

University of North Carolina at Asheville  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
Minutes, April 26, 2012, 3:15pm

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

Visitors: G. Ashburn, E. Boyce, D. Eggers, M. Galloway, B. Haggard, G. Hardy, L. Holland, E. Katz, J. Konz, K. Krumpe, A. Lanou, J. Li, L. McCane, P. McClellan, C. McKnight, P. Mitchell, R. Pente, K. Ray, R. Ridenour, A. Shope, H. Stern, R. Straub, G. Trautmann, A. Weldon.

### **I. Call to Order and Announcements**

Dr. Volker Frank called the meeting to order at 3:15 pm and welcomed senators and guests.

A moment of silence was held in memory of Mark Nielson who came to UNC Asheville in 2007 as an academic technology specialist, and for Anita Raphaela Chambers, a 22-year old sophomore resident of Hoey Hall.

### **II. Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of March 15, 2012 were approved as distributed. The minutes of April 5, 2012 were approved with an editorial correction.

### **III. Executive Committee Report**

Dr. Frank reported for the Executive Committee.

#### **Installation of Security Cameras on Campus**

Chief Eric Boyce, Director of Public Safety, gave an overview of security on campus. Motion-activated security cameras will be placed outside all academic buildings within the next 100 days to record people who go into and outside of the buildings. Some cameras will be installed inside buildings. Our number one goal is personal safety on campus. If a crime or an incident occurs we can review camera footage to try to identify a suspect.

This initiative not only protects university assets but the UNCA community's private property and personal assets in our offices and classrooms. Signs will indicate areas under surveillance. This initiative is an outward sign to the students, parents and community that UNCA takes public safety seriously.

Four vendors were invited to place bids; the bid has not been awarded yet, but they believe it will be awarded soon.

Chief Boyce would like to partner with the Faculty Senate and FWDC to develop a training program available to all faculty and staff to learn what to do in an emergency. A tabletop exercise of our emergency operations plan will be held June 5-6. Although we are currently on a quarterly full-siren cycle, Chief Boyce prefers a monthly test cycle.

Public Safety is working to identify vendors who can integrate all of our emergency notification products into a single module to make it easier on emergency dispatchers. There are LED screens and LED messaging in classrooms and they will be monitoring the speed of the messages. All of the servers are centrally located in Institutional Technology Services. The server will hold up to 200 cameras. The initial phase is to have the infrastructure in place, and then we will see how many cameras we can have.

#### **Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee**

Mr. Robert Straub reported on the Chancellor's Staff Advisory Committee (CSAC).

Mr. Straub said CSAC's biggest work effort of the past year was working with the Staff Assembly which is the university system representatives from all the chancellor advisory committees around the state. Work was done in regards to Bill 575, the Unified Personnel System.

Neither the Staff Assembly nor the Chancellor's Council here will take a stand yet as to whether Bill 575 passes or not, but we want to be prepared in case it does pass. We worked on the Best Practices for it, and as part of that they conducted a survey that was passed along to the Staff Assembly as well as the President of the university system and the Chancellor. They made some changes but they have not sent the changes out yet and they still do not know if the bill has passed yet.

A major dialogue is taking place now in CSAC to decide who they are and what they are. They are

exploring what activities they wish to sponsor, such as Greenfest and the holiday party.

Dr. Frank, Dr. Mark Harvey, and Mr. Straub will meet tomorrow to talk about what they can do with staff. When we talk about faculty and staff, we are talking beyond Faculty Senate and CSAC.

#### **Comments from the Chancellor**

Chancellor Ponder thanked Senators for the opportunity to speak and she welcomed questions.

She thanked the faculty for their extraordinary and heroic dedication. This has been a remarkable year and that is due to a list of extraordinarily important elements on which all of us have worked:

- NCAA recertification
- Preparation and hosting of the Southern Association Visiting Team
- Opening of the Sherrill Center, a new and complicated building in which we host a new array of opportunities for serving our internal and external community

The faculty has stepped forward in this worst of all budget years to teach more students and more classes to make sure that our students were not disadvantaged because of the timing of our work together. Chancellor Ponder said she lifts up the work of the faculty not only within our walls but when she has an opportunity to brief the Board of Governors and speak in public.

In a few days, the faculty will join the Chancellor in watching the ceremonial moment of triumph that our graduating seniors will be experiencing. She thanked faculty for their attendance and involvement in commencement, as well as the reception afterwards where the students and their families will be expressing their thanks and admiration as well. Her request is for the faculty to encourage their adjunct faculty or affiliated staff to volunteer to be present and involved in commencement.

Part of what helps the university with social sustainability is from time to time gathering with ourselves. There is a faculty meeting and a reception for retiring faculty on Monday. On Tuesday, after lunch and after commencement, from 1:30-3:30pm, we will have the Second Annual Pie Party at the Pisgah House. All employees of the university and our retired faculty and staff are all invited. You can also, as faculty, help me make sure our staff from all across campus understands how we admire, appreciate and rely on their excellent work.

Our Executive Director of the North Carolina Center for Creative Retirement joined a few of us, including our own Dan Pierce, as a recent and successful guest on Bill Friday's *North Carolina People* television show. We had a chance to brief a wide audience about the North Carolina Center for Creative Retirement. Chancellor Ponder will recommend that the University Planning Council invite that group to share their future plans at a meeting next fall. She wants the faculty to know that although the Center for Creative Retirement is noncredit, it is a highly visible element of the university.

Chancellor Ponder said the greatest single concern that most faculty have shared with her during the year is: what the future will bring in terms of teaching load. We will continue to work as a university to look for external ways where we can have a more reasonable and sustainable teaching load approved and assigned to us. But the faculty has the primary role in relation to that topic: to bring to fruition an agreed upon model or models for how the curriculum will be prioritized and organized. It is with a curriculum of appropriate size and structure that we will be able to advise students well in order to have a sustainable and optimized curriculum. This is what makes sure what you call the "teaching spread" is such that sustains our careers and allows us to flourish in our careers. She encouraged that work and is grateful to the faculty for undertaking that in a serious and a consultative way.

#### **Questions**

Dr. Burchard asked the Chancellor to clarify: "Lowering our teaching load will depend on how we manage the curriculum review"

Chancellor Ponder said there are three intertwined elements: the budget and enrollment calculus, the size and scope of the curriculum which includes how it is prioritized and how it is described for students, and teaching responsibilities.

In regards to the budget and enrollment calculus, we will continue to pursue adequate funding for the public liberal arts university. There is very little that the faculty can do to help, though if and when I need your help, I know that it is there.

In regards to the size and scope of the curriculum, faculty has been using the phrase "streamlining the curriculum." I hope there will be an agreed upon priority so that the curriculum can be of an appropriate design.

In regards to teaching responsibilities, that includes the whole life of being a faculty member here.

Of those, the one that the faculty is in charge of and must be the most influential and can carry the resolve

– the one way that you, the faculty, can help the most is to complete your work on the curriculum -- in having a curriculum of appropriate complexity and size is indeed directly connected to teaching load. This is something that we began this year and we have talked all the year through. You have had some substantial discussions and remind us all that the outcome will be important for teaching load as well.

Dr. Boudreaux asked if merit increases are a possibility for this next academic year.

Chancellor Ponder said neither dollars nor permission to use them for salaries of any sort has been ours in the current year. The university system and the Board of Governors' legislative priority for the coming year include both additional dollars in their proposal and a fervent request for greater flexibility for the way we use those dollars. The answer is unknown, but the request that would make consideration of that possibility is forward in terms of policy and dollars. The outcome in this legislative environment is uncertain.

Chancellor Ponder said she speaks with great pride about the skilled capability, dedication, and "just darn" brilliance of the faculty at UNC Asheville. She is honored to be your chancellor.

### **Update on Curriculum Review Task Force**

Dr. Frank reminded the Senators that there will be a first meeting of the task force tomorrow afternoon and a second meeting next Wednesday. These are the first meetings of the semester where we would like to have as many of the task force members present as possible. Tomorrow will be an important day because the task force will be looking at proposals and information from the constituent committees; specifically, the Big Picture, the Sustainability, and the Research and Evaluation committees.

It is the task force's hope to arrive at a shared understanding, but also a shared vision of how to proceed. We will have time for discussion and debate and sharing of our visions, philosophies, and perspectives. Following these two meetings, more information will likely be shared with the campus community in terms of further curriculum task force considerations.

An important second step of the task force will be to go into the community – the departments, programs and all the ILS components -- to get their feedback, to hear their concerns, their visions, and their proposals; to further change proposal(s) the curriculum task force will come up with and then hopefully arrive at a consensual model at the end of next fall.

We will be paying particular attention to departments, to the ILS, and very importantly, to the relationship between the departments and ILS - and how we can strengthen this relationship by proposing changes to some of the departmental practices and ways we construct ILS.

About forty people have been participating in the task force off and on. The task force may reconfigure itself to make it effective and efficient when we share the ideas and visions with the constituent elements of the university. The point people have talked about this but no decision has been made -- we wanted to come to the point where we are now before consulting with everybody on the task force.

The teaching load, which the Chancellor just mentioned, is one of the items on the agenda for tomorrow and perhaps on Wednesday.

The work of the task force has been a challenging but good experience, not only in terms of what we can accomplish but in how we go about accomplishing things. A lot people have put in their time, research, and work to get us to the point where we are now.

Dr. Frank hopes to make a presentation to the Faculty Senate in spring 2013. If the Senate wishes to hear from the Curriculum Review Task Force, representatives would be happy to give ongoing reports to the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Frank invited members of the task force who were present to speak.

### **Questions / Discussion:**

Dr. Burchard asked who was on the task force.

Dr. Frank asked for a show of hands and several people responded. He said to his knowledge, we have never attempted to make curriculum changes with so many people involved. He has always considered that a major strength, knowing that it may slow us down, but as one of the crucial aspects it will hopefully not only gives and receives a legitimacy credit, that we also make use of that in terms of speaking for so many aspects of our institution and groups.

Dr. Hook said he was not on the Curriculum Review Task Force but he has heard a lot about it and he was concerned since there is a movement for transparency. There are many ideas and it may not be prudent to put details online now; however, at some point after these two meetings he would hope a document will be posted online for those who are unable to attend the open meetings. The transparency is going to have to come through putting things online and this is incredibly important.

Dr. Frank thanked Dr. Hook for his comment. He promised that after the meetings the task force will tell everyone how the meetings went, what the task force did, and its next steps. Everyone will be invited to that.

#### **Sense of the Senate Resolution**

Dr. Frank said Senators received the Sense of the Senate Resolution earlier and, if it passes, this will be the third resolution that relates to SACS that this body shall have passed. He did not receive any feedback for changes. Questions and feedback were received on the need and necessity of the resolution. Those who shared were encouraged to share with this body.

Dr. Frank said the Faculty Senate has heard many times from Bruce Larson and Mary Lynn Manns. We thank them and the UNCA SACS team for their work toward our reaccreditation. The Resolution follows:

#### ***Sense of the Senate Resolution***

*The Faculty Senate gratefully acknowledges the work of **the UNCA SACS team** in preparing the University for an on-campus site visit by SACS and in working hard towards a successful re-accreditation of the institution.*

The Resolution passed without dissent and became Senate Document [11012S](#).

#### **Reflections of Year 2011-12**

Dr. Frank reported on Faculty Senate's activities.

#### **1. Work accomplished during AY 2011-12 includes:**

**APC:** 102 documents  
Class Attendance  
Academic Calendar 2013-14, 2014-15  
Change Criteria for Awarding Latin Honors  
Change minimum hours in residence required for a degree

#### **FWDC:**

Review of Tenure and Promotions System: joint effort with Provost Cabinet  
Clarification of Family Medical Leave  
Clarification of Post-Tenure Review Procedures  
Supplemental Pay Policy  
Changed Preface to Faculty Handbook  
Changed Merit Categories for Annual Evaluation of Faculty  
Added Annual Evaluation of Chairs and Program Directors  
Replaced Guiding Concepts with the Strategic Plan  
Re-defined difference between Departments and Programs  
Dean's Evaluation of Program Directors  
Created new Committees: Library and Instructional Technology  
Institutional Effectiveness Committee  
Inquiry Arc Advisory  
Eliminated Committees: Library  
Information Resources and Technology

#### **IDC/UPC:**

Campus Master Plan  
Student Surveys  
Change in Membership of UPC  
Budget Considerations  
Property Acquisitions  
Bookstore Outsourcing  
Board of Governors visit  
NCAA Re-certification  
Undergraduate Research Benchmarks

SACS and QEP  
WCU Relocation  
Admissions Strategies  
Existing and new Programs

Senate:

SACS: institutionalize process  
Institutional Effectiveness Committee  
Inquiry Arc Advisory  
Director of Institutional Effectiveness  
QEP, classes, student learning outcomes (SLOs), students, faculty  
Sense of Senate Resolutions in support of SACS: 3

Online evaluations: started in fall 2010, now in fourth semester and participation declining.

Dr. Frank asked Pat McClellan to give break down of participation between paper and online evaluations:

|         | <b>Semester:</b> | <b>Percentage Participation:</b> |
|---------|------------------|----------------------------------|
| Paper:  |                  |                                  |
|         | Fall 2008:       | 84%                              |
|         | Fall 2009:       | 83%                              |
| Online: |                  |                                  |
|         | Fall 2010:       | 74%                              |
|         | Spring 2011:     | 69%                              |
|         | Fall 2011:       | 67%                              |
|         | Spring 2012:     | 59%                              |

Dr. Frank suggested that the Senate may need to consider ways to entice more students to fill out the evaluation and perhaps evaluate the instrument itself. Ms. McClellan has ideas from experience of observing the flow of input to share with the Senate to encourage student participation.

**Visitors:**

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| Regular Presence: | Academic Affairs, Student Representative of SGA |
| Regular visits:   | Chancellor, John Pierce                         |
| Sporadic:         | Diversity Action Council (DAC)                  |
| One-time:         | Book store reps, CSAC rep                       |

**2. Challenges and Opportunities Ahead**

APC:

May want to consider a more university-wide Impact and Rationale statements and are seen in a more interdisciplinary praxis.

The Curriculum Review Task Force will come back to the Senate and needs serious discussions on ongoing work and how to get the work out to the community.

FWDC:

Committee assignments and Committee reporting, and the Senate taking a look at annual reports - Not only about the submission of the reports but that the Senate becomes familiar with the work of the committee to know what practices worked and what did not work.

Digital faculty records: upcoming

IDC/UPC:

Sustainability, Social, Economic, Environmental: upcoming

The Senate needs to especially pay attention to Program proliferation and what the big picture is and could be and should be: Master degrees, joint programs (e.g. BA/MD with UNC-CH), MLA, Pharmacy

Importantly, the Senate needs to help develop a faculty perspective: where do we stand? Is there commitment from faculty? What is big picture for faculty and students: who favors more masters programs, why, why not?

Per the Faculty Senate Constitution, IDC could have an interesting and important role in producing the big picture. The reason Dr. Frank says IDC, not UPC, is he proposes that IDC needs to take on a much more pronounced role in contemplating the big picture and then take it to UPC. Why IDC? Because IDC is faculty and UPC is a joint group, the shared governance group. The place to create and develop a faculty perspective on the future of the University is first and foremost in the Senate and there in IDC. Once faculty has a vision that reflects faculty concerns and ideas, then the vision can be shared with the administration and UPC. Following IDC and Senate deliberations, the in-house dialogue with the Provost and the Chancellor may be more productive.

#### Senate:

DAC: diversify faculty and student body; expand benefits for faculty and staff. Invite DAC on a regular basis to the Senate.

CRTF campus-wide deliberations finished by fall 2012 so that APC and the Senate can look at implementation through APC, etc.

Faculty-Staff relations: room for improvement, perhaps consider joint projects such as internships and/or undergraduate research.

Faculty Assembly focus/presence: With more organizational linking between UNC Senates, we can learn more, stay more informed about developments at the BOG and GA level. Our own Senate also needs to pay closer attention to developments beyond UNCA, and IDC could be the place to bring ideas that come from the study of developments beyond UNCA.

Release time, significance for Senate and the work done, workload of Senators.

Parliamentarian: we could designate either a Senator or a faculty member to attend Senate meetings and provide guidance whenever procedural issues are not clear.

Institutional Memory and Homework, trust, efficiency: All Senators need to continue to do homework, and study work done, come to Senate prepared and bring in ideas. As mentioned last year, there is always room for new discussions, such as in Old and New Business.

Shared Governance: information, consultation, participation. These issues and beginning practices need to stay in the room and explicitly so.

Trust between faculty and the administration is crucial for all involved.

Good experience with cooperation: SACS, QEP, CRTF, Review of Tenure and Promotions,

Next step: Opportunities: Development and Fund Raising: Faculty, departments, Deans, Students

Accountability: Big Picture Ahead: Shared Accountability: Faculty, Senate and AA and UNCA

In-house: Faculty and AA: retention, graduation, recruitment, SACS, QEP, SLOs

UNCA and Higher Ed: BOG, General Administration, Legislature.

#### **Faculty Assembly Report**

Dr. Lora Holland submitted a report on the Faculty Assembly meeting of March 23, 2012:

##### **1. Budget**

Budget for current year: no mandatory recession anticipated; \$150 million ahead of revenue projections in February, economy is growing; up 6% in personal revenue growth, 7% in tax growth (up from 1% or so, best in several years). Hard to say if we will see a budget increase, but we should expect level funding for next year.

##### **2. Performance Funding**

Performance funding model: additive, will not take away previous funding. Consensus reached by group of CAO's and CEO's: 10 measures upon which performance will be measured, will be same for all 16 campuses across system. Three of the measures are campus-specific to allow flexibility across the system; two chosen by campus, one chosen by GA for improvement over next several years. The seven core measures are focused on students, space; utilization, energy, etc. The three campus-specific measures will eventually have about 12-15 to choose from, still working to finalize that group. This is a work in progress -- targets are not yet set. Ten measures, each worth one point. But you can get points for incremental progress, it's not all or nothing.

##### **3. Human Resources**

Faculty retention /recruitment fund increase on tap; legislative restriction on pay raises. Faculty Assembly is trying to get that provision out, hoping for some across the board pay increases from governor's budget.

##### **4. Faculty Workload Policy**

Committee make-up is five BOG members, two chancellors (Pembroke and NC State), Sandie Gravett, and a

few from GA. Been meeting monthly since August. We use Delaware Data now, but realize teaching workload is not all that faculty do. In January, several Deans and Chairs met with BOG to talk about workloads. Policy discussion in April, looks like they will keep Delaware, but with other measures in mind, perhaps establishing some additional regulations to get data in a more timely manner.

Language Assembly update. August to early fall, will develop and launch a site (preliminary site) for the portal that the participating institutions will be able to use for registration of students.

#### **5. Distance education update**

Standards, etc. still being worked on, but these are not mandated by most institutions.

#### **6. Upcoming Legislative Short Session update and State Bill 575 (May 16 to beginning of July)**

Proposing several policy issues to legislature: student fees can be deposited into trust fund account in order to be protected from reversions instead of into the general fund, which is not so protected; 575 proposes to consolidate all personnel into one system; a proposal that restrictions on faculty salary increases be lifted; optional retirement program be offered to all employees (without 10 year vesting period); more flexibility to regulate smoking on our campuses.

#### **7. Academics First workforce**

Academics First workforce is working on developing a “seamless” transfer ability between community college system, within the UNC system, high school credits, military credits coming into the system.

Academics First workforce charge from Suzanne Ortega to look again at 1990’s graduation and retention rates policy, review BOG policy on minimum admissions requirements, look at satisfactory academic progress policy, what is a credit hour, look at drop/add/repeat/replace, etc. No more than 1% of freshman class can be admitted as exception to these requirements under current policy. Working on transfer issues.

#### **8. 2012-2013 Student Health Insurance Premiums**

95 pages of how ACA (Affordable Care Act) federal rules relate to student health plans. No policy can be less than \$100,000 (but not clear if this means annual limit or per incident), by 2014-2015 unlimited benefits. No pre-conditions by 2014. Contraception exceptions cannot exist. Rates may go up by \$350 per student for next year, will be \$927 next year. May now do age banding instead of one size fits all, but students (mostly grad students) age 45+ would have a premium over \$3000 (this year around \$850 or so).

#### **9. Grievance process report**

Need shorter training modules; putting together proposal to President Ross for necessary resources to provide training. Workshop at April meeting on grievances. Faculty Handbooks on some campuses are not in compliance with code, campuses need to have the right information so that they can comply.

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

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

Mr. Bowen thanked members of the FWDC for their hard work and said they have his deep appreciation: Greg Boudreaux, Gary Ettari, Brian Hook and Reed Roig.

#### **First Reading**

The following documents were considered for First Reading:

[FWDC 15](#): Elimination of Campus Commission on Allocation of Student Services Funds  
(Revision of [SD4806S](#); Faculty Handbook [10.4.2](#))

[FWDC 16](#): Modification of Faculty Scholarship and Service Awards Committee  
(Revision of [SD7708S](#); Faculty Handbook [10.3.4](#))

[FWDC 17](#): Proposal to Clarify the Duties of the Faculty Committee on Hearings  
(Revision of [SD4191S](#); Faculty Handbook [10.2.4](#))

FWDC15 and FWDC17 will be considered at the first Senate meeting in Fall 2012.

**NOTE:** *FWDC16 was passed by the 2012-13 Faculty Senate at its organization meeting on April 26, 2012 and became Senate Document [SD0112F](#).*

### **Second Reading**

The following documents were considered for Second Reading:

[FWDC 12](#): Replacing Guiding Concepts with the Strategic Plan (Revision to [SD3201S](#))  
(Faculty Handbook 1.3.3)

[FWDC 12](#) passed without dissent and became Senate Document [11112S](#).

[FWDC 13](#): Defining Departments and Programs (Faculty Handbook [1.4.3.4-5](#))

#### **Discussion**

Dr. Burchard said, for clarification purposes, there wasn't a difference between a department and a program except for having faculty lines.

Dr. Bowen said yes, that is the perspective of the state and General Administration.

Dr. Kormanik asked if FWDC considered the likely possibility of a program hiring two tenured track faculty which would then create a department of two. That does not seem sustainable even if the definition follows General Administration Rules and Guidelines. In a department of 10, the chair has reassigned time. With a department of two, the chair would have some reassigned time which increases the reassigned time costs.

Dr. Bowen confirmed that FWDC considered this possibility but there wasn't much concern. He thought Religious Studies was a department of two. In the case of reassigned time, the department gets reassigned time as well.

Dr. Roig was not aware of any guidelines from the state regarding a program vs. a department. This is an internal definition to give us some guidelines. We settled on two tenured faculty lines basically.

Many Senators voiced concern that more institutional planning was needed to consider the exact size a department, as well as working out the dynamics in regards to a department where one tenured faculty is chair of the department and the other one is not.

Dr. Berls raised the issue of faculty evaluations. In a two person department, one person will be evaluating the other faculty member but in a program that person is not evaluated by that individual.

Dr. Kormanik explained his issue is in a program, in most cases, faculty has other responsibilities. They are not solely in just that program. For example, there are some lecturers in Humanities but they do not have a position in a department. Everyone else in Humanities has a home in another department.

Dr. Katz asked how does the Religious Studies work as a two person department.

Dr. Burchard responded that the Religious Studies department has faculty from other departments teaching and they have 30 majors -- that the department works very well.

Dr. Berls reiterated that the only thing this document changes is who is doing the evaluations of said faculty. When funding is the same and faculty lines are not changing, the only thing this document changes is who does the evaluation of the faculty.

[FWDC 13](#) passed by a vote of 12 to 5 and became Senate Document [11212S](#).

[FWDC 14](#): Preface to the Faculty Handbook (Faculty Handbook 0.0)

[FWDC 14](#) passed without dissent and became Senate Document [11312S](#).

Dr. Frank thanked Rob Bowen and the FWDC for their work throughout the year.

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

Dr. Kevin Moorhead reported for Institutional Development Committee and University Planning Council. The University Planning Council has not met since the last Senate meeting.

Dr. Moorhead thanked those fellow senators who served on the committee this year: Gregg Kormanik, Ted Meigs, Melissa Burchard, Eric Gant, and Blake Hobby.



## **Report on Institutional Development Committee meeting – April 19, 2012**

Members: K. Moorhead, G. Kormanik, T. Meigs, M. Burchard, E. Gant, B. Hobby.

Guests: J. Dunsmore, G. Ashburn, A. Gravely.

### **1. Follow up to the HERI survey**

IDC revisited the HERI survey to determine if we could provide more concrete recommendations based on survey results. Volker Frank, Chair of the Senate, suggested that IDC provide more tangible recommendations from the HERI survey based on our initial recommendations at the April 5, 2012 Senate meeting. IDC discussed the limited role that we have in mandating action based on our charge and our duties. IDC can bring issues to the University Planning Council, provide awareness to important university issues related to planning, development and budget, review materials related to those areas, meet with appropriate people to discuss issues, and provide a check and balance with university administration and academic departments. Related to the HERI survey, IDC recommends that the Provost review our recommendations from the minutes of our April 5 meeting and respond to IDC concerns at the first Senate meeting in fall 2012. Based on the HERI survey, IDC also recommends a repeat of the survey of administrative offices in the 2012/2013 academic year. The last survey of administrative offices was in 2007.

### **2. Graduate Education**

Five years ago faculty overwhelmingly rejected the idea of UNC Asheville graduate programs. Budget issues have changed considerably since then, and with the loss of WCU graduate programs as a revenue source for the university, IDC is concerned about the lack of a defined process to plan and implement graduate certificates and the potential for new certificates to be added without careful and appropriate oversight. Graduate certificates through the MLA program have been recommended as a means of developing new opportunities for graduate level education. The Intent to Plan process for new undergraduate or graduate programs and degrees is fairly well defined; requiring thorough documentation of intent, resource needs, and impacts. However, it lacks definition for the required approval by appropriate campus committees and authorities. The establishment of certificate programs requires much less oversight and approval. IDC recommends that UNC Asheville develop a well defined internal process to evaluate new programs and certificates, including identifying appropriate committees and authorities. As a starting point, we recommend a chain of approval for planning new degree programs and certificates by the Provost, IDC, and Faculty Senate. IDC, in consultation with the Provost, should develop an internal process by the end of fall semester, 2012.

### **3. IDC issues for 2012/2013**

We have identified several issues that will require IDC oversight in 2012/2013. They include the fore-mentioned internal review process for new programs and certificates, and review of:

- 1) the MLA and Asheville Graduate Center activities
- 2) the potential collaborative UNCA/UNC medical degree
- 3) resource implications of the Pharmacy School
- 4) the MAHEC and Broadway properties
- 5) the results of the curriculum review task force
- 6) the Master Plan
- 7) the upcoming NESSI and alumni surveys
- 8) the survey of administrative offices.

#### **Questions / Discussion**

Dr. Gant asked if all the faculty received a copy of the HERI Survey results.

Dr. Moorhead said everyone received the survey results from Institutional Research a while ago.

Dr. Kormanik said our colleagues may not be aware that we have a Certificate in Climate and Society. He questioned how this came about. We have a process for review of certificates SD1884 <http://www2.unca.edu/facultysenate/y8485/sd1884.txt> that defines a certificate and the review process for a certificate. It says [excerpt]:

#### *“DEFINITION OF CERTIFICATE*

*A certificate is a simple but formal attestation of:*

- 1) a set of specified courses and experiences,*
- 2) unified by a determined purpose or function,*

3) *completed with a certain measure of success.*

*The set of courses is designed to stand by itself, without necessary reference to an academic degree, a major, or a minor.*

**REVIEW PROCEDURE FOR CERTIFICATES**

*Certificates are subject to the normal academic review procedures of the University."*

The policy may be re-evaluated but it is in use. The Certificate on Climate and Society was not approved by our process.

Associate Provost Ed Katz said this was the first certificate he had done and he was unaware of the 1984 policy. He got two parts of it from General Administration and SACS. He noted that he did receive advice from Dr. Kormanik, Dr. Volker, and Mr. Berls so that he could move forward on it. UNC Chapel Hill has academic policies to review those certificates and others have the information. He would like to get Senate leadership's advice to move forward in the most effective and appropriate way. He will set up one or a series of meetings over the summer to get the best counsel on this.

Dr. Keith Ray clarified conversations taking place on the partnership/relationship between UNC Asheville and the UNC School of Medicine. There are not and never have been any discussion about a joint degree. The conversations taking place have been about a partnership and an arrangement that will allow our students who are appropriately recruited and have achieved certain benchmarks to have expedited acceptance into the Chapel Hill School of Medicine. UNC will have their degree, the Medical School will have their degree, and we will have our degree. There are no conversations about a joint degree. We are talking about a relationship and a partnership about collaboration and recruitment from one program, one degree, one institution to another.

Dr. Moorhead thanked Dr. Ray for the clarification. There has been no update and no further discussion of the collaboration between the schools from the last meeting.

Dr. Frank noted that IDC will continue the practice that has been established to have an explicit update on this issue at every Senate meeting. He thanked Keven Moorhead and IDC members for their work this year.

**VI. Academic Policies Committee Reports**

Mr. Rob Berls reported for the Academic Policies Committee.

**Second Reading [Unanimously Approved]**

The following documents were considered for Second Reading:

[APC 98](#): Change the Withdrawal Policy; Revise the entry under Academic Load

Mr. Berls explained that all students may only have three (3) withdrawals while they are here and this decreases the time that they can withdraw from courses. This is holding the students accountable to the withdrawal policy and it brings us in line with the UNC system.

Dr. Roig asked if APC considered that this change may cause an increase in failure for students.

Mr. Berls said APC discussed the increase failure rate, but its main concern was to make sure that seats are available for students who are serious about taking the courses.

Ms. McClellan said we are setting up the expectation that when students sign up for the course, they are sincere about it. When students sign up and then withdraw from a course, that is taking up in some cases a very sought after seat. Students can still withdraw, but the motivation and their incentive is to approach the work seriously and seek the help they need closer to the start of the semester.

Dr. Hook said the impact of five weeks is actually a little more than what is represented in the document. Faculty will have to give students a major grade or a major assignment within five weeks.

Dr. Moorhead asked if this policy is returning to the shorter period of time we had previously.

Ms. McClellan said it is one week shorter, but we also have a shorter semester. It does mean that faculty needs to give students input. It doesn't have to be an assignment that accounts for 50% of their grade or even a third, but the student should have some idea how they are doing.

Dr. Roig was worried about the unintended consequences; that is if we see a spike in failure rates will Academic Affairs support faculty, knowing we have not changed standards, that it is due to the fact that students now have to stick it out.

Ms. McClellan said over the long term this can help students to be more successful by completing the courses and having that urgency to get help and to make that decision early in the semester.

She explained extraordinary circumstance handled by Academic Affairs. If a student has an emergency, they

are still allowed to fill out a Late Withdrawal Petition. We ask them to bring documentation. When they come back, whether we replace the W or not is taken on an individual case. Extraordinary circumstances will not count against three withdrawals.

Dr. Roig said he foresees late withdrawals being more difficult or more supportive when working with students who miss the withdrawal deadline and have not had an emergency.

Ms. McClellan said when we receive a withdrawal petition and acceptance, we write you to get input about the student. If the professor writes that the student has been attending faithfully, has been working, and has had tutored help and wanted to wait until the first test and failed it, then we are probably going to work with the student.

If this is passed today, we will begin the campaign to let students know: repeated emails, posting on the One Port site, and posting in classrooms. We will try to get faculty to put a statement on their syllabus. Everybody starts at 0 and they have three withdrawals -- whether they are a senior or a freshman.

Dr. Meigs said this puts us in a better situation where now when a student has a lousy performance on the first exam then maybe we need to change our tone and say, "Maybe you need to get out." It is a more urgent question. He added that he is leery of anything that sets up a perverse incentive to tank a class because a student missed the withdrawal date. That is a different conversation we should have.

Dr. Moorhead offered a friendly amendment to change the deadline from five weeks to six weeks.

Dr. Ettari asked if APC looked into the impact between five and six weeks on student financial aid.

Ms. McClellan said there was no impact.

The friendly amendment passed.

APC 98 passed as amended without dissent and became Senate Document [11412S](#).

APC 99: Delete INTS 325, 345, 350

APC 99 passed without dissent and became Senate Document [11512S](#).

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

Mr. Berls said this document has generated a lot of conversation and APC has discussed possible ramifications with the addition of these courses. Several meetings have taken place outside of APC. We have seen within APC what Dr. Frank alluded to under the challenges we face. APC sometimes does not have the entire picture given its current format of documentation. He proposed that the next chair of APC put together a team to look at the submission process and the information needed to have a more global institutional picture. Due to the discussion this document has generated, we realize that we need to investigate how APC can function in a better format.

#### **Discussion**

Dr. Roig said he did not understand how this proposal could work on a global basis. He was surprised to find foreign language outside the Foreign Language Department. Is that typical?

Mr. Berls said in its current iteration, this document will not fulfill the foreign language requirement.

Dr. Roig asked, wouldn't Foreign Language have a say in a foreign language being offered by another department, or shouldn't they have a say?

Mr. Berls said that is another level that we will be discussing with the current rules, but we have precedent outside of the university for classes like these being taught by other departments.

Dr. Greta Trautmann said on behalf of the Modern Foreign Language Department, they are thrilled that Chinese is offered here. It has been lacking for the last several years in our curriculum and Chinese language needs to be here. She recently had the opportunity to talk with Dr. Li and learned they have a common interest in comparative studies with Latin America and China as well as colleagues in common. Dr. Trautmann said first and foremost she was looking forward to working with Dr. Li.

Second, no one in my department is comfortable with a modern foreign language being administered outside of the Modern Foreign Language Department. She addressed this from a couple of different angles. From the angle of the outside looking in, it has to do with being a hub for information and a clearinghouse for offering advice as we talk more about faculty and admissions. I can't tell you how many times I have had interested students or parents say, "What about Chinese?" And I have had to say, "I don't know." That is not just egg on my face. Or a student who says, "How come Chinese is 4 credits and Portuguese is 3 credits?" That lack of information is very awkward for us when speaking with the students who are interested as well as with other faculty who call us. More importantly, from the angle of the inside looking out, any individual who is teaching a modern foreign language should have the support in second language instruction of peers on our campus as well as in the UNC system. The most important reason has to do with transparency and identity. We only became aware of this

document on April 17, 2012. This requires more discussion about advantages and disadvantages before we put permanent policy in place. This document is going to affect my department and other departments and programs. The department will have a new chair this fall and she should be part of this conversation. Chinese needs to be here and we are thrilled. We share students and interests. There are a lot of possibilities as we build in other languages. This is all positive, but there is a lot going on where “the cart is being placed before the horse.”

Dr. Subramaniam said he was elated that Foreign Languages Department is thrilled that Chinese is being offered. We share that happiness, and we have been surprised at the support and interest that students have shown as a consequence of studying the Asian Studies Minor here. Two years ago, we started an Asian Studies Minor in response to an incredible amount of feedback from students in the International Studies Program. When we looked around various campuses looking for best practices, we found there are various models in how to put together an Asian Studies Minor. We started small with four people, and in two years the Asian Studies Minor is now one of the biggest minors on campus with 30 students. At the end of the first year, we were fortunate to be tapped by the East-West Center in Honolulu, Hawaii in a grant targeting new Asian Studies programs around the country. The grant was really in Chinese Studies.

The Best Practices to strengthen the Asian Studies Minor would be to provide some language instruction. But the language instruction is embedded in the minor, for the faculty would be bringing instruction to the faculty resources Chinese language and complementary areas. We put together in a collaborative team with five faculty in the departments of Literature, History, Philosophy and Political Science. We expanded this to include Music, New Media, and Sociology. We brought together those who could offer the depth of Chinese studies within our Asian Studies Minor.

This model has been replicated in various institutions. For example, in Chapel Hill the Chinese language and studies is housed in the Asian Studies Minor. This is part of making the Asian Studies Minor credible and respectable as well as to provide the skills that students may apply.

How successful has this been for students? This past spring semester our Asian Studies Minor students have been awarded on a competitive basis a scholarship this summer to attend Fudan University, an Ivy League school in China. The scholarship is a system-wide program offered to four students and we snagged one. Another scholarship has been given to spend a month in China free of charge where there are 15 offered and we snagged five while Chapel Hill got four. The point I want to make is by some small miracle we got this small thing off the ground. It has not been done perfectly, but I think that bodies such as this would put the interests of the students before anything else when what we have now is successful and working.

We are happy from this point forward to engage with anyone in the faculty to see how we can make this better. To say this is not collaborative, that is not true. We have a China group on campus which reflects faculty from nine departments. We did what we could and it was very experimental, but we are very proud of where we are now and very proud of what our students have accomplished.

Dr. Grant Hardy said there needs to be more cooperation and support between Modern Foreign Language Department and the Asian Studies Minor. It is easy to think that because we call it Modern Languages that any language is a modern language belongs there. Although some schools do it that way, that is certainly not universal. In a lot of schools Chinese and Japanese is considered part of Asian Studies, similar to the way that here Classics is not considered a modern language although Latin is closer to the European languages we have in Modern Foreign Language Department. There is overlap that is beneficial to share, but a lot of schools like us who have big research concentrations have found that it is beneficial to put Asian Studies, Asian languages, and Asian culture classes together to reinforce the language.

Dr. Trautmann said we should take our time and look at the advantages and disadvantages. She agreed with Dr. Hardy regarding other schools, though big schools like Chapel Hill usually have more than one instructor teaching Chinese. Our COPLAC schools, the ones with strongest programs in languages such as William & Mary, have Asian Studies programs that are very strong. The instructor does not belong to the Asian Studies department but to the Modern Foreign Language Department which administers the course strengthening both departments. I am talking about administering a course in order that the department can benefit, students can benefit and our system can benefit. She did not support passing a permanent policy when many of us have just learned of it and do not know anything about it. She said she agreed with Dr. Hardy -- everybody is open for greater communication and collaboration so let's start and see where it can go.

Dr. Subramaniam agreed that collaboration and communication are needed. What this document proposes to do is strengthen an existing minor by building the program to strengthen the curriculum, not a department. As for the timeliness issue, the Asian Studies Minor has been in existence for two years. The students on campus know about it: there are 30 students in the minor program, 60 students have taken Chinese Language, and 75 more students have taken courses in Chinese Studies. It is not a mystery that students have gravitated towards it, they see

how Chinese fits into a larger intellectual framework. It is not just about acquiring a language. Chinese provides an additional layer of depth and rigor that we would like to have in the Asian Studies Minor.

Dr. Kormanik said it is fantastic that we have Chinese taught again on our campus. He appreciated the argument that Dr. Subramaniam made regarding strengthening the curriculum, but languages should be in the language department. The students would benefit from getting exposure from other programs and departments. Another issue is that it is premature to do this now because the Foreign Languages Department is getting a new chair who should be consulted on this issue.

Dr. Alice Weldon congratulated the Asian Studies Minor program and said Dr. Subramaniam's arguments make sense. Her question is if we are really talking about the learning for everyone involved and collaboration, where were the language faculty on Dr. Subramaniam's committee? Second, she has noticed a pattern that concerns her a great deal with APC and with the Senate who brings in documents in at the last minute and are passed at the last minute. She agreed with Dr. Kormanik -- this is not the time to rush this through. It is a concern that needs to be heard.

Dr. Hook said he wanted to support the document, but he did not understand why students should not get credit for Foreign Language by taking a language. And if that is the case, he preferred it be 3 credit hours, not 4 credits -- or, he wanted students to have to take 4 hours of Latin and Greek too, as well as the other languages. He said his interest is not in collaboration but in uniformity. He has a vested interest in this too.

Dr. Subramaniam responded to Dr. Weldon's question. When we put together the initial team, it was people who could in three years teach something in the Asian Studies Minor. If there were a person in the Foreign Language Department who would be willing to retool and teach Chinese then we would have been happy to have them in the group. We looked at the interdisciplinary faculty. Regarding rushing the document, there is a timeline for submitting documents and the documents came through the pipeline and eventually came to APC for deliberation and then to the Senate. It is a slow process. He said we wrote this document to tell students that the Asian Studies Minor at UNC Asheville is not a fly by night operation. It is here to stay and the faculty is serious about this minor.

**Mr. Bowen called the question, which failed by a vote of 5 to 12.**

Dr. Burchard said with regard to the idea that having a language in the Asian Studies program actually deepens the Asian Studies program that does not appear to be the case. If the program was strong before the introduction of a language, why can't the program continue to be strong and get stronger without having a language embedded within it? In regards to Dr. Subramaniam's statement that this is not a fly by night program that isn't going anywhere, my question is do we have a permanent faculty member or a permanent position teaching Chinese? I was under the impression that we did not.

Dr. Subramaniam said the impact of teaching Chinese in an Asian Studies program that makes it stronger is based on programs across the country.

Dr. Hook said we need the language to have a pivotal role.

Dr. Burchard asked if the language has to be housed in the minor.

Dr. Hook said it does not have to be housed in the minor but their reasons make sense.

Dr. Subramaniam said the initial goal was to get someone who could deliver on the important things to have a successful Chinese program.

Dr. Reynolds said she had heard some good arguments and she is happy that we are going to have more Chinese, but she would feel very uncomfortable approving this document without there being more time for discussion between the Modern Foreign Language and the Asian Studies Minor. There has been a lack of collaboration and discussion, but it wasn't intended that way. She did not believe waiting another month or next fall would have any serious impact on our students. Right now, she would not vote for this document.

Dr. Hook asked if Dr. Subramaniam was willing for students to receive Foreign Language credit and to drop down to 3 credit hours.

Dr. Subramaniam said absolutely, we would like more students to take Chinese. We would like more to take Chinese because they want to be Asian Studies Minors. He would have to defer to his colleague on the issue of decreasing the credit hours.

Dr. Meigs said if the different departments would pull together and do what is in the best interest for the students and push these classes forward, he would vote to approve the document.

Associate Provost Katz agreed with Dr. Meigs; the Senate should do what is in the best interest of the students. And the students who are studying language, particularly a pretty challenging language, should receive credit for taking language. In response to the question about the teaching position, we are doing a good job and exceeding our expectations in terms of student activity in that program. The trajectory looks positive. In this case, if the trajectory continues, I am sure we would do the same thing as we do in other programs and departments.

Dr. Trautmann said we all want what is best for the students. If this does not go in as a permanent catalog

change now that just means it will be taught for one more year or half year as a special topic. Regarding the discussion on credit hours, we all want more. Regarding the issue of sustainability, that should be part of the conversation to not necessarily drop Chinese down to three credit hours but to make all of them four credit hours. In the fall, we will be offering Hindi which will be administered through my department. I do not know how that would fit in with Asian Studies but I would like to have that conversation -- perhaps it could contribute to Asian Studies. There are other offerings too.

Provost Jane Fernandes said she understood that the document is an approval of a course and not a policy. These are courses that we are offering now and we can continue to offer with a well-qualified Chinese language and culture instructor. She urged the Faculty Senate to approve the courses, but added a caveat that all the discussion brought up important points that need to be addressed. She needed the conversation to be had between the Classics, Modern Foreign Languages and Asian Studies. She said she did not know enough about what we are doing, but she believed we are all for Hebrew in the Classics and Hebrew both a modern and ancient language. There isn't a stipulation that a modern language is in one place and ancient language is in another place. We need to be consistent. She would hope we could approve the courses and then agree to continue the dialogue over issues that have to be discussed, and then make systematic plans.

Dr. Sophie Mills clarified that in regards to Hebrew, it was Biblical Hebrew that is traditionally in Classics rather than in the Modern Foreign Languages.

Dr. Roig asked for a clarification on resources: the impact says there are no added faculty resources but we heard that currently this faculty person is under a grant. When that grant runs out, we have to replace this somehow. The impact is not a correct statement. In fact, this would impact resources – particularly if we put them in the catalog making them permanent classes that would lend credence to adding that faculty line.

Provost Jane Fernandes said part of the stipulation of the grant is that the university was prepared to fund and support China language and culture instruction by funding of a Chinese culture and language faculty member. In terms of the position, we have moved step by step. First, we brought a well-qualified Chinese language and culture professor here and allowed the courses to be delivered for one year. We have seen success. At the recent Position Allocation Committee Meeting, there was unanimous support for continuing that position for two more years. If we continue to see success, we will move to the next step, whatever that may be. We are doing as much as we can to offer a good program to students and to make the decisions about positions and resources.

Dr. Kormanik asked what the biggest advantage was in passing this document now.

Dr. Subramaniam did not see it as an either/or proposition. If we are committed as faculty and we agree to introduce Chinese Studies into our curriculum, then we establish a baseline in the catalog so the students will know that it is taught here. When I host an open house, parents show up with very eager and ambitious high school kids, and the first thing they ask is, “Do you have Asian Studies,” and they want to see my classes. I say, “Yeah, we hope to build something down the road.”

Dr. Sophie Mills noted that this cannot get in the catalog this year (2012-2013). By waiting and having the time for conversations, it will be in the catalog at exactly the same time and we would have the benefit of this dialogue and time. She was impressed with what Dr. Subramaniam had done with the Chinese, but felt uncomfortable about the unresolved issues.

Dr. Moorhead said he kept getting hung up on the fact this is not going to count for a foreign language. He did not understand why that is not going to be worked out before putting it in the catalog. How would this be done after the fact? Bring in another APC document?

Dr. Subramaniam said yes, we could bring in one more APC document just for that purpose. We would not be starting from scratch but “moving the ball on down the road.”

Dr. Frank said before we move one, he wanted to remind everyone that a lot of lessons were learned in this conversation and even more promises were made. In the spirit that he invoked early on in establishing trust within our bodies and within Academic Affairs, we as faculty deserve and owe it to each other that the promises that we makes speak to what we teach and preach which is interdisciplinary and spirit of mutual learning. I hope that next year's Senate lives up to that and that we do that.

[APC 101 passed by a vote of 9 to 8 and became Senate Document 11612S.](#)

[APC 102: Revisions to Asian Studies Minor description;](#)

[Addition of courses to list of Asian Studies minor electives](#)

[APC 102 passed by a vote of 14 to 3 and became Senate Document 11712S.](#)

### **Discussion**

Dr. Roig asked why APC 100 was tabled.

Dr. Subramaniam said people raised questions and he asked that the document be tabled so he could revisit the questions that were raised.

Mr. Berls thanked APC members for their work this year. Dr. Frank thanked Mr. Berls and APC members.

## **VII. Administrative Reports**

### **Academic Affairs**

#### **Report on Activity of Position Allocation Committee (PAC)**

In regards to the 2011-2012 year, Provost Fernandes reported that PAC provided input into proposals from the budget cut. If you remember, that was the year that we had to cut 10 faculty lines and we lost approximately \$800,000 in faculty salary money. We were severely restricted in terms of what positions we could approve. We did some good tenure track hires in spite of the challenges. PAC also provided input into one year and multi-year lecturer appointments and several visiting assistant professorships. The report reflects only hires that PAC had advised the Provost -- not all hires that PAC had advised the Provost are listed in the report.

PAC has also discussed with the Provost the Spring Semester departmental and program requests for tenure-track, lecturer, and visiting assistant professor positions for the coming year. The Provost is close to making the decisions and informing the departments. She will make an official announcement soon.

### **Student Government**

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

SGA passed their Transparency Act so they can increase communication with the student body.

SGA would like to continue communications with the Faculty Senate in the next administration. They understand the difficulty of schedules for faculty to continue to visit their SGA meetings; however, the next administration would like to work out a meeting of SGA and Faculty Senate to facilitate that continued communication.

SGA hosted its annual Greenfest event this week. The main event was the clean-up of the 525 Broadway property with over 150 students, staff and faculty volunteers.

SGA has appointed an elections commissioner to look at the challenges we face and to try to rectify as many problems as possible so the in-coming freshmen elections in the fall will run more smoothly and we will have a more democratic process.

## **VIII. Old Business**

There was no Old Business.

## **IX. New Business**

### **Thanks to Dr. Volker Frank**

The Faculty Senate presented to Dr. Frank a gift and a round of applause as a thank you for serving as Senate Chair for the past two years.

### **Retirement of Sandra Gravely -- Deep Gratitude for Decades of Service**

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

### **APC Recognizes Alicia Shope**

Academic Policies Committee acknowledges from their deepest hearts Alicia Shope for her hard work and service to APC during the year. She was given a gift and a round of applause.

### **Faculty Senate recognizes the Chairs of APC, FWDC and IDC**

The Faculty Senate also thanked their chairs for their hard work and service this past year with a gift and a round of applause.

## **X. Adjourn**

Dr. Frank adjourned the meeting at 6:20pm.

Respectfully submitted by: Sandra Gravely and Lisa Sellers  
Executive Committee