

University of North Carolina at Asheville
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Minutes, September 6, 2012 (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, B. Schaffer, S. Subramaniam; J. Fernandes.

Visitors: P. Ponder, S. Capone, P. Catterfeld, J. Dunsmore, L. Friedenber, E. Katz, J. Konz, K. Krump, N. McGaha, P. McClellan, D. Race, R. Ridenour, A. Shope

I. Call to Order, Introductions and Announcements

Dr. Melissa Burchard called the first fall meeting of the 2012-2013 Faculty Senate to order at 3:15 p.m. She welcomed new Senators and introduced Lisa Sellers, the temporary Administrative Assistant.

II. Approval of Minutes

- [April 26, 2012 3:15 p.m.](#) - Last meeting of 2011-2012 Faculty Senate
Approved without dissent
- [April 26, 2012 6:30 p.m.](#) - First meeting of the 2012-2013 Faculty Senate
Approved without dissent
- [The Standing Rules and Rules of Order – 2012-2013](#)
Document tabled pending further review and revision. The document is to be revisited for updates particularly regarding the duties of each senator and the standing committees. Changes are to be submitted to Dr. Burchard.

III. Executive Committee Report

Dr. Burchard outlined the two branches of concern that encompass most of the work for Faculty Senate in the 2012-2013 year: (1) the faculty's welfare and workload, and (2) transparency at all levels.

She asks the Faculty Senate to pursue faculty workloads very seriously. This means getting the Curricular Review Taskforce Proposal out so decisions can be made quickly. Dr. Burchard has been in contact with Dr. Frank regarding the Curricular Review Taskforce Proposal. Dr. Frank says they are not ready in September and wishes to give an update in October. Dr. Burchard would like to see the taskforce's proposal by October.

In regards to transparency, Dr. Burchard's concern is when policies are not being properly executed and procedures are not being followed as they are laid out. Faculty Senate will work to clarify procedures and follow up on concerns in a timely manner.

Dr. Burchard would like the senate to begin initiatives in regards to campus communication; there is a need for more frequent communication more directly to the UNC Asheville community. Dr. Burchard welcomes anyone to share their ideas with her. This will be an item on October's Faculty Senate Agenda for discussion.

IV. Student Government Association

Nicole McGaha is the new Student Government representative. SGA is focused on Freshman Elections in order to have a full senate. They are also looking into conducting an "Earth Hour" with a component of community service.

V. Chancellor Ponder addresses the Faculty Senate

Chancellor Ponder had two sections of remarks prepared to address the senate and then she will take questions.

She said that this year she will be unable to be present at all Faculty Senate meetings as has been the custom. Currently, faculty senate meetings conflict with the Board of Governors meetings in Chapel Hill which the Chancellor is required to attend. Melissa, Jane and the Chancellor met to confirm the process that the senate would use if we need her. There are two ways: invite her to the particular Faculty Senate Meeting or to invite her to the Faculty Senate Executive Meeting for urgent topics. We will continue the custom of the Provost working primarily with the faculty leadership. However, neither the Provost nor the Faculty Senate should hesitate to contact Chancellor Ponder as she is needed to be of service in any way.

Section one of the Chancellor's remarks concerns how the university has come through a hard patch of economic times. The Chancellor looked at her notes from a year and a half ago when she made requests of the Faculty Senate to assist in the hard economic times. She thanked the faculty and reviewed the ways they have splendidly completed each request she made:

- Teach your students and keep the budget anxiety out of the classroom. Due to the faculty's conduct, few students experienced the detrimental aspects of the economy on the university's budget.
- Show up to demonstrate your membership by participating in UNC Asheville's community life. Whether it was a reception for new faculty or a holiday party, your presence of enthusiasm reminds the community what we are doing as an academic and intellectual community.
- Be compassionate, resilient and reassuring to others that we will come through this time. The faculty's leadership and tone you model demonstrates how a great faculty handles situations professionally.
- Asked you to work with the Provost on curricular and systemic improvement. She appreciates how the faculty works in a palpable and meaningful way. This includes the work on the HERI survey and the Provost's substantial response shows this work will continue to provide meaningful improvements for all of us.
- She told the faculty that she could not do anything about teacher workload at that time and asked the faculty to keep the complaints to yourself and to do your best to soldier through at that time. You did that and taught more student credit hours, more classes, more students and exceeded expectations at a time that the university needed it most urgently. She does not underestimate what this consistent support and effort from faculty means to the university and its students.

Chancellor Ponder believes that the completion of the curriculum revision is the most influential action to aid the university in addressing teaching workload. After the completion of the curriculum revision, it will be time for the university to assert an initiative to work on a more appropriate and sustainable teaching responsibility for our faculty. We will need to be unified in what we are asking of the General Administration and Board of Governors before proceeding. Please be patient but get ready for action by completing the curriculum revision so we know we can plan a sustainable teaching load as well as deliver the curriculum that our students need.

A year and half ago the chancellor also noted we were dedicated to the following work even when we did not have funds to do so:

- Curriculum work by Jane, Volker, and the Curriculum Review Task Force
- Campus Master planning which several of you have been involved and helpful
- Re-visioning, expanding, and reinvesting in fund raising, development and advancement work

As a result, although we did not have money, we still were able to do the work we had hoped to do together. She thanks the faculty for their important and heroic work they do for UNC Asheville.

The Chancellor's second section of remarks concerns work underway. The top topic is to advocate with the faculty to develop a curriculum that is intrinsically valuable for students, demonstrable in content in terms of student learning and will also be the right size of a curriculum for us to sustain in a great way. "There is no one I would rather work with, no one I would rather trust to imagine that curriculum in the right shape and size – but you may not take forever to do that. I am hoping by Thanksgiving we will have for the university as clear a path as possible for what the curriculum will be. "

The second topic for the current day is to thank you for all your work you have done on the Southern Association for Colleges and Schools Reaccreditation. The response is in and we are not only cautiously optimistic but confident that all is fine. In December, the Provost and the Chancellor will go and receive the action that the commission will take. We will announce the outcome when it becomes official and it does not become official until that moment. However, there is nothing else for us to do between now and then.

The third topic is to announce the marketing and branding that you heard about at your open faculty meeting is underway. The Chancellor wanted to mention the importance of this work is to show others the splendid work we do here. That can't be just the Chancellor's voice or a voice of any one of us. Chancellor Ponder believes that the media, the publications and the way it describes us will mean that donors, prospective legislators, prospective parents and grandparents will come to admire and appreciate us more as they come to know us better. She thanks you for your support.

Our newest resident hall, Overlook Hall, is stunning. It is on time and on budget. It is a brilliant green accomplishment for the university. There will be a ribbon cutting on October 27, late in the afternoon, and there will be tours afterwards. The faculty is invited to come and tour.

The Chancellor has heard great compliments from the faculty that the renovation of Rhodes and the sprucing up of Carmichael has been successful and she thanks you for that.

Also the feedback from the faculty about the strength of the intellectual and academic prowess of this entering class has almost been universally positive, and she thanks faculty for your role in admissions and enrollment in bringing the finest students we have yet to see to the university.

Thank you for what you do and what you mean to UNC Asheville. Chancellor Ponder is extremely grateful to work with faculty of this caliber.

Questions – none.

Thank you.

III. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee

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

Committee Assignment Preferences

Mr. Bowen said FWDC has already met three times this semester working on committee assignments. If you remember last year, we passed a document that basically was senator approval for committee appointments. Due to Sandra, who was our backbone, no longer being here, Dr. Roig looked into the document further to see that there was tremendous oversight - or under sight - in what was approved. As a result, a new document is before the senate to repair what we did. This document shows what the committee assignments should be and FWDC recommendations for these. Dr. Roig has done a tremendous amount of work for us and Mr. Bowen wanted to recognize his work with applause. Mr. Bowen asked Dr. Roig to speak to the changes.

Dr. Roig said the document that was presented in April was incomplete with openings designated as TBD (To Be Determined) since we did not have access to the needed information. The yellow-shaded items on the new document complete the appointments. When we went through this document, we also found that we made appointments that we should not have made due to how the committees were to be constructed so we took people we appointed in April out and put in people who met the qualifications for the committee. Dr. Roig lamented how much "fun" he had doing this

and how much he misses Sandra. This document reflects those changes as well and now appointments are complete in this current document.

Motion to accept the document as presented. The motion was made and seconded.

No Discussion.

The Committee Assignments Document passed without dissent.

Mr. Bowen relayed that one of the most difficult parts of this process is to find out how much work faculty are doing in regards to service because the only committees we monitor at this time are standing committees. However, there is a tremendous amount of service work being done beyond standing committees by faculty in ad hoc committees and task forces as well as departmental service. We discovered a document that has not been followed in as long as Mr. Bowen has been at UNC Asheville for he has served on ad hoc committees where they did not follow that document and that has been a long time ago since he has served on those ad hoc committees. This procedure is in the faculty handbook and Mr. Bowen sent out an email to everyone this afternoon regarding the document.

It states in [Section 10.6](#):

“On formation of the committee/task force, the chair of that entity must notify the FWDC of the Faculty Senate of the objectives, membership and anticipated length of service of the group.

At the time of its formation, the committee/task force must identify a finite time limit.

If the committee/task force exists beyond a two year limit, it must convert to a standing committee or disband.”

Mr. Bowen hopes the chairs of all these committees will be sending Faculty Senate this information.

Question: When will that website be up and available to make that easier?

Mr. Bowen answered that the website is not up yet. Dr. Roig said that it does not take that long to setup but he has to work with Luke to get it on the website. Dr. Roig is hopeful it will be up sometime next week. Mr. Bowen can receive the data anyway if the committee wants to send the information to him.

Question: Do departmental committees have to make this information available also?

Mr. Bowen said that departmental service falls under this section and in particular [Section 10.6.1](#) but he is not sure that departmental committees have to make the same disclosure. That will be part of the FWDC’s further discussion of this matter.

Second Reading

FWDC 2: Elimination of Campus Commission on the Allocation of Student Services Funds
(Revision of [SD4806S](#); Faculty Handbook [10.4.2](#))

Motion made and seconded. No Discussion

FWDC 2 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 0312F.

FWDC 1: Proposal to Clarify the Duties of the Faculty Committee on Hearings
(Revision of [SD4191S](#); Faculty Handbook [10.2.4](#))

Motion made and seconded.

Discussion:

Dr. Kormanik had sent the “old” FWDC committee some comments and concerns last year in regards to the problem of the document’s current wording and proposes a friendly amendment to remove the word “defined as” to “including” so the document sounds more consistent with the

General Administration document. His other concern is the scope of the committee. His concern is that faculty really needs to know what their rights are so they can have their issues addressed in a timely fashion. He would like to see this document direct faculty and staff to what their recourse is since they only have 5 days to respond in order to not miss the deadline.

Dr. Roig asked if a decision not to reappoint is not a discharge from employment.

Dr. Kormanik answered technically no.

Dr. Roig stated that the ultimate result of a decision not to reappoint is discharge from employment.

Dr. Kormanik points out that the General Administration document does not point out the specific reasons and he feels that these need to be clarified so people know the specific reasons and what their rights are and what to do.

Dr. Hook clarified that this change is only a change to the general purpose and the details are in the handbook.

Dr. Burchard asked is there a reason not to have detail information on these documents.

Dr. Bowen said the task was to define the committee. Whether we want to include more stuff, we can but need to table or pull this document.

Dr. Hook emphasized that we wanted to make sure this committee is limited to just these two things suspension or demotion which is FWDC's interpretation of the General Administration document.

Dr. Roig confirmed that this document specifies what the GA document specifies. If you search the code, the only section that mentions serious sanctions is this section and we only listed what is listed in their code.

Dr. Kormanik asked for the opinion of our legal counsel Mr. Capone.

Mr. Capone says that 603 and 604 are the relevant sections of General Administration code. [Section 603](#) talks about the imposition of serious sanctions and finds these three things and that is all: discharge from employment, suspension or demotion. These sanctions apply all the way up to the Trustees and the Board of Governors. [Section 604](#) is regarding non-reappointment. Typically throughout the UNC System, the Faculty Hearings Committee hears the cases that fall under Section 603 and Section 604. The Faculty Grievance Committee hears all the others.

[FWDC 1 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 0212F.](#)

IV. Institutional Development Committee / University Planning Council Reports:

Dr. Ted Meigs reported for the Faculty Welfare and Development Committee.

[UPC minutes 8-23-2012](#)

[UPC minutes 5-10-2012](#)

[UPC minutes 4-27-2012](#)

Dr. Meigs notes from the UPC meetings:

- Dr. Frazier is taking input on commencement
- Campus master plan is being guided by consultant Rob Nelson
- Campus traffic – need appropriate signage that direct people to the front door not to the back door along with better walkways and a change to the approach from Weaver
- More bike friendly campus with covered racks and lockers
- Utilization of scenic parts of campus like the gazebo area
- Utilization of the Broadway property – suggestions so far: new admissions building, alumni house, advancement space or something nonacademic to keep academic buildings together, conference center, performing arts center, amphitheater
- More money in budget than previous years
- Endowment funds recovered

IDC met for the first time of this academic year on August 30 where they talked about this overarching theme of our UNC Asheville identity and how we want to shape to keep that which we are known intact while ushering in change for the better.

IDC established a list of topics that will get most of the attention from IDC in the coming year:

1. Scrutiny of strategic plan to see how our goals and UNC system goals align
2. Make sure we have a thorough internal process for new programs and certificates at UNC Asheville
3. Examine the MLA and Asheville Graduate Center activities and plans which include the Master of Public Health
4. Examine the recommendations of the Curriculum Review Task Force – How do the proposed changes affect the identity of UNC Asheville
5. Broadway Property
6. Address the points of concern in the HERI survey revealed UNC Asheville
7. Discuss the resource implications of UNC farm school here and the potential of the joint UNCC and UNC Asheville medical program
8. Climate and Society certificate didn't go through the proper senate channels in regards to SD18 in 1995. We need to fix the certificate to care for students currently in the program. Then redefine SD18 and bring that document to Faculty Senate in October
9. HERI survey – Provost was asked to respond to the issues and she provided IDC a detail response. He is very grateful to the Provost for her detail response – Ted said he would make this available to faculty senate via email by end of today
10. Importance of periodic survey of administrative offices which is part of the institution climate survey

Questions:

Dr. Mills asked for clarification on hearing there is a proposal for a Masters of Public Health for UNC Asheville.

Dr. Meigs confirmed it is being proposed and asked Dean Krumpe or Dr. Katz to comment.

Dean Krumpe confirmed that Dr. Katz and he, as a result of conversations with their public partners like Memorial Mission, MAHEC and the NC Center for Health and Wellness, have begun some preliminary discussions regarding a Masters of Public Health program in Western North Carolina.

Their discussions have been with the academic leadership at the UNC School of Public Health since they are the number one public health school in the state and the number two school of public health in the Nation. When it was expressed to the Dean and Dr. Katz that there was an interest in having a Master of Public Health in Western North Carolina, they decided to talk with them. They engaged them very early this summer with a visit down there, and they had a subsequent visit from one of the UNC School of Public Health administrators up here later in the summer.

They are currently working to establish a process for continued conversations about the idea of a Masters of Public Health in Western North Carolina. They do not have any details about that nor do they know what it will ultimately look like. They are first seeing if the UNC School of Public Health would themselves like to have a presence in the western part of the state.

Dr. Friedenbergl asked if this would be through the Asheville Graduate Center for the graduate center is looking for new programs. Dean Krumpe responded perhaps or could be independent of UNC Asheville – they do not know at this point for this is just the beginning of the conversations.

Dr. Meigs said that Dean Krumpe has agreed to come to IDC meetings to have conversations about the possibilities and evaluate the pros and cons of this where the picture will become clearer as we proceed throughout the fall.

Dr. Meigs welcomes comments and questions via email.

V. Academic Policies Committee Report

Dr. Sophie Mills reported for the Academic Policies Committee.

APC met last Thursday and one of the fruits of the meeting is the updated APC Memorandum for submitting documents for the year. We have changed the language to make it better. Instead of talking about concurrence and non-concurrence, we are now talking more about communication with affected departments which we felt captured what we wanted departments to do rather than straight concurrence and non-concurrence.

First Reading

APC 1: Remove Computer Competency from Academic Regulations
(Revision of [SD0201E](#); Revision of [2012-2013 Catalog](#) page 46 - Computer Competency under Academic Policies and Procedures)

The last SACS cycle required us to put Computer Competency in as part of the university's regulations for all programs, and now, SACS says we do not have to have one; therefore, this is a document to remove that from regulations. This will come up for second reading at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

In upcoming business, we will be looking at more efficient ways to handle submission of APC documents, possibly talking about an online system to streamline the process. Last year, APC processed over 100 documents, and Dr. Mills thinks with the proposed curricular review changes that there could easily be that many documents this year. It is quite a cumbersome process of redoing documents and picking them apart. We are going to try to think of something more streamlined to help our work so we can do other things other than redo documents.

Questions:

Dr. Roig asked a question about the document up for first reading, APC1. In concordance to the new APC Memorandum, where all affected departments are notified, was timing issues the reason why this document has not been sent to all departments.

Dr. Friedenbergsaid that this is her document. This document was originally brought to Faculty Senate last year and all departments were notified and there was resounding support. The document as tabled by Dean Krumpe last year due to possible computer science issues which have now gone away. So this is an un-tabled document from last year.

VI. Administrative Reports

Academic Affairs: Provost Jane Fernandes

SACS accreditation is not actually done; we have sent our last response to them. Chancellor Ponder and Provost Fernandes will go to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Conference in December. That is when we will find out their decision relating to our accreditation and she will let you know. She thinks it will be very positive.

Diversity Action Council (DAC): From now until 2016, our university will be recognizing the milestone of fifty years of integration. Biltmore College, the forerunner of UNC Asheville, was intentionally a segregated institution. In 1961, an African-American woman, Etta Whitner Patterson was the first African-American student admitted to our college. She is the person who had that role of being the first, but she didn't graduate as often happens.

In the following semester, she was joined by another African-American woman, Francine Delany, who became the first African-American student to graduate. That was in 1966. Between now and 2016, the university will be having a variety of programs, commemorations and celebrations of 50 years of integration. Through these activities, we will learn how to do better in our present and plan for a stronger future.

Chancellor Ponder did have an event at her home this summer to recognize many African-Americans and people who participated in the Civil Rights movement here which is known as ASCORE. They shared many memories of their struggle.

The Diversity Action Council has set a goal that 75% of our faculty/staff will participate in diversity and inclusion training between now and 2016. First basic training will be provided to give us all a common knowledge which will be followed up with further training at a later date. The Provost hopes the Faculty Senate will be in support of this initiative by encouraging faculty and staff to participate in the trainings when they comes up.

UNC Asheville did not magically desegregate. On the day that Ms. Patterson walked on campus or the day that Ms. Delany graduated, UNC Asheville did not desegregate. Although we have seen the days that Dolly Mullen, Dwight Mullen, Dee James, Charles James and Anita White-Carter became first professors of color to work here, we still have a lot of work to do and we need all of us all to be part of it.

As Chair of the Faculty Senate, Dr. Burchard wanted to officially endorse the Diversity Action Council's work and encourage participation in these trainings. This is important work, and as leaders and faculty, we need to show support of important projects. Dr. Burchard is participating in the trainings this week and next week and feels it is worth doing.

Merit Raise information: All faculty were given a general 1.2% pay increase as all state employees received. In addition, UNC Asheville identified a small pool of funds that we were able to use to award merit pay for some years when no pay increases were given.

If all goes well, for this is the Provost's first distribution of merit pay at UNC Asheville, the merit pay will be included in the September 30th pay check. She took the total amount of money she had available and divided it between salary and benefits, about \$280,000.00 was for salary.

A dollar amount was awarded in three categories: merit, high merit and exceptional for each of three years. Merit award is \$300.00, high merit award is \$600.00 and exceptional award is \$1,200.00.

These awards are for the merit increases of 2008-2009, 2009-2010 and 2010-2011. The merit for 2011-2012 will be carried forward to next year when two merit pays will be awarded at once, provided that funding is available.

Although the awards seem too small, the Provost finds it gratifying to be able to tangibly reward faculty for all the work that you do.

Report from the Institutional Effectiveness Committee

Dr. Jessica Dunsmore, Director of Institutional Effectiveness

Last year there were two committees. In the beginning of the Fall, the committee started as the Vice Chancellor of each division and one additional person from each division so it began as an administrative committee. In the spring, the committee transitioned as faculty were added and the Vice Chancellors were taken off so the committee had a faculty voice going forward with the process. Officially beginning this Fall, we have a committee with faculty participation.

In regards to the work, the committee has reviewed all 96 IE reports of the various divisions. The process they used was to let different areas review other area reports which provided education as well as fresh views. Once they finished the review, they explored what worked and didn't work with their process in order to get the process to be a more sustainable, reflective process.

They changed to a three year cycle requiring a minimum review of all outcomes at least once in the three year cycle and then spending time of reflection and discussion of the results within the unit or department.

The committee had interaction with SACS team and was interviewed by the evaluator when they were here. That went very well and Jessica appreciates the faculty coming out and helping with that meeting. Lisa and Jessica were interviewed privately by the evaluator. The evaluator asked how UNC Asheville got faculty involved in assessments!!! – Thank you, thank you, thank you!

They have revised the manual and the website to reflect the changes. They have also offered some workshops. Lisa and Jessica looked at outcomes and proposed some reorganization of the outcomes – not changing the outcomes just the organization of them to make it easier. Jessica will send the document to faculty senate and come back in October to get endorsement on those changes.

VII. Old Business

Committee Review of Tenure and Rewards

Mr. Bowen reported that FWDC has the submission of one of the documents and is awaiting the other document's submission. When all the documents are in and in order to get input from faculty, FWDC would like to have a full faculty discussion before seeking the senate's approval. They are trying to get this done before November to avoid the rush of finals. Mr. Bowen has the timelines to share with Dr. Burchard.

VIII. New Business

IX. Adjourn

Dr. Burchard adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by: Lisa Sellers
Executive Committee