

University of North Carolina at Asheville
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Minutes, May 2, 2013 (3:15 pm)

Senate

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

Visitors: G. Ashburn, M. Cameron, P. Catterfeld, B. Judge, E. Katz, J. Konz, K. Krumpe, P. McClellan, D. Race, A. Shope, W. Strehl, L. Whittaker

I. Call to Order, Introductions and Announcements:

Dr. Burchard called the Faculty Senate Meeting to Order by welcoming everyone to the last meeting of the 2012-2013 Faculty Senate. She especially thanked the senators for their service this past year and welcomed the newly-elected senators who were present at this meeting. The first meeting of the 2013-2014 Faculty Senate convenes immediately after this meeting's conclusion.

In regards to the celebratory news, Dr. Burchard encouraged her colleagues to attend and support fellow faculty at the Faculty Senate-sponsored Record Party on Thursday, May 9. Dr. Burchard said she has favorable feedback from faculty regarding this event.

II. Approval of Minutes:

- [March 21, 2013 Faculty Senate Minutes](#)

Moved, second, no discussion and approved without dissent.

- [April 25, 2013 Faculty Senate Minutes](#)

Moved, second, no discussion and approved without dissent.

III. Executive Committee Report

Dr. Melissa Burchard

The 2012-2013 Year in Review. As is the Faculty Senate custom, Dr. Burchard, as chair, presented the annual review of the Faculty Senate's accomplishments:

1. Raised difficult questions. Although not all have been answered nor resolved, Dr. Burchard believes it is important to raise difficult questions. Unresolved questions will be carried forward into the next school year.
2. Reestablished an effort to make more connection between the Faculty Senate and the faculty and staff as a whole.
3. Reconnected and strengthened communication with the Faculty Senates of our sister campuses in the UNC system. We are engaging efforts at solidarity, staying in the loop and being more involved in the work at the UNC system level.
4. Reinforced our belief in faculty governance and our solidarity with the other campuses by endorsing a number of resolutions by the Faculty Assembly.

5. Endured enormous challenges created by further reductions in resources. Enduring these challenges should always be celebrated.
6. Engaged in difficult discussions and learned new things about ourselves.
7. Made important revisions in policies and procedures.

Projects that will need to be addressed next year:

1. Curriculum Review
2. Continuing the review of policies and the handbook
3. Discussion of graduate programs
4. Continuing need of relief in faculty workload

Student Government Report. Ms. Leigh Whittaker, the newly elected Student Government Association President, is the new SGA Representative to Faculty Senate for 2013-2014. She is a rising junior Political Science major. The Faculty Senate congratulated her on her election and welcomed her to the Faculty Senate.

Currently, SGA is transitioning between administrations. The SGA passed a resolution against [NC Senate Bill S666](#) which changes voting regulations where the parents do not receive their tax deductions if their college students vote in a different county from the parents' residence. Dr. Burchard said she was glad that SGA spoke out against this legislation.

Faculty Assembly Report.

[Memo from President Ross 03252013](#)

President Ross requests institutions review their missions this summer. This seems to be directed more towards institutions where online education is a significant component of the entire curriculum. Since UNC Asheville recently did a review of our mission in 2009, the consensus is that we do not need changes nor do we foresee any mission changes at this time.

Faculty Assembly Resolutions. These three resolutions reflect the continuing concern that the faculty has about the strategic plan and how it will be implemented. In particular, there is concern about the importance of faculty remaining prominent in the decision making. These were approved by the Faculty Assembly last Friday, April 19, 2013:

[Resolution 2013-06: Resolution on Budget Cuts and Mission Reevaluation](#)

[Resolution 2013-07: Resolution on General Education Competencies](#)

[Resolution 2013-08: Resolution Providing Recommendations on the CAA](#)

These resolutions emphasize the importance of faculty in the implementation of the strategic plan and deciding further budget cuts. There are concerns where major decisions tend to be made over the summer when faculty is not around and the Faculty Assembly wanted to say that faculty still needs to be involved in these decisions to the greatest extent possible. In summary, these resolutions are about appropriate faculty roles in decision making. She asked for a Sense of Senate Resolution to endorse these resolutions from the Faculty Assembly. There was a motion made and seconded. There was no discussion.

The Sense of Senate Resolution was passed without dissent.

IV. Curriculum Review Task Force Proposal Survey

The Faculty Senate has seen the information that has been gathered from the survey. [The Executive Committee Response to the Survey.](#)

The Executive Committee thanks the Curriculum Review Task Force for the enormous amount of time, concern and effort that has gone into every phase of the review process. Regardless of the outcome of the review, they want to be clear there is no question of the Faculty Senate's appreciation of that work.

The Executive Committee (EC) finds that the survey does not provide a ringing endorsement. There are many significant and thoughtful concerns that need to be addressed before the proposal comes to APC and the Faculty Senate in a formal way. The level of the opposition to the proposal seems high enough that it signals that there is not enough support for the proposal to simply move forward at this time.

The EC believes that it would be wise not to try to push forward a change when the campus seems ambivalent about it. Further given that the deadline for APC documents passage for implementation in 2013-14 has passed, it makes sense to consider what can be done to address some of the concerns that have been brought forth with regard to the proposal before writing APC documents for consideration next year. Of course, the EC recognizes that this is frustrating and disappointing to many people and they are sorry for that. However, it is the EC's recommendation, on the basis of their best judgment about what makes sense for the institution.

Discussion and Responses:

Dr. Fernandes said that an hour ago Dr. Frank stopped by her office and asked her to express his views on his behalf. Dr. Frank could not come to the meeting today due to a prior commitment. Dr. Frank does not agree with the Executive Committee's interpretation of the results of the survey and believes the survey does endorse of the CRTF proposal. He views it as 60/40 and that 60/40 is an acceptable amount of support for a complicated curriculum project. He urges the Faculty Senate to ignore the Executive Committee's advice and to move ahead with a decision of some kind, preferably action for the proposal without further delay.

Dr. Meigs said that IDC had concerns about the straw poll. They had a couple of questions: Was the straw poll anonymous? Was it possible for a person to vote more than once?

Dr. Kaplan, speaking for FWDC who conducted the poll, said the straw poll was anonymous and that a machine could only vote once. IDC also was concerned regarding the low response, 92 out of 210 faculty members. Dr. Kaplan said that 50 percent is a high response rate for a voluntary response survey. Usually, a response rate for voluntary surveys is around 10 percent. FWDC was responsible for putting the questions together. They created the draft and ran it by several outside experts.

Dr. Meigs also asked how to treat the non-responses. Are non-responses a lack of approval or a sign that they do not have issues? IDC also felt that since 41 of the 92 respondents voted no warrants significant Faculty Senate discussion.

Dr. Hook asked for clarification of what the EC recommendation means. Is EC recommending to scrap the proposal? The chair answered no.

What is the recommendation exactly?

Dr. Burchard said the recommendation is for the Faculty Senate to look more closely at the concerns that were raised in the survey and consider whether there is something we could do to address those concerns before formal APC documents are written.

Dr. Roig asked who the “we” was. Dr. Burchard is not sure who the “we” will be. Certainly, the Faculty Senate is going to be involved at some level.

Dr. Hook said that his understanding that the decision to conduct a survey rather than hold a vote was to simply get a sense of faculty and not to make any decision whatsoever. Before the survey, we knew that we had more work to do. Dr. Hook believes that Faculty Senate can’t do anything with the survey for the response was 60/40 and not everyone commented and there was far less than 50 percent of eligible faculty who responded. He believes the completion of the work is neither further away nor closer than two meetings ago.

Looking back at the minutes, Dr. Kaplan said his impression of the Faculty Senate’s intent was to see if there was anyone missing from participation or issues not heard at the different meetings held spring semester. One of the reasons for the low response to the survey could be that the faculty felt heard in those meetings and did not feel they needed to reply to the survey. It was not the intention of the Faculty Senate that this was the vote of the faculty but a chance for faculty to give additional feedback.

Dr. Kaplan’s impression is the survey reflects the same comments that were coming from the discussions in general. The information is not new but reinforces what we heard and is comforting in that sense.

Dr. Schaffer said the raw numbers showed less than 40 people voted no. Thus, he does not find the results of the survey alarming enough postponing moving forward with APC documents.

Dr. Galloway said that IDC talked about how many of the comments were ambiguous and contradictory.

Dr. Roig’s impression was the task force said they worked on a consensus basis. The fact that a fair number of faculty said they could not support this makes him feel there is less consensus. He said that the issues raised were very similar to the issues raised by the task force and these issues are broadly felt by the faculty. The question is do we have consensus.

Dr. Burchard’s memory is before we did the survey there was a discussion regarding what happens next.

Dr. Kaplan said that the March minutes say (where Dr. Burchard and Dr. Frank were discussing the process), that step one is to survey the faculty (which we did) and then the next step is CRTF and the Faculty Senate gets together to alter the proposal. After that, there will be a faculty vote on the altered proposal and only then would it go to APC.

Dr. Burchard agreed with Dr. Kaplan’s summary. However, she does not believe that the proposal could go to APC in its current form.

Dr. Kaplan agreed and said that next CRTF and the Faculty Senate forms an ad hoc group

to alter the proposal. Dr. Kaplan said if that was a motion of action, he could vote for that.

Dr. Eggers said she felt there is some valuable information in the survey. She believes there is broad agreement on several aspects of the proposal. There is quite a split on the humanities (as there was on the task force as well). She believes that we should look at the humanities specifically and do a poll of the faculty this fall to see if it really is 50/50, as an example.

Dr. Kormanik is concerned about losing momentum to move forward. As Dr. Schaffer said, less than 40 folks rejected the document out of 230 faculty members. He believes we have a framework and that we can move forward with that framework. For example, the science faculty could come up with a document to address the science requirement in this document. The foreign language folks could come up with a document to address their aspects. The management folks can come up with a document to address their aspects. The humanities folks can come up with a document to address the humanities.

Dr. Kormanik emphasized that we have a framework. He does not believe someone will come up with a document that has five humanities courses in it. It may be a total of three versus four humanities classes, and we may have a spirited discussion about that. We have a framework and a total number of hours as a goal to guide us as we proceed forward. For example, considering 379 or considering clusters, as we move on those issues, the whole package will come together.

Dr. Burchard expressed that she believes that is the idea of CRTF and the Faculty Senate doing the work together to set up how we will move forward within this framework.

Dr. Bowen emailed Dr. Frank asking what the best process should be and believes he forwarded those emails to the Executive Committee. Dr. Frank's statement to Dr. Bowen is that it goes to APC with members of CRTF to start formulating a document. His intention or idea is that it starts with APC at the beginning of the year. However, Dr. Bowen likes Dr. Kormanik's idea of taking other documents from other areas and moving them; however, maybe it should be housed in APC.

Dr. Hook pointed out that he would not want to see another closed intensive summer group for it seems to him that is where this process became murky. It isn't just about consensus and persuading people who don't think the same way. We have to talk through and agree to disagree openly in a larger process. Dr. Hook understands the momentum issue, but the insularity issue is more of a problem. He believes minimal work should happen over the summer.

Dr. Hook was very disappointed that everything "fell off the table" for several months at the beginning of this semester. If we wanted the work completed this semester, those months were crucial. At this point now, Dr. Hook strongly feels we need the entire faculty involved and the process needs to be very open and be completely different than it was last summer. Dr. Hook advises the Faculty Senate to be cautious moving too many things forward during the summer. He believes that is partly why we are where we are today.

Dr. Meigs said that IDC talked about finding aspects of the proposal that enjoyed overwhelming support such as taking away the topical clusters. If that had enough support,

perhaps that could be moved forward separately much as the 379 proposal is being moved forward separately. We decided not to try to push that through too quickly, but it is something that the Faculty Senate could consider whether there are parts of the proposal that do not have much opposition from the faculty as a whole that could be implemented sooner. He understands that Dr. Frank is not thrilled about that idea of piecemeal; however, there would be victory in that the CRTF work would amount to a change.

Dr. Fernandes wanted to emphasize what Dr. Frank has said that the CRTF Proposal is a whole. If as a group we pass the elimination of the clusters but leave the rest out of the recommendations, the whole proposal would fall apart. CRTF worked at consensus where no one agreed with the entire proposal but with enough of it to see the whole go forward. He would not be pleased regarding piecemeal vote, part-by-part. As the Provost, she does believe there is a small committee available to do the work going forward. Dr. Frank urges the Faculty Senate to move ahead with the full proposal. Sixty people spent two years developing a proposal and he won't call that group together again. The proposal has been made and the CRTF's work is done.

However, the Provost said there are people who have volunteered already from CRTF to work with APC and the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Burchard, in summary, described the suggestions for moving forward. One of them is to create an ad hoc group with members of the task force and members of the Faculty Senate that would begin to work on documents for the fall.

Another option is to ask each department to write their departments' APC documents reflecting the work in the proposal for their area. For example, the science department would write a document regarding the science requirement UNC Asheville ought to have.

Dr. Miller asked if we are writing these documents out, does that not assume we approve the CRTF proposal. Does the vote of the faculty of the whole have to come first? To Dr. Miller, the vote needs to come first.

And Dr. Ruppert asked if different people are writing different parts, does that make it parts instead of a whole? Will the parts be separate documents put together in one document for APC?

Dr. Burchard said that was another issue as to how the documents come to APC. Do they come in one package or are there different documents that speak to different aspects of the curriculum?

Dr. Hook asked Dr. Katz how did the ILS pass, as one document or multiple documents?

Dr. Katz replied that it was one document. He explained that there was a proposal for a curriculum. The Faculty Senate voted on that proposal which got unanimous approval. Then over the summer, a team of people from the ILS group and two faculty members from APC worked up a draft of a document for the whole curriculum. That document went before APC and APC revised, made suggestions and voted on the document. It went forward from there to the Faculty Senate. That was the entire process: proposal first as a whole, and upon approval, then over the summer the ILS group with 2 APC members made an implementation document along with the catalog documents.

Dr. Mills relayed that she thought that the survey wasn't the faculty vote, but there would be a faculty vote before it proceeded through the official channels. Is that now completely off the table or is that still an option? If the faculty votes for the proposal, then there is a reason for going forward; however, if they don't, then that seems problematic.

Dr. Meigs reiterated that IDC believes that the proposal needs to move forward since so much good work has been done. Clearly, from the straw poll, there is a majority of faculty who support this so it needs to move forward. We have to find a way to make it move forward even if it has to be changed. He feels that there are those, including Dr. Frank, who believes the proposal is final and can't be tweaked in any way to be effective.

Dr. Meigs does not believe that. He believes that it can be tweaked to gather more popularity among the faculty and then it can move forward in that form. That is the challenge to be worked out. He admits that he says this cavalierly as he rotates off the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Burchard agreed that the sense of the Executive Committee's recommendation that the significant thoughtful concerns be looked at before formal documents are brought to APC.

Dr. Miller asked if the Faculty Senate could encourage the Executive Committee to go forward with their suggestions by looking at the concerns on the survey and ask if they are reasonable. If they are reasonable concerns, ask how to address them. If they are not reasonable, put the proposal to a vote of the faculty of the whole.

Dr. Burchard said the Faculty Senate as a whole needs to endorse the Executive Committee's recommendation.

Dr. Miller asked if there is a need for a motion and Dr. Burchard concurred.

Dr. Miller moved that the Executive Committee moves forward with looking at the concerns of the survey and decide whether any tweaking needs to be done before it goes to a faculty-wide vote in the Fall.

Dr. Galloway asked if the task should be assigned to EC or should we have a task force. CRTF was the task force and they addressed a lot of the concerns that came up in the survey. Is this EC's role or do they want a group to look at this survey with a fine-tooth comb when we are not sure it is representative of the whole faculty?

Dr. Burchard said that since the concerns of the survey are the concerns we have heard continually along the way that they can be taken seriously.

Did we have a second to that motion?

Dr. Hook expressed that he does not know if the Faculty Senate can add that to the Executive Committee. He doesn't understand how that would work.

Dr. Burchard concurred that it is not simply the job of the Executive Committee to do this, but the Executive Committee could participate with others in a group which includes members of the task force who are willing as well as those who raised the concerns to ask what we can do about the concerns, if anything. Perhaps, the Executive Committee or the Faculty Senate could appoint a group.

Dr. Miller expressed that it seems we are dead in the water right now.

Dr. Galloway agreed and it is the Faculty Senate that needs to move this forward upon the advisement of the Executive Committee's recommendations. There should be a

commitment to not take another year. Sometime in the Fall 2013, we anticipate a faculty-wide vote after we hear the considerations of this task force.

Dr. Miller withdrew his motion.

Dr. Galloway made a motion that Faculty Senate forms a task force of representative members of various groups to explore the concerns that may hold up the process of approving the proposal by the faculty of the whole.

Dr. Miller seconded.

Discussion:

Dr. Hook said that the clear concern here is the humanities which he has interest. He wants the humanities to be as it is. If ILS goes away, that leaves the humanities as core and so he does not have a clear understanding of what the objections to the humanities are.

Some of the issues seem to be regarding workload and faculty scheduling which can be addressed by faculty and departmental commitment.

However, Dr. Hook's understanding is the primary issue is the "I don't understand why the humanities are so important" issue. There are faculty members who say they do not want to be a liberal arts college "that way" anymore. They don't want a core built on this sequence. In the least, they don't want to have this much of it. If that is the major issue, that is a different kind of an argument. In Dr. Hook's mind, this is the primary issue.

If there is a study to look at this principal issue, he is for it. If there are enough faculty to commit and will teach in the humanities area as well as chairs to allocate enough faculty to teach the required number of sections, and if the Position Allocation Committee prioritizes the humanities for they understand that the humanities is important – then we can address that.

Dr. Hook can see a study to determine whether there is a sustainable commitment to the humanities. However, he does not support having a committee delve into the numerous concerns of the survey that were all over the map.

Dr. Hook proposed adding a friendly amendment to appoint a group to look at "the principal issues of concern." The humanities seem to be the number one issue of concern. What is the number 2 issue? State the principal issues to be studied in the motion. He would support a motion stated like that.

Dr. Eggers suggests a friendly amendment that we don't call this a task force but a group. Dr. Meigs and Dr. Eggers stated they do not feel it would be too much to consider the concerns in the survey since they do come down to a few issues to address. They support a committee to study these and to tweak the language of the proposal before it goes to APC.

Dr. Meigs feels there should be a timeline added to give the group until October. Dr. Eggers asked it to be July 1 for it is not going to take long.

Dr. Hobby said if the Faculty Senate is really going to appoint a group to consider the faculty comments, then there needs to be a formal survey of faculty at a more ideal time in the semester. This survey was done very quickly at the end of the year. He doesn't understand the benefit of another group looking at a nonrepresentational set of responses. For example, from the CRTF prospective, the humanities cease to be an issue. There were a number of people on CRTF who objected to this, and CRTF came up with a compromise which is not changing the

humanities at all.

From the CRTF prospective, Dr. Hobby wonders why we are revisiting the humanities issue when the CRTF group of 60 is very close to the number of 90. If we are looking at the major things from the proposal, there are things like clusters and 379s that across the campus we have support. He does like the language about considering any reasonable concerns or all concerns. However, if a group is formed, he suggests that we conduct a more detailed survey that gives more time for responses since we do not have a representative pulse of the whole faculty.

Dr. Kaplan shared that he does not believe we are dead in the water. Again, we have a list of what we were going to do after the survey:

- Sit and look at the results (which we are currently doing)
- Consider alterations to the final proposal (by putting together an ad hoc committee)
- Put the Edited Proposal to the vote of the faculty as a whole before it goes to APC

If we are going to follow this route, we can decide to send this proposal unedited in the fall to the faculty as a whole for a full vote. Or have a group look at the concerns to see if we need to tweak it or not, and then have the proposal go to the whole faculty in the fall for a vote before going to APC. This is what we outlined before.

Dr. Roig agrees with Dr. Hobby that he does not know whether we have the representative feedback needed and agrees that there is a need to resurvey.

Dr. Ruppert disagreed that between the survey and the sessions the Faculty Senate sponsored that Faculty Senate does have enough information and there isn't a need for another survey. Dr. Kaplan concurred.

Dr. Galloway believes that it is important to have members of CRTF to be part of the group that puts together the documents.

Dr. Mills feels the survey, though informal and imperfect, seems to replicate very closely the divisions of CRTF. She does not understand in a way why we are repeating this again. She does not know what more we are hoping to find.

Dr. Hobby concurred that these are the same concerns and the same breakdown in voting that occurred in the taskforce.

Dr. Meigs said that 41% of the respondents said they wouldn't support it and he believes that should be delved into a bit. If we can't make it more palpable, then it would be fine to take it to the faculty as a whole vote anyway. However, if we find we can do some things to make the proposal more attractive to more than 59% of the faculty as a whole that does seem like a viable option.

Dr. Burchard suggests that maybe to combine these two pieces. Seems to be good to review some of the concerns as well as move forward by having a group writing documents. Is there a reason why we can't put together a group to write documents and have that group also be responsible for looking and addressing some of the concerns in the language in the proposal. That work can be brought in the fall either to the full faculty for a vote or to APC as full APC documents.

Dr. Fernandes liked that option of working on documents for that will give a sense to

everyone that there is momentum. If the group finds the people with concerns, they can ask them about it. Face to face conversations might be more effective than surveys.

Dr. Konz spoke to Dr. Hook's concern about the small group who worked over the summer. Because of the insularity, the value of the group was the face to face conversations. The same objections were made but concluding that they could live with that. Maybe the face to face conversations with those who object could help to build consensus.

Dr. Burchard reminded the Faculty Senate that there is a motion on the floor. Does the Motion stand or is it withdrawn? There was a call for rereading of the current motion.

Ms. Sellers, Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant, relayed the motion including the friendly amendments:

Dr. Galloway made a motion that Faculty Senate forms a group of representative members from various areas which includes CRTF members to explore the concerns that may hold up the approval of the faculty as a whole and report to the Faculty Senate by October's meeting.

Dr. Galloway accepted the friendly amendment to her motion that the group also writes the APC documents.

Motion after friendly amendment:

Dr. Galloway moved to form a group of the Faculty Senate and CRTF to begin formulating APC documents based on the proposal by CRTF as well as considering the concerns expressed in the survey about the proposal. These documents are to be presented to APC by November 1 after the faculty as a whole has voted on the edited proposal.

There is still dissent regarding considering the concerns of the survey so Dr. Galloway withdraws her motion.

Dr. Hook then took up the discussion to understand where the Faculty Senate stood. He understands that we are going to need a group no matter what to draft APC documents as Dr. Kaplan relayed from the language of the March minutes. Though the information from the survey is inclusive, it did replicate the basic discussions of the CRTF which has been working on the proposal much longer.

Dr. Hook moved that a group drafts APC documents over the summer. In the fall, we will bring the CRTF proposal to the faculty as a whole for a vote at the near start of fall semester.

Dr. Galloway seconded the motion.

Discussion:

Dr. Fernandes liked the motion but would ask the Faculty Senate to make a determination of what vote of the whole faculty is acceptable. She does not anticipate 100% support and believes that it will be a split-vote.

Dr. Kormanik said that the standard course is 2/3 majority is required. His question is whether the percentage of the eligible faculty or of those who vote. Dr. Eggers suggested that the group decides the acceptable voting.

Question called for a vote.

The chair announced the final motion for vote including friendly amendments added:

A group (whose members contain APC and CRTF) drafts APC documents over the

summer. In the early weeks fall semester, we will bring a proposal to the faculty as a whole to a vote. The group will determine what is acceptable in terms of the vote. The result will bring documents to APC by November 1.

The motion passed 16-2 dissent.

The chair or someone will be contacting the continuing and new members of the Senate to work over the summer. If you are interested or willing to do that, the senators were to let Dr. Burchard know before they left the meeting.

IV. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee Report

Mr. Rob Bowen

First Reading

FWDC13/IDC4: Certificate Procedure Additions (Faculty Handbook 5.4.2 Program Changes)

FWDC13/IDC4 outlines the process to be followed for the adoption of certificate programs at UNC Asheville and completes the senate's resolution that they adopted in November 2012.

Second Reading

FWDC 9: Modification of Faculty Scholarship and Service Award Committee (Revision of [SD7708S](#), [SD0112F](#), and [Section 10.3.4](#) of the Faculty Handbook; Award instituted in Fall 2000 (see [SD0700F](#)))

FWDC 9 adds a second Distinguished Service Award which is endorsed by The Provost. A motion was made and seconded to accept the document. No discussion.

FWDC 9 was approved without dissent and is Senate Document SD8813S.

FWDC 10: Institutional Review Board Policy Revisions
(Replacing [Section 4.3.6.2](#) of the Faculty Handbook
Replacing [Section 10.4.20](#) of the Faculty Handbook
Concerns [SD0393F](#) and [SD3110S](#))

FWDC 10 revises the Faculty Handbook's Institutional Review Board (IRB) section to the current IRB policies. A motion was made and seconded to accept the document. No discussion.

FWDC 10 was approved without dissent and is Senate Document SD8913S.

FWDC 11: Addition of Shared Governance Document to the Preface of the Faculty Handbook
(Revision of [Section 0.0](#) of the Faculty Handbook: [PREFACE \(SD11312S\)](#))

FWDC 11 adds the Shared Governance Document to the Preface of the Faculty Handbook. A motion was made and seconded to accept the document. No discussion.

FWDC 11 was approved without dissent and is Senate Document SD9013S.

[FWDC 12](#): Change the number of ILS committee members
(Revision of [Section 10.3.8](#) of the Faculty Handbook
Faculty ILS Oversight Committee (ILSOC)
[SD8307S](#) [SD0703F](#) [SD0304F](#) [SD0105F](#) [SD6309S](#))

FWDC 12 reduces the number of ILS Committee members by two in order to allow for more workflow during the year. A motion was made and seconded to accept the document.

Discussion:

Dr. Roig suggested a friendly amendment to remove nonconsecutive staggered terms for their wish is to reappoint an individual for continuity.

Dr. McKnight offered that this request came from ILSOC itself and said the reason for this document is due to the numerous members preventing a face to face meeting where all could be present, and as a result, they settle with email meetings. FWDC 12 will allow face to face meetings.

FWDC 12 was approved without dissent and is Senate Document SD9113S.

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

FWDC 8 was tabled at the last meeting until the vote on the Constitutional Amendment. Mr. Bowen asked Dr. Roig for his report of that vote. Dr. Roig reported that the Constitutional Amendment passed. Where 50% voter turnout was required for the vote to be valid, there was a whopping 61% voter turnout (116 of the 189 eligible voters). 113 faculty members voted yes and 3 voted no. Achieving the required 2/3rds majority, the amendment to the Constitution passed.

FWDC 8 was taken back up for its Second Reading. FWDC 8 makes the needed changes to Section 10 of the Faculty Handbook so that the common practice of election process now matches Faculty Senate's approved legislation.

A motion was made and seconded to accept the document. No discussion.

FWDC 8 was approved without dissent and is Senate Document SD9213S.

Mr. Rob Bowen concluded by saying that FWDC has accomplished a great deal this year. He personally thanked Dr. Dee Eggers, Dr. Brian Hook, Dr. Sam Kaplan, Dr. Jeff Konz and Dr. Reed Roig for their hard work.

VI. Institutional Development Committee/University Planning Council Reports

Dr. Ted Meigs

Second Reading

[IDC 3](#): Proposal to Reorganize the University Student Learning Outcomes
IDC 3 was the work of IDC, Dr. Blake Hobby and Dr. Lisa Friedenberg.

IDC 3 is a proposal to reorganize the University Student Learning Outcomes (USLOs) in two areas:

1. The development of human capabilities;
2. The acquisition of lifelong learning skills and the application of these skills to real-world scenarios and practical situations.

Outcome 1 describes the means by which students develop the capabilities and Outcome 2 articulates the lifelong learning skills we value and lists ways that students apply these skills. This reorganization preserves the focus of our current USLOs.

A motion was made and seconded to accept the document. No discussion.

IDC 3 was approved without dissent and is Senate Document SD9313S.

Dr. Meigs went over the highlights of UPC's April 17th meeting:

[UPC Minutes April 17, 2013](#)

IDC met on April 25. Highlights Dr. Meigs covered from that meeting:

- The Graduate Program Survey has been circulated and Dr. Katz said the response time ends on Monday. They had over 50% faculty response. Overall, the response has been strong with over 1100 responses (15%) out of the total 6500 surveys sent which is well above the 6-9% typical success rate.
- IDC's role in interpreting the survey next year.
- CRTF concerns which were relayed in the earlier discussion.
- Suggested priorities from 2013-2014:
 - The Curriculum since ultimately the faculty is responsible for the curriculum at UNC Asheville. Exploration of programs at UNC Asheville: How many and what types?
 - Asheville Graduate Center programs and their resource implications.
 - Heri and NSSE surveys where IDC needs to pay attention to the data that comes forth.
 - IDC needs to discuss what to do with new assets; specifically the property across the street.
 - Keep an eye on the state level and work to maintain UNC Asheville's unique mission in the landscape of the Board of Governor's new strategic plan.
 - Scrutiny of our strategic plan to make sure it aligns with what goes on at the state level while keeping our unique identity and mission.

Dr. Meigs closed by saying how he appreciated working on IDC and he will miss doing this work.

VII. Academic Policies Committee Report

Dr. Sophie Mills

First Reading

[APC 99](#): Add new course prefix, WLNG, for World Languages (Second reading will be at the next meeting (the first meeting of 2013-2014 Faculty Senate which comes to order immediately after the adjournment of the present meeting).

Second Reading

- [APC 79:](#) Change credit hours and descriptions for CLAS 101, 102, 103 and 104
- [APC 80:](#) Change credit hours and descriptions of CLAS 315 and 316
- [APC 81:](#) Change course description for CLAS 495; Move CLAS 495 and 499 from separate listings under the Greek and Latin courses to the end of the Classics course listing section
- [APC 82:](#) Changes to requirements for Classics Major and Minor
- [APC 83:](#) Add new courses, INTS 201, 301, 320 and 330, cross-listing INTS 320 and 330 with ASIA 320 and 330
- [APC 84:](#) Add ASIA 100 and INTS 201 as options for the introductory
- [APC 85:](#) Change title and description of HWP 310; Change prerequisite for HWP 335
- [APC 86:](#) Change prerequisite for HWP 316
- [APC 87:](#) Change title and description of HWP 355
- [APC 88:](#) Delete the following courses from Health and Wellness Promotion: HWP 220, 292, 321, 390, 410 and 421
- [APC 89:](#) Change when the following courses are offered:
HWP 154, 155, 253, 333, 345, 360, 420, 480
- [APC 90:](#) Change requirements for the major in Health and Wellness Promotion
- [APC 91:](#) Add new course, SABR 000, Study Abroad or Study Away
- [APC 92:](#) Change descriptions and prerequisites for FREN 110 and 120;
Add new course, FREN 130;
Change descriptions and prerequisites for GERM 110 and 120;
Add new course, GERM 130;
Change descriptions and prerequisites for SPAN 110, 120 and 130
- [APC 93:](#) Delete CSCI 242, 342 and 446
- [APC 94:](#) Change requirements for Concentration in Information Systems
- [APC 95:](#) Change the terms offered for several CSCI courses;
Change the title, course description and prerequisite for CSCI 344;
Change the prerequisite for CSCI 431
- *[APC 96:](#) Change to the Repeat Course Policy
- [APC 97:](#) Revision of Academic Honesty procedures
- *[APC 98:](#) Change LS 379 from a required course for transfer students to an optional course (Revised)

***Note:** APC 96 was pulled to ask for clarification before voting.

APC 98 passed APC with a 4-1 vote. Since this is not a unanimous vote,

APC 98 was also pulled to be considered and discussed separately.

A motion was made and seconded to accept APC documents APC 79 through APC 95 and APC 97.

APC 79 through APC 95 and APC 97 were approved without dissent.

Clarification of APC 96:

Dr. Galloway asked for clarification stating that going to only 8 hours is too restrictive. She would prefer it go from 16 to 12 hours since she sees students who struggle.

Ms. McClellan said that earlier in the year APC had discussions regarding the students' culture of believing they can always replace the grade. Ms. McClellan expressed that this document addresses that culture to help the student earlier in the process to be realistic in scheduling classes each semester in order to not "bite off more than one can chew." They can still repeat courses they just can't replace the grade except for two. In a way it expands things where it opens up for them to repeat courses for Grades C- and below but we are only going to replace 2 grades.

Dr. Galloway thanked Ms. McClellan for the clarification which helped her understanding.

Dr. McKnight further explained that students could go through a semester doing gradually worse in a class and feel like they would not need to put forth the effort to improve their grade for they could repeat the course and replace the grade. APC felt that was not educationally sound line of thought.

A motion was made and seconded to accept the document.

APC 96 was approved without dissent and is Senate Document SD11113S.

APC 98 Discussion:

Dr. Mills reported that APC 98 which did not come unanimously from APC. Dr. Mills introduced APC 98 which proposes that LS 379s be optional for transfer students to lighten up the workload and scheduling issues in the coming 2013-2014 school year. This document does not eliminate LS 379 but does lighten up scheduling for faculty and students alike.

Dr. Kaplan asked if there is any sense how many sections are required. In other words, if this passes, is there a sense of how many sections will be needed in the fall?

Ms. McClellan said no. We already had this optional for a large number of students and we always had to make a guess. Based on the number of those who are required to take the course, she tries to leave 4-5 sections. Currently, they have 8-9 sections on the schedule. Typically, they have 15 sections. They also are short 6 sections of ILS courses and down 12 cluster courses from last fall and this coming fall.

Dr. Katz said that much of this is due to the uncertainty of the task force's proposal. This decision would free up some faculty power to be directed toward the freshman and other ILS curriculum. It is a simple thing to insert certainty into the curriculum.

Dr. Roig pointed out that this shifts workload as much as it relieves. If they do not pick up this course, they will have to pick up an information literacy or writing intensity course somewhere else. It is a shift and not necessarily a relief.

Dr. Mills also pointed out that students can still take the LS 379 course.

Dr. Kaplan asked if the dissenting voice on APC would like to share with Faculty Senate their views and concerns.

Dr. McKnight replied that he would. The original discussions between APC and ILSOC

implied the elimination of 379 entirely. There were members of ILSOC teaching 379 who felt and spoke very strongly regarding the positive educational experience their students were receiving from this course. To eliminate 379 before a curriculum proposal is implemented seemed precipitous.

A motion was made and seconded to accept APC 98.

APC 98 was approved 17-1 dissent and becomes SD11313S.

Dr. Mills concluded her report saying that although APC did not receive the anticipated documents this year regarding the CRTF proposal that APC still had a busy year processing and passing 98 documents. She enjoyed this year the work of APC and thanked her great colleagues who served with her.

VIII. Administrative Reports - Dr. Jane Fernandes

Dr. Fernandes had six points to cover:

1. Position Allocation Committee Report

Dr. Fernandes said she came up with a notion that the three-year allocation plan described in the Faculty Handbook could be conceived as follows:

- Year 1 is the year the position requests are submitted,
- Year 2 is the year when the search is approved and conducted, and
- Year 3 is when the faculty that was hired starts work.

It took the Provost a long time to see that as a framework for a 3-year allocation plan. If she works with that framework, the Provost believes she could make an annual report to the Faculty Senate. However, any other framework would be difficult to report annually.

Dr. Fernandes has summarized the outcomes of 2011-2012 as well as the recommendations made in 2013 that have been approved by Chancellor Ponder. Going forward, the committee will have to drastically revise requests for tenure track and lecturer positions. If the committee doesn't have the clarity about needs, making decisions is harder. They will review the request form to inquire what qualitative and quantitative information is needed to make the best decision for the department and the university.

Questions/Discussion:

Dr. Kormanik expressed his appreciation to Dr. Fernandes for giving much more information than in the past to the Faculty Senate from the Position Allocation Committee. He did have a question regarding the requests awarded. He wanted confirmation that 25 percent of the requests are awarded. What percentage are approved and not approved?

Dr. Fernandes said she could put that in a future report. From this past cycle of the 3-year plan, she would estimate about 10 requests were not approved. Some departments have multiple requests but overall about 10 requests were not approved.

Based on that information, Dr. Kormanik said that means that more than half of the requests are approved.

Dr. Kaplan directed senators to look at page 6 of the report which shows about half of the requests are approved.

2. NCUR's 30th anniversary will be held at UNC Asheville in 2016

Dr. Fernandes is proud to announce that the Council of Undergraduate Research and Mark Harvey made a proposal that UNC Asheville has the honor of hosting the 30th anniversary of the National Conference of Undergraduate Research on April 7-9, 2016.

The university wants to do this and has accepted the offer. As most faculty knows, the conference originated here in 1987. This is a major annual event that attracts around 3,000 students and faculty from universities across the nation. We will have the 30th anniversary to commemorate our origins and our participation in this great conference.

This means that there will be 3,000 additional students and faculty on campus in addition to the 3,500 UNC Asheville students. We will need to plan an academic calendar for April 7 and 8. Our students are encouraged to participate in the conference rather than their traditional classes. Mark Harvey and Ed Katz will work to organize this and welcomes faculty input and participation.

3. Chief Academics Officers meeting news

At the last Chief Academics Officers' meeting, they received a great presentation from the Provost at Clemson University regarding student portfolios. Every student has to prepare a portfolio to present their knowledge, skills and outcomes as evidence that they have obtained the knowledge and the skills that the university endorses. They have electronic portfolios at Clemson.

They were meeting in the context that all of the UNC 16 campuses would be asked to agree on 3-5 learning outcomes for our general education programs so all 16 campuses would have the same learning outcomes for general education and all graduates would have electronic portfolios as presenting evidence. The Clemson Provost said that the portfolio review is a requirement before the student can be certified to graduate because Clemson wants to guarantee that a student has the knowledge and skills that the university claims.

There were a range of views among the provosts at the meeting and Dr. Fernandes was rather surprised that some of them are in favor of this work that is derived from the strategic plan workgroup on academic quality. Since Dr. Fernandes is not a member of that workgroup, she does not know where this is going. However, the Provost plans to have individual meetings with Suzanne Ortega during the summer when they have agreed to meet each other halfway. Dr. Fernandes will probably advocate that UNC Asheville be granted an exception from the whole process similar to the way that New College in Florida has been granted an exception from their systems' curriculum changes because they are a public liberal arts university within a bigger system. Since she has evidence of other states giving their public liberal arts universities an exception, she will try to advocate for the same thing.

4. Academic Efficiencies Strategic Plan Workgroup

Dr. Burchard and Dr. Fernandes are on a strategic plan workgroup together involving academic efficiencies, which right now involves monitoring and agreeing on common class and section sizes. She doesn't think anyone wants to go there. It seems to her that all the campuses are saying no. There is a concern where GA wants all class sizes and sections to be the same which would, of course, be devastating to our unique mission within the UNC system. Suzanne

Ortega recognizes that UNC Asheville is distinctive which was heartening to the Provost in the midst of her concern.

The UNC system has to internally cut their budget by fifteen million dollars in 2013-14. The Academic Efficiencies Workgroup is one of the primary ways they expect to achieve the cuts and the provosts do not understand how they will get close to that amount of money. For example, UNC Asheville is already working at maximum efficiency and Dr. Fernandes has told them that. Ms. McClellan merges into one section several sections of the same course with low enrollments. Since we already do that, we will not gain anything further by discussing it. Suzanne Ortega recognized that UNC Asheville's only contribution will be to document the procedures we have in place to monitor optimal class size which is a good outcome.

At one point, someone said, "If you have a class with 50 seats, but only have a roster of 42 students to put in it, it may be seen as a waste of time and money since those seats should be filled before flying the plane." To Dr. Fernandes, this didn't make sense as if you would never fly a plane unless all the seats are full. Then another person said if you fill the 8 seats, you save only \$50 and so it not worth the work to do all the monitoring.

5. Curriculum Review Task Force

Dr. Fernandes does not know all the details, but she understands that some students are having trouble getting a course to satisfy their graduation requirements because some of the cluster courses are not offered. This cannot be allowed to happen since we have a curriculum on the books that we have to offer until it changes. We could be more liberal with waivers or exceptions, and Ms. McClellan will work with students. However, the faculty will have to continue to teach cluster courses until/unless a formal change takes place. Hopefully next year we will move ahead with Curriculum Review recommendations and no longer have this problem.

6. Gun Bill regarding guns on campuses

Dr. Burchard distributed information regarding a proposed gun bill as it applies to UNC campuses where people are authorized to have concealed guns in their cars. Presumably people would have guns available as needed where they could run to their cars and get their guns. As far as the Provost knows, that every UNC campus safety office is against this bill. We are concerned that law enforcement would not be able to tell who the perpetrator is and who is trying to help in the chaos if a shooting should unfold.

At first, the system was not going to respond to the bill, but we are really pleased that President Tom Ross sent a strong statement. However, although some are working to get that piece eliminated, a state representative told the Provost this morning that they do expect the bill to pass.

Dr. Haggard is working on a statement to come from UNC Asheville. Dr. Fernandes is asking Dr. Burchard and the Faculty Senate to give consideration to support a statement from the university to give power to the statement. Dr. Burchard said Faculty Senate could do this via email over the summer.

Dr. Fernandes concluded her report by thanking all members of the Faculty Senate as well as Dr. Burchard, Dr. Mills, Dr. Meigs and Mr. Bowen. Although the Faculty Senate has dealt

with very difficult issues this year, Dr. Fernandes greatly enjoyed her work and learned a lot from all senators. She looks forward to continued work with the Faculty Senate and faculty in other capacities.

IX. Old Business

None.

X. New Business

Dr. Mills, who is one of six faculty members rotating off the senate, presented all her colleagues with a token gift.

Dr. Burchard presented token gifts to the Executive Committee officers in appreciation of their hard work serving on the Executive Committee (EC) and chairing one of the Faculty Senate committees:

Dr. Sophie Mills chaired the Academic Policies Committee (APC)

Dr. Ted Meigs chaired the Institutional Development Committee (IDC)

Mr. Rob Bowen chaired the Faculty Welfare and Development Committee (FWDC)

She said that she could not ask for a more supportive committee and is very appreciative of their work this year.

On behalf of the Faculty Senate and the Executive Committee, Dr. Burchard also presented a gift to Ms. Lisa Sellers who served as the Administrative Assistant who Dr. Burchard said has done a wonderful job this year.

Dr. Mills presented to Dr. Burchard the traditional gavel as a gift from the Faculty Senate to its chair in appreciation of all her work leading the Faculty Senate and the Executive Committee.

In closing, Dr. Burchard thanked the senators who are retiring or rotating off for their fine service of the past three years.

XIII. Adjourn

Dr. Burchard adjourned the meeting at 5:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by: Lisa Sellers
Executive Committee