and should we wait to see how things transpire.

Chancellor Ponder said she needs to know more about what happened in the Disciplinary Panel Reviews. The Provost and her folks need to tell us whether we need to start adapting tactically in the meantime. Nothing will get significantly worse until after the next Board of Governors' meeting. Dr. Fernandes may have more insights or a different answer to Sophie's question.

Provost Fernandes said there will be a meeting tomorrow. She does know that many faculty members who were part of the panels told the Provost that they did cast a vote; however, that vote was not reflected in the results that the Provost received. All the faculty came back from the disciplinary panels and reported that they did not accept a particular course or they accepted that course with several caveats; for example, only if it was part of a cluster. None gave blanket acceptance; the nuances were not reported. They were all reported as "Yes." She believes all five of them said the same thing. Those who were on these first panels do have their notes and the papers they signed so we do have evidence prepared. Since nothing is going to change before the next Board of Governors' meeting, there is time to monitor the situation before deciding how to proceed.

Provost Fernandes also relayed that the General Administration has hired a new person called the Director of Reverse Transfer. She met her at the CAO meeting. Dr. Fernandes went to the website to find out what her job is specifically. The website explained a situation of a transfer student taking four courses from a community college (such as AB-Tech) who then transfers to a university (such as UNC Asheville). Upon completing 45 hours at UNC Asheville for a total of 60 hours combined from both A-B Tech and UNC Asheville, that student will receive an AA degree from AB-Tech. If that is not called a homogeneous curriculum, Dr. Fernandes does not know what would be. This is not what our curriculum is about. All the pieces of our curriculum fit together with integrity. It is not to be broken down in parts where some things count for some students and but don't count for others. President Ross seems to believe he is not doing that, but everything that they are doing leads to a homogeneous curriculum.

The Chancellor is heartened and appreciative of the faculty's support and she believes that this is a challenge that UNC Asheville must oppose and prevail. She leaves this for the Faculty Senate and the Provost to determine the next best step.

Dr. Meigs wanted to emphasize that we are in two battles here. One battle is UNC Asheville's personal battle to make sure that we are exempted from implementing a homogeneous curriculum. Also we are in a battle together with the entire UNC System to avoid the system from being wrecked. We are in a tricky position where we have to defend our right to do things here, but we also advocate with our fellow UNC institutions. The Chancellor agreed and expressed that if we do not advocate for ourselves, no one else will do it for us.

The Chancellor concluded with a wish that her future visits to Faculty Senate will be happier. She knew she could rely on the Faculty Senate's support. The strength of our campus is its clarity. Our united voice will make us even stronger and she said it is a great honor to be affiliated with you. Thank you.

[Curriculum Review Task Force: Dr. Volker Frank](#)  
[Curriculum Review Principals and Summary](#)  
[Rationale Statement](#)

Dr. Frank thanked the Faculty Senate for the invitation to speak on behalf of the Curriculum Review Task Force.

The Curriculum Review Task Force (CRTF) had a meeting today where they took a look at the additional proposals and feedback that were submitted since the proposal was released last December. In the meantime, they have held campus listening meetings. Today was the first time the task force has met since releasing the proposal. Their goal today was to finalize the crafting of the proposal. The meeting was constructive in that they made decisions concerning which proposals to integrate into the current proposal.

Dr. Frank said he could go into details but he would prefer not to since not all task force members could be at today's meeting. If it is okay with the Faculty Senate, he would like the task force to find out first what they decided and then share the final proposal with the entire campus.

CRTF will meet one more time because there is one more issue that has not been resolved. The Humanities do not enjoy unanimous CRTF support as other items have. The issue is whether they retain the Humanities at 8-12 hours or 12-16 hours and how to incorporate into a full proposal so that one proposal is presented.

The implementation phase was briefly discussed today. Dr. Bahls and Dr. Frank had met with the Executive Committee and APC the past month and talked about implementation. They are keenly aware that right now we have to still deliver the current curriculum as well as implement the new curriculum, if approved. A way must be provided to migrate from one curriculum to the other. Dr. Frank concluded that this is a curriculum of the faculty, by the faculty, and for the faculty and our students – if there is a will, there is a way...

**Questions:**

Dr. Hook asked how Dr. Frank envisions the rest of the process going forward including how to present to the campus, APC and the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Frank said implementation will be on the task force's agenda for their next meeting. It is obvious to everyone that it has to be presented to the campus for approval so they will talk about how we wish to do that. Dr. Frank is confident this semester that the task force can present to the campus a proposal in its final version and ask the campus for its approval: either approve or reject an up or down vote.

Dr. Mills asked for clarification for she said this sounds different than what was agreed upon in Executive Committee and APC. She thought it would be a survey to get the general opinion of faculty. She asked if she misunderstood.

A discussion on the helpfulness of a campus-wide faculty survey of the final proposal. Dr. Frank expressed concern that a survey would allow faculty to tear the proposal apart.

Dr. Burchard expressed her understanding is the Executive Committee was not proposing a vote so there wouldn't be any question of the campus tearing apart the proposal. What the Executive Committee proposed is asking faculty for their input with regard to the different pieces. She is not sure why Dr. Frank would think that would happen.

Dr. Meigs explained that a survey would allow the Faculty Senate to know which aspects are overwhelmingly viewed as a problem. Now that said, Dr. Meigs urges everyone on campus to read the documents that the task force has put out. When you read these documents, Dr. Meigs said that you will get a feel for the careful consideration and thought that has gone into the process. Upon reading these carefully, the faculty will see how deeply the process was turned over by the task force. After reading the

documents, the survey would let the Faculty Senate know the major problems that many faculty and departments find which he believes Faculty Senate should know.

Dr. Frank thanked Dr. Meigs and he said that the task force meets next week and will see where we go from there. He admits he may be wrong and the task force would welcome a survey as Faculty Senate wishes. Either way the implementation unfolds, Dr. Frank believes we will have accomplished a lot by the end of the semester.

Dr. Hobby, who is on the task force, is wondering if the Faculty Senate could discuss putting out a survey at this meeting. Dr. Hobby feels that once the final proposal is distributed that it would be great for Faculty Senate to debate the document as well as poll the faculty. One of the things they talked about at the CRTF meeting today was getting the faculty all to vote and have open-ended feedback so CRTF could see where there would be problems. From what he heard in the meeting, he doesn't think that the task force and the Faculty Senate are that far apart from how to proceed.

Dr. Kormanik wanted to add to the discussion that he doesn't think (he admits that he may have misheard Dr. Frank) that the Faculty Senate is going to have a whole proposal to vote on this year obviously because it has to be tweaked into form that APC and the Faculty Senate can then handle.

There are places that could be implemented before the end of the year. For example, the Faculty Senate could very quickly have an effect by theoretically saying no 379s. An APC document could pass which would relieve workload from not having to establish these courses for next year.

Dr. Kormanik also raised concerns regarding the straw poll for every decision to put something in the final proposal means that something has to give or come out. When considering the proposal, faculty has to consider the whole package and understand it has to balance out. The whole package has to fit together in an integrated form.

Dr. Kormanik is for gathering all the information that Faculty Senate can but he believes that Dr. Frank and the task force has done a yeoman's job of getting as much input as they can.

Dr. Mills just wanted to add that she thinks a survey would be helpful to encourage the faculty to read the documents. She thinks that would be a productive way forward and give us the general sense of the faculty.

Dr. Meigs thinks the key is to be swift. If we are going to try to gather information, then we need to do it quickly.

Dr. Mills also added for that to happen we need a final proposal from CRTF.

Dr. Roig offered that one approach is to distribute the survey with the final proposal with the survey. To get to the heart of the issues, the survey would have open-ended questions which ask, "Are there items in this package as a whole that would cause you to vote down the whole package?"

Dr. Hobby said that was exactly what the CRTF discussed today in exactly those words.

Dr. Roig said that Dr. Kormanik is right that it is a whole package and we can argue about the number of sciences and whether we should have Health and Wellness and etc. Unless we know those particular issues are such that that someone would vote down the whole package, he is not sure the survey would provide meaningful data.

Dr. Kaplan offered that he believes the survey conducted as a proposal comes to APC would be from the Faculty Senate for the Faculty Senate. Dr. Kaplan believes he understood Dr. Frank saying we would have the final proposal within a week or two. Then the Faculty Senate could put it into a survey and the survey would begin with "Did you read these two documents?" If so, proceed. He believes that FWDC would be the committee to put out the survey as well as to collect and organize the responses rather than create a separate ad hoc committee. By the next Faculty Senate meeting, there would be something to put on the table.

Dr. Fernandes asked if the Faculty Senate does the survey after we have the proposal from the task

force, will there be at another time a formal vote by the Faculty Senate. How is the survey processed? Do we move ahead with Faculty Senate documents? Or do we move ahead with a vote and then Faculty Senate documents? How do we get to the end?

Dr. Mills said that depends on how CRTF would want to proceed with implementation. She sees this as an interim step one of gathering information and then move on once we have this input.

Dr. Frank and Dr. Burchard outlined the proposed process:

1. Survey the faculty
2. Faculty Senate and the task force look at the results and consider alterations to the final proposal.
3. Conduct a vote of the faculty on the proposal
4. The proposal passes through APC and Faculty Senate
5. Then APC documents from departments and program areas implementing the changes and inserting them in the catalog would then pass through APC and the Faculty Senate.

In summary, Dr. Ray said we want to accomplish two things: to provide sufficient opportunity for faculty voices to be heard and to make a decision on the final proposal so we can move forward in making curriculum changes. The downside is if a lot of negative feedback about the package exists then more energy is needed to hammer out a new package. The Faculty Senate members concurred.

Dr. Kaplan sensing a consensus on the process made a motion that as soon as we have the final proposal from the CRTF, FWDC will be responsible for putting out a survey on behalf of the Faculty Senate. Second was made. The Secretary was asked to make a note in the minutes that both the motion and the second came from members of FWDC.

Motion approved without dissent.

## **V. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee Report**

Dr. Brian Hook gave the report for FWDC. Chair Rob Bowen was away at a conference.

### **First Reading**

[FWDC 5](#): Modifications to the Tenure and Promotion guidelines and clarification of Teaching, Scholarship, Service, and Engagement ([Faculty Handbook Section 3 FACULTY RIGHTS, RESPONSIBILITIES AND EVALUATIONS \(SD3111S\)](#))

[FWDC 6](#): Revising Standards for Merit Evaluation ([Faculty Handbook 3.5.4 Procedure for Evaluating Faculty Members for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion \(SD3701S\)](#))

[FWDC 7](#): Including Dean's and Provost's Evaluations in Personnel Reviews (Faculty Handbook Sections: [Section 3.5.4.1](#), [Section 3.5.4.2](#), and [Section 3.7.2](#))

[FWDC 8](#): Elections and Eligibility in [Section 10 of the Handbook](#)

### **Second Reading**

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

Faculty Elections Update: [Timeline](#) Dr. Reed Roig

[Constitutional Edits](#) Update: Dr. Reed Roig

Before Dr. Hook introduced the FWDC documents, he wanted to mention student evaluations. Pat McClellan came to a recent meeting with some data and we just wanted to address two areas that have



been talked about.

One area is regarding students evaluating the wrong class. While it has happened, it happens so rarely — fewer than 10 instances in over 50,000 evaluations now. In light of that data, FWDC decided not to institute a policy.

The other topic was response rates. Response rates are not what we would like, hovering around 65%. What seems to work at other schools is tying the availability of grades to the evaluation of the course; however, not punitively as in withholding grades until we receive an evaluation. FWDC would like to transition to making grades visible only at the end of the grading period for all students, and then allowing those who have completed evaluations to see their grades “early” as a reward for evaluating the class.

There seems to be a general sense among the faculty, and certainly among the members of FWDC, that our current SRIs are not particularly helpful. With changing curricula and changing SLOs, our SRIs will need more revision. FWDC is discussing a recommendation that the Senate forms another committee, or reconstitutes the former committee, to rewrite our current instrument based on the UNC Asheville mission, SLOs, the new curriculum, and in comparison with electronic SRIs from other universities. That is part of FWDC’s ongoing work.

**Questions:**

Dr. Kormanik asked how they came to the number that there were only 10 in 50,000 error responses. Is there a way to correlate?

Ms. McClellan said that the ones that people have brought to her attention only number between 5 and 10. Even if you triple the numbers of the ones that she is aware, in comparison to the number of evaluations that have been done, the number of errors is very small. Indeed, there have been close to 50,000 evaluations completed.

The reason Dr. Kormanik asked was he has observed 3 or 4 mistakes himself.

Dr. Hook introduced FWDC 5: Tenure and Promotion Document Section 3 of Handbook for first reading. Since this document is nearly 40 pages long, he wanted to go over FWDC’s rationale and call attention to the principal changes as well as where they occur in the document.

What the Faculty Senate has received is Section 3 of the Faculty Handbook, in its entirety, where Faculty Rights, Responsibilities, and Evaluations are described. There are not changes in every section, but because there are changes throughout the document, this is not the final document with proposed changes incorporated, but a draft document showing the proposed edits.

As you know, this document originates from the recommendations of the task force on the [Review of Tenure & Rewards System](#). The task force began its work in 2009 at the request of Provost Fernandes. Since UNC Tomorrow commissioned campuses to develop, measure, and value public engagement in scholarship, teaching, and service, that was one of the principal charges for the RTRS task force. They surveyed scholarly literature on the subject of engagement, conducted a survey of faculty, and interviewed departments and members of the Tenure and Promotion committee at the time. The RTRS task force issued its report in spring 2011,

In spring 2012, the provost’s cabinet met weekly or biweekly with members of FWDC and a few members of the RTRS task force to discuss its implementation. As it happens, those discussions were neither linear, nor in the end, particularly conclusive. This is a partial explanation for why we are bringing this to you nearly a full year later than the initial timeline states.

At the end of the spring 2012 semester, some subcommittees were formed around the categories of scholarship, teaching, service, and engagement. Their goal was to create documents that incorporated the discussions that had taken place and then a proposal for implementation.

As a reminder of the results of the RTRS task force, they found that the faculty identified “two

main problems with the current system: a) a lack of clarity of expectations; and b) a desire to have flexible definitions of what kinds of work are valued to better match the variety of faculty trajectories currently in practice at UNC Asheville.” The task force’s report lists 21 recommendations, and those that address faculty rights, responsibilities, and evaluation became the foundation for the proposed changes in FWDC 5. Those relevant recommendations appear at the beginning of FWDC 5 as part of the rationale for this document.

Dr. Hook mentioned where the main changes were in the document.

First FWDC started with Scholarship because it was the first section completed, and a draft has already been circulated this past fall among Senate members. Dr. Hook worked on that section with Gary Ettari and Jeff Konz. The document clarifies a distinction between scholarship, (which is primarily peer-reviewed and made public through presentation, publication, performance, or in some other way) and scholarly or creative activity for scholarship (which is preliminary and preparatory, for the most part). This is essentially a descriptive change because it reflects the current understanding and practice of faculty as well as the tenure and promotion committees. There was a general consensus on this area in the meetings with the provost’s cabinet. The definitions and descriptions for both “scholarship” and “scholarly or creative activity” are articulated on page 4 and pages 28-29.

For the other areas of faculty responsibility and evaluation; however, namely teaching and service, there was and is no consensus on its proper nature or evaluation, and so FWDC has had to be more prescriptive in incorporating the recommendations of the RTRS task force. However, the task force gave clearer directions for the evaluation of teaching, and the group that drafted that section of the document included Reed Roig, Gwen Ashburn, Kitti Reynolds, and Melissa Himelein; Melissa was a member of the original task force as well as the current director of the Center for Teaching and Learning. You will read the details primarily on pages 16-18 of FWDC 5, but the goal of the changes is to recognize better the “multiple dimensions of effective teaching,” which include instructional delivery and design skills, course management, content expertise, and student achievement. To that end, we propose several changes, including a system of peer review of teaching, and online evaluations of all classes that meet a certain enrollment threshold, rather than our current system of at least 50% of courses.

No subcommittee from the original group convened by the provost took on the subject of service. Therefore, it remained for the current members of FWDC to hammer that out; Dee Eggers and Sam Kaplan took the lead on that document. As our main effort was to make sure that service in all its dimensions is recognized, a large part of our work identifies categories and activities within them, as you’ll see on pages 4 and 18-19. Another notable change, reflecting our need, is the expectation that faculty service should increase with one’s rank not decrease, as is often the case.

The last but not least area of our document regards engagement, which is introduced and defined on page 4. Rob Bowen used a definition drawn from the RTRS report and from supplementary scholarly work. As the RTRS task force recommended, engagement is not a fourth separate and mandatory category of faculty evaluation but a potential element of scholarship, teaching, and service. FWDC tried to lay out guidelines about how this element is to be described and evaluated when a faculty member wants it to be considered as part of her or his evaluation.

The final substantive change in the document is found on page 16. We follow the RTRS task force’s recommendation that each department creates a statement of the criteria and/or values by which its faculty members will be judged and evaluated. These statements will be shared with faculty members to clarify the expectations by which they will be evaluated, and with academic affairs, which will provide these statements to the tenure and promotion committee to communicate disciplinary specifics.

Finally, Dr. Hook noted that the document was sent to the Provost’s Cabinet last month for any suggestions, concerns, or objections, and it comes to the Faculty Senate having heard none from that

group.

Dr. Hook asks the Faculty Senate to give careful reading and consideration to this document, because it proposes some substantive changes in the ways the faculty are evaluated. He looks forward to the discussion at the next Senate.

FWDC 6 adds language to the definition of the evaluation category of “accomplished” to recognize those who “exceed expectations” in all three areas.

FWDC 7 adds Dean’s and Provost’s letters in tenure and promotion reviews to the list of materials for consideration.

FWDC 8, on Eligibility to be Elected and Serve, really belongs with the discussion that will follow after the one document for second reading and Dr. Hook will leave the leading of that discussion to Dr. Roig.

FWDC 4/IDC 2 document, the only document up for second reading, is the procedure for starting a program. This comes as a FWDC document because FWDC is the committee charged with all inclusions in the Faculty Handbook. This document implements SD0512F passed in the Fall (IDC 1) which we have already discussed.

Dr. Hook calls for a motion to pass FWDC 4/IDC 2. The motion was moved and seconded. No discussion.

[FWDC 4/IDC 2 passed without dissent and became SD4313S.](#)

Election update. Dr. Roig gave an update on elections. The Hearing Committee election is going on now. He hopes that all have voted, and if not, he urges faculty to vote before the end of the week. He forewarned that faculty will get one more annoying email regarding that.

His email on Monday begging for additional nominations was successful enough. He passed around a document listing [the nominees on the ballots for Academic Appeals Board and Faculty Assembly.](#) For Academic Appeals, we have to have a ballot of at least seven faculty members distributed across the program areas which there are eight on the ballot and two will be elected plus an alternate. For Faculty Assembly, one is elected plus an alternate from three nominees. These are the only two ballots that the Faculty Senate approves before the election. Dr. Roig called for a motion for approval of the nominees on the ballot listing for these elections. The motion was made and seconded. No Discussion.

The Nominees were approved for the Academic Appeals Board and Faculty Assembly election ballots without dissent.

Edits to the Constitution. Dr. Roig also introduced the edits to the Constitution proposed in FWDC 8. The Faculty Senate has talked about amending the constitution to effectively remove all the eligibility requirements and move them to the Faculty Handbook. In the process of doing that, they adjusted the eligibility requirements to include things that are in practice but were not in the Constitution. The discussion of eligibility in Article I has been pulled as well as a small part of Article II, Section II which relates to the composition of the Faculty Senate.

The amendment to the Constitution has to be voted on by the whole faculty. The Faculty Senate has to give one month written notice before the vote can take place so the Faculty Senate needs to move forward with this. Dr. Roig has talked to IT who said we can use the same voting system that we use for Faculty Elected Committees.

Dr. Roig does not believe the Constitution indicates that the Faculty Senate has to endorse the changes; however, in the past he does believe the senate has endorsed the changes to the Constitution before the changes go before the faculty for a vote. Dr. Roig appealed to the Faculty Senate for guidance

for proceeding. He would like a Faculty Senate endorsement of these amendments so Dr. Roig can indicate when presenting the amendments that the Faculty Senate voted to endorse these changes. A motion was made to vote on the changes and seconded.

**Discussion:**

Dr. Kormanik expressed concern about this process of modifying the Faculty Senate Constitution. He is concerned with replacing aspects of the Constitution with something that will be in the Faculty Handbook. When they vote for these changes, the faculty is not going to have any idea about what is going on in the Faculty Handbook.

Dr. Roig understands Dr. Kormanik's concern and that is why these documents have been presented at the same time. When Dr. Roig presents the amendment, he will direct them to the eligibility requirements that are being incorporated into the handbook. Dr. Roig said that it is a valid concern and FWDC has made appropriate arrangements.

Dr. Kormanik added that it is inappropriate to vote on this motion because it is a first reading and Faculty Senate is bending the first reading rule in his mind.

Dr. Roig says it isn't so much a Faculty Senate document as much as it is an endorsement from Faculty Senate before the changes goes before the Faculty for a vote.

Dr. Miller said we could phrase it that way.

Dr. Kormanik remarked that this would result in doing something without giving the documents the full consideration they are supposed to receive.

Dr. Roig argued that the Faculty Senate cannot change the Constitution. All the Faculty Senate is voting on is that we endorse these changes for the faculty to vote on. The Constitution says nothing about requiring Faculty Senate endorsement. He was seeking a version of "Sense of the Faculty Senate" before presenting to the faculty.

Dr. Kormanik is concerned that what is removed from the Constitution is placed in the Faculty Handbook. Dr. Roig refers to FWDC 8 where the eligibility sections are placed into the Handbook.

Dr. Roig explained what FWDC has done in the document FWDC 8. The Constitution, as it currently reads, reads that eligibility will be determined based on six contact hours per semester. However, in practice, we have been using 12 contact hours per year. Those are two very different measures. One of the substantive changes going from the Constitution to the Faculty Handbook is to put in the 12 contact hours per year, which is the current practice.

Another substantive change is to allow our non-tenured faculty to exclude themselves from the Faculty Senate ballot. That is not in the Constitution, but it is our current practice. It is now being put into the eligibility requirements in FWDC 8.

All the changes proposed are changes in practice. We have never adjusted the documents. FWDC 8 is slated for first and second readings. If the Constitutional Amendment does not pass, then we pull the document. This way the document is public while considering the Constitutional changes.

Dr. Kormanik thanked Dr. Roig for the explanation.

Dr. Roig added that he ran all these changes by Greg Boudreaux, the previous election manager, to make sure he had run this election correctly. Dr. Boudreaux agreed that these changes outlined in FWDC 8 match current practices and make sense.

Dr. Roig thus called for friendly amendment to the motion and so the motion now reads a call for a Sense of Faculty Senate Resolution that the Faculty Senate endorses the Constitutional Amendment so Dr. Roig can bring proposed changes before the faculty for a vote. The amended motion was moved and seconded.

The Sense of the Faculty Senate Resolution was approved without dissent and the proposed amendments to the Faculty Senate Constitution are to be presented to the faculty for a vote to change

the Constitution.

Dr. Hook then declared, "FWDC rests!"

## **VI. Institutional Development Committee/University Planning Council Reports**

Dr. Ted Meigs

UPC Meeting Highlights: [UPC February 20, 2013 Minutes](#)

- The Board of Governors approved our tuition and fee increase request without change or comment. UPC is concerned how current students faced with this greater financial challenge than they anticipated will cope.
- The Communication and Marketing staff won the Grand Award from CASE (a peer review process) for the best integrated student recruiting campaign at the recent regional CASE conference. Our video and other publications also received awards of excellence in this peer-reviewed competition among 3,500 schools in our region. These efforts increase advancement dollars and better scholarships for our students.
- The Economic Impact Study is near completion. Part of the findings, our Athletics Department is supporting 140 local jobs a year (excluding UNC Asheville employees), adds \$4.3 million in local income and raises local output by \$11.7 million. Through local purchases and visitor spending, the UNC Asheville Athletics Department causes state and local tax revenues to increase by \$715,000.00 each year and Federal tax revenues by \$878,000.00. Sporting events held by the UNC Asheville Athletics Department adds \$4.3 million in local direct visitor spending each year, which by itself supports 70 local jobs, and raises local output by \$5.6 million.
- The Advancement Division is 83% of the way toward their goal of \$4M private funding goal for the year. Traditionally the goal had been between \$2M and \$3M. It is important for faculty to support Advancement. It is important especially now to think of creative ways to raise more dollars for the University to help out the students who are struggling.
- Beth Bartlett gave report on situation with the Financial Aid Office where there are items of concern. She reported the Federal Government is increasingly unwilling to allow a student to take a range of courses. Students are encouraged to take courses that go straight toward their degree. Retakes are getting pinched, for Financial Aid does not want to pay for retakes. UNC need-based aid is being limited to nine semesters which speaks to the importance of good advising. In the past, students have been receiving a 6 month grace period before having to make loan payments. Now students must begin payments immediately after graduation. Our student loan default rate is low compared to the national average. Our student loan default rate is 3.2 percent. The national average is around 13 percent. In comparison to other institutions, our students graduate with lower loan debt. Half our students leave with no debt. Among those who have debt, the debt is between \$15,000 and \$17,000 total. In interpretation, since half of the students do not have debt means those that have debt have even more debt than the reported average. There is 51% increase of parents taking out Parent Plus loans compared to four years ago.

The university needs to pay attention to this problem or we start losing good students who can't pay the bills all their way through college.

IDC March 7, 2013 meeting highlights:

Lisa Friedenbergl talked about a document she has worked up on student learning outcomes. IDC is going to take her recommendations and work up a rationale document. IDC will present to Senate for first reading in April so the whole process is taken care of by the end of the Spring Semester.

FWDC 9 will be a work up on a document found by Archer Gravely from the Chapel Hill Provost Office which has clearer steps for introducing new certificates.

IDC talked about the 2012 NSSE survey ([National Survey of Student Engagement](#)). IDC is still working on a summary of these results and will present that in April as well.

IDC also reported on the status of the survey initiated by the Board of Trustees to ask the campus community about the possibility of graduate programs at UNC Asheville. Dr. Meigs talked to the folks at STAMATS who are running the survey. They hope to have the draft of the survey instrument within the next two weeks. Ed Katz and STAMATS are both aware that IDC would like to take a look at this instrument and see if they have suggestions regarding that. They wish to administer the instrument either the 3rd or 4th week of April.

## **VII. Academic Policies Committee Report**

### **Dr. Sophie Mills**

#### **First Reading**

- [APC 50:](#) Change the name of the Sociology department to Sociology and Anthropology
- [APC 51:](#) Change semesters when SOC 385 and SOC 393 are offered
- [APC 52:](#) Add field experience requirement to EDUC 319
- [APC 53:](#) Adding ACCT 320 as a pre- or corequisite to ACCT 317;  
Changing the ACCT 317 corequisite in ACCT 320 to a pre- or corequisite
- [APC 54:](#) Changing the title and description for ACCT 417
- [APC 55:](#) Changing prerequisite for MGMT 386; Changing prerequisite for MGMT 484
- [APC 56:](#) Request to Establish a Graduate Certificate Program in Climate Change and Society;  
[Appendix A](#)
- [APC 57:](#) Add LANG 260 as a prerequisite to 300-level Creative Writing workshops, clarifying all of these courses may be repeated once
- [APC 58:](#) Change the application process for the Major in Literature and Language with either a concentration in Creative Writing or Creative Writing with Teacher Licensure
- [APC 59:](#) Add Certificate in Climate Change and Society to the Master of Liberal Arts entry in the catalog
- [APC 60:](#) Delete the following ART courses: 114, 201, 213, 250, 302, 313 and 390; Delete the following ARTH courses: 355 and 380
- [APC 61:](#) Change the credit hours for ART 499 and ARTH 499
- [APC 62:](#) Delete ART 110 and 111; Add new courses, ART 122 and 133
- [APC 63:](#) Delete Ceramics courses, ART 230, 231, 330 and 430, replacing with ART 234, 334, 336 and 434
- [APC 64:](#) Delete Drawing courses, ART 112, 113, 212, 303 and 403, replacing with ART 144, 204, 304, 305 and 404
- [APC 65:](#) Delete Painting courses, ART 210, 211, 310 and 410, replacing with ART 218, 318, 319 and 418
- [APC 66:](#) Delete Photography courses, ART 227, 327, 337, 338 and 437, replacing with ART

- 264, 364, 366, 367 and 464
- [APC 67:](#) Delete Printmaking courses, ART 220, 221, 321 and 322, replacing with ART 254, 354, 356 and 454
- [APC 68:](#) Delete Sculpture courses, ART 240, 340 and 440, replacing with ART 246, 346, 347 and 446
- [APC 69:](#) Change the credit hours and descriptions for the Senior Exhibition courses, ART 490, 491 and 492
- [APC 70:](#) Replace the category headings within Art History
- [APC 71:](#) Add new courses, ARTH 303, 306, and 420 to Art History
- [APC 72:](#) Change the descriptions and credit hours for ARTH 201, 202, 301 and 302
- [APC 73:](#) Change course descriptions and credit hours for ARTH 311, 312 and 320
- [APC 74:](#) Change the credit hours and descriptions for ARTH 330, 340, 350, 355, 360 and 365
- [APC 75:](#) Change the descriptions and credit hours for ARTH 381, 385, 386 and 410
- [APC 76:](#) Change the descriptions and credit hours for ARTH 460, 480, 484 and 485
- [APC 77:](#) Edit the opening narrative and the requirements for declaring a major in Art
- [APC 78:](#) Change the major requirements for Studio Art (B.F.A. and B.A.) and Art History;  
Change the minor requirements for Art (Studio) and Art History

## **Second 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 many documents up for first reading. Many of them are department specific. She drew the Faculty Senate's attention to APC 56 and APC 59 listed above. The relationship between these two is that they are one and the same document. APC 56 gives the general context for establishing graduate programs that align well with our mission. APC 59 is a shorter version which is the catalog copy. Also, the Art Department is revamping their curriculum to 4 credit hour courses which is reconfiguring in interesting and quite significant ways.

As far as the second reading documents, all of these came unanimously approved by APC. One note, APC 48, about moving to four digit course numbers, will not be implemented before 2014. It is going to take a long time to add all those zeros.

Dr. Mills called for those second reading documents the senators wished to pull to talk about separately.

Dr. Roig asked that APC 41 be pulled. Although he does not wish to talk about it, he does want a separate vote for he will symbolically vote negatively on APC 41.

Dr. Burchard has a question about APC 48. She wants to know how the course numbers are going to be changed. Alicia said that zero will be added to the end of the present course numbers to give flexibility in how courses are cataloged. For example, 101 will become 1010 and 179 becomes 1790.

Dr. Meigs asked if the selling points for APC 49 are different from before. Ms. McClellan said that the main point is we have a line of students eligible for financial aid, which has not always been the case. GA has a warning signal when students fall below. They can stay here passing 70% of their classes in a successful way.

Dr. Roig asked for the difference between the 67% and the 70%.

Ms. McClellan said that is more logical than mathematical or scientific. We have things above a little bit to get the point across.

Dr. Roig complimented Ms. McClellan on the clarity of the document. He felt it was very clear on what all the standards are.

Dr. Mills asked for a motion to support APC 38-40 and APC 42-49. Motion was made and seconded. No further discussion.

APC 38-40 and APC 42-49 were passed without dissent.

Dr. Mills introduced APC 41 regarding the removal of the computer competency from the catalog. She asked for a motion for accepting APC 41 and the motion was made and seconded. No discussion.

APC 41 passed 17 to 1 and becomes SD4713S.

#### **VIII. Administrative Reports - Dr. Jane Fernandes**

The Chancellor has already brought up the 30-hour and 60-hour common core in her presentation. Dr. Fernandes wanted to let the Faculty Senate know officially that there have been five (5) disciplinary panels with eight (8) more coming up in April. After discussing what happened with the first five panels tomorrow, we will be better prepared for the next ones.

We are exploring the implications of the Affordable Health Care Act. It appears that all employees who work 30 hours a week for 9 weeks will be eligible for health insurance under the new Affordable Health Care Act. UNC Asheville will have to budget the cost of that. The Provost's Cabinet discussed if there are any adjunct faculty who would be eligible for health insurance and they found a small number who would be. Going forward, temporary employees with a certain amount of work over nine weeks will be eligible for health care. Student workers (mostly in ITS and the Library) who work over 30 hours per week for over nine weeks will be eligible for the same benefits.



Dr. Fernandes had shared with the Provost's Cabinet the proposed UNC budget information for 2013-2015 in order to be aware of the five main strategic plan goals and the one that causes us the most consternation: maximizing efficiencies. There is concern regarding all the goals and how we will achieve them but the fifth one is of most concern. In UNC system's proposal, the General Administration is requesting additional funding for the first four goals for 2013-2015.

However, the requests for additional funding are counterbalanced by the commitment from the system to cut \$25.8 million dollars in 2013-2014. In 2014-2015, then, an additional \$45.8 million will be cut from system, all through maximizing efficiencies. At the Provost's Cabinet meeting, they talked about reducing layers of management, strategic purchasing, developing class-size guidelines and course offering guidelines and eliminating programs. Additional savings can be accrued through carry forward reform and expanding shared services throughout the system. The Provost expects a lot of the savings to come from reducing duplication of course offerings because President Ross, in his memo, referred to reducing duplication.

As the Chancellor said, the budget process is in flux. In Governor McCrory's proposal, which is just the initial proposal and nowhere close to the decision, our system is cut 8.1 percent while other state agencies are cut only 2 percent. Our expenses are cut by 5.3 percent and the Governor's proposal increases out-of-state tuition by 2 percent. This 2 percent will be paid directly to the state coffers and will not go to the UNC system. This will increase UNC Asheville's out-of-state student cost by 6 percent which in effect means we will not have many out of state students because we would become unaffordable.

The Provost is seeking guidance regarding the Governor's memo relating to travel restrictions for this year and she will be able to share more at the chair and program directors meeting on Monday.

Dr. Fernandes is sorry to be the bearer of all the bad news. We all need to be vigilant in watching these processes. Nothing is final yet. We have a long way to go. Hopefully, this will all end in a better position than the beginnings seem to indicate.

## **IX. Old Business**

The Faculty Senate will be scheduling at least two more discussion sessions regarding the curriculum review. There will be one next week and another the week after that.

Dr. Hook wanted to thank Lisa Sellers for the email she sent out to the Faculty Senate today. At the last meeting Dr. Hook had asked a question regarding some questions that appeared in gray in the strategic plan last year that showed UNC Asheville as a significant outlier in expenditures per degree. We were the only UNC system university that increased over 6 years. As Dr. Kormanik and Dr. Hook discussed before the meeting, if you were an administrator looking only at this chart that UNC Asheville suddenly sticks out and Dr. Hook asked where those numbers came from at the last meeting and why were we so out of line with everyone else.

Dr. Hook said that Lisa sent an extremely informative email explaining where the numbers come. Lisa said they are using our numbers from our [UNC Asheville fact books](#) and plugging them into a formula. Dr. Hook's follow-up question is: Are we presenting our information in the same way that the other schools are?

If we are not, we are hurting ourselves by putting information out that they are using to show that we are doing something that is so out of line with what other institutions are doing. Dr. Hook does not know why our costs would increase 9% per degree while other schools were decreasing 20% or more per degree. Is it simply a presentational issue?

Dr. Fernandes said we would have to ask Archer Gravely, but believes that all IR offices have the same instructions about how to present the information so she suspects it is the same. One thing that

Dr. Fernandes has learned from that report about our system's performance and the university's performance within the system is that we have very low costs per student in terms of our total budget. That would be a strong argument and strong piece of evidence that to argue that UNC Asheville's cut, if a cut should happen, should be proportional and not across-the-board. The UNC system should not cut a percentage across-the-board. UNC Asheville should be rewarded for the efficiency that we already have demonstrated. There is good news in this data for us, and hopefully, we will be successful with that.

Dr. Hook agrees that if our expenditures per degree were already extremely low then the fact that we increase 9% doesn't really mean anything. It means that we have maintained efficiency while other places were spending too much and decrease waste. However, the other institutions somehow look better in that graph in the strategic plan and Dr. Hook is bothered by that.

Dr. Hook thanked Lisa for tracking the data down; it was phenomenal and informative he said. Other senators concurred.

#### **X. New Business**

Dr. Kormanik (talking to the Provost) is anticipating a report on the activities of the Position Allocation Committee in April which is when the Faculty Senate typically has this annual report. This Faculty Senate has not seen a three year allocation plan. He knows it is difficult; however, he would like to see a three year allocation plan and that the Position Allocation Report be as complete as possible. He is not sure if it only includes recommendations by the Position Allocation Committee, but he would like to see all of the positions that have been awarded. He realizes that it is difficult to keep up with some of the appointments because they happen at different times; however, it is especially critical for positions are lost and it makes it harder to decide how to make the curriculum sustainable. It is critical that positions go to where they really need to be and he believes a Position Allocation Report would help us plan.

Dr. Fernandes said she would do her best to provide a report but does not think it will cover all of Dr. Kormanik's concerns. She will provide information on what PAC has done this year although it will not be complete by the time of the next meeting. Under no circumstances will there be a three-year plan with any claim to legitimacy because that is beyond anyone's control at this point.

Dr. Fernandes feels it is unrealistic at this time to expect PAC to come up with any kind of a plan that is legitimate. When we get past the decisions we have to make this year, we could consider a more realistic charge to PAC for the years ahead.

In her report, Dr. Hook suggested she talk about what makes it so difficult to plan for this has been a discussion in FWDC as well.

When FWDC talked about PAC last year, Dr. Roig believes they discussed not a three year plan, but the importance of planning in the process such as being aware which positions are likely to come due and future departmental needs.

Dr. Fernandes said that information would be nice to know. PAC would appreciate having this information. Dr. Fernandes agreed to try to cover what the challenges are in the PAC report to the Faculty Senate.

#### **XI. Adjourn**

Dr. Burchard adjourned the meeting at 5:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by: Lisa Sellers  
Executive Committee