

University of North Carolina at Asheville
 FACULTY SENATE MEETING
 Minutes, October 4, 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, N. Ruppert, B. Schaffer, S. Subramaniam; J. Fernandes.

Excused: R. Roig

Visitors: G. Ashburn, L. Dunn, J. Dunsmore, L. Friedenber, E. Katz, J. Konz, K. Krump, N. McGaha, P. McClellan, D. Race, A. Shope, W. Strehl, T. Dohse,

I. Call to Order, Introductions and Announcements

Reed Roig is excused from this Faculty Senate meeting.

II. Approval of Minutes

- [September 6, 2012 3:15 p.m.](#)
Approved without dissent.

- [The Standing Rules and Rules of Order – 2012-2013](#)
 The FWDC section is the only part of the document that needed changes where FWDC took the language from the Faculty Handbook whose source is the Faculty Senate Constitution.
Moved and second. No discussion. Question called and approved without dissent.

II. Executive Committee Report

Ideas for Improved Communication with the staff and the faculty at large.

At the last senate meeting, Dr. Burchard asked the senators to think about useful ideas to improve communication between Faculty Senate and the staff and the faculty at large. She asked for those suggestions to be brought to the table:

1. Dr. Mills mentioned a previous suggestion: a Senate Happy Hour. A Senate Happy Hour could take the Senate out of the formal meeting room and into a bigger, open space in order to foster more open connections.
2. Dr. Kaplan suggested having a weekly or monthly “come over gathering” where Senate members are located in different buildings instead of one huge space.

The faculty senators could hold “Senate office hours” in their own buildings which would be easier for senate members and the faculty/staff. This is a way to make senators available and let all know that we want their input as well as a way to check in with departments.

An example of how it could work, the senators in Rhodes-Robinson would reserve a room weekly or monthly. They would send out an email to faculty and staff in those halls to come. If there is money in the budget for food, a possibility would be to have an appetizer spread and drinks to provide hospitality to faculty and staff as a means to invite them into the gathering and discussions.

Dr. Ruppert asked what the specific purpose is and how is the senate going to communicate this purpose to the staff and the faculty at large. Is the purpose to address concerns and improve communication between Faculty Senate and faculty/staff or is it the idea that there is a Faculty Senate that exists at UNC Asheville?

Dr. Kaplan agreed that this not be the space where concerns are addressed. By having the gathering, the senators are available to staff/faculty raising the visibility of the senators and sending the message that the senate wants input and wants to hear from both the staff and the faculty.

Dr. Burchard asked for and received unanimous commitment from all Faculty Senators to participate in these ideas. The Executive Committee will work on the details of these suggestions.

Promotion of Staff Welfare

According to our [Standing Rules and Rules of Order \(page 2, item q under duties of the Senate\)](#), Faculty Senate shall “maintain and promote the welfare of all members of the University community.” Dr. Burchard would like Faculty Senate to take this duty seriously by putting effort into trying to imagine anything the senate could do to help our staff, many of whom are in difficult straits.

Human Resources Department told Dr. Burchard that salaries for staff people are roughly just over 50% of what those salaries are in terms of the market. The Staff is significantly underpaid. If we have a responsibility for maintaining and promoting welfare of all the members of the community, Dr. Burchard thinks this is something we should look at and see what we can imagine doing.

Discussion

Dr. Burchard asked for support and opened the floor for discussion.

Dr. Ray said that part of this involves having a thorough understanding what the community needs. Dr. Ruppert mentioned salary issues where we need to know the implications of that and what role we may play. In regards to staff, are there other issues we need to be aware to improve.

Dr. Burchard thought a first step would be to talk to CSAC (Chancellor Staff Advisory Committee) and get feedback from them as to whether they think there is anything that Faculty Senate can do to make life easier for the staff.

When talking to CSAC, Dr. Ruppert suggests we find out the immediate issues concerning staff and the programs in place at this time to help staff with these immediate issues.

Dr. Eggers also suggests that Faculty Senators talk to staff on the ground for issues staff would not necessarily raise to CSAC; however, when allowed to suggest anonymously, they would confide.

Dr. Burchard suggested that senators engage with staff with whom you already have a working relationship.

Mr. Bowen suggested inviting also staff to the Senate Happy Hours.

Dr. Burchard thanked the senate for their ideas and the senate’s starting point will be to talk to CSAC to get their feedback first.

Curriculum Review Task Force

Dr. Frank will not be able to give an update today. The Task Force is engaged in weekly meetings and working to get consensus around outstanding proposals. The proposals will come forward to the faculty as a whole first before coming to APC and the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Ruppert suggested that Happy Hour would be a great place for small group discussions of the proposals.

Provost Fernandes, who is a member and co-chair of the Task Force, asked the senators for their advice to take to the Task Force.

Dr. Schaffer asked for structure to the discussions with the faculty as a whole as well as timelines regarding the faculty at large discussions as well as for when the proposals are going to go through APC and Faculty Senate.

Dr. Ruppert expressed concern that the faculty has not heard anything from the task force. Faculty in her department are asking Dr. Ruppert due to her role as a faculty senator what is going on and if she has heard anything.

Dr. Ray asked if Dr. Ruppert's concern is due to the rumors circulating of what is going to happen, what is being proposed, what is being cut and how we manage the rumors and have conversations in a positive way until we are at the point that we are all "looking at the same page."

Dr. Ruppert said that there are lots of rumors which are becoming destructive and it worries her for people are tired and they don't need another reason to complain.

Dr. Schaffer said not only is it destructive but people want to plan around things they are hearing and it is really difficult for we do not know what could be a rumor nor what is going to happen.

Dr. Ruppert said people want to know something and asked if the Provost can share with the task force the faculty senate's concerns.

The Provost said that they had hoped to be done this week but there are some proposals that they are still working on to reach a consensus.

Dr. Meigs asked how the proposals will be passed. Are they brought as one body of legislation that are passed or not passed, or are the proposals itemized. Dr. Meigs' understanding is in the past this has come to the Faculty Senate as one wholesale change or no change, like a Bill in Congress where it is the whole thing or nothing. He would like a clear understanding of how this will work and feels it is important that the senate know that also.

Dr. Fernandes said the task force is voting on a set of consensus recommendations and they have one very important section remaining. There are multiple faculty perspectives on it. They will take the time they need to reach a consensus on that section. Once the recommendations have been brought to a consensus, the task force will take them to a broader discussion among the faculty at large. Once that input has been received and factored into the recommendations, they will be brought for review to the Faculty Senate.

The Provost will communicate with Dr. Frank regarding this discussion.

Dr. Kormanik suggested that the senate could request a meeting with the faculty as a whole to consider how these should proceed through the Faculty Senate after the documents have been distributed which should be soon.

Dr. Kaplan asked for and received confirmation that these concerns could be addressed to senators in the room who are members of the Curriculum Review Task Force.

Upon confirmation, Dr. Kaplan hereby requests a module presentation by the task force to the faculty at large as well as to the Faculty Senate. He requests the proposals come forth to the Faculty Senate in module form rather than as one huge all or nothing proposal. He suggests that the proposals that are about faculty workload are one module and proposals that are the core of a liberal arts institution are another group of recommendations. Otherwise, we run the risk of having "a poisoned pill" where you have a lot of good potential changes that get voted down by the senate due to one thing we do not like or the faculty as a whole does not like.

Dr. Mills, in response to Dr. Kaplan's request, said she certainly hears what he is saying; however, she doesn't think that the document is conceived as he describes and that it is more in terms of three categories: majors, free electives and revised ILS.

Dr. Eggers asked for comments from the senators on the task force on whether they will be presenting the proposal as all or nothing and whether the document will be modifiable.

Dr. Mills responded that she does not know any more than anyone else on that point.

Dr. Burchard is inclined to think that Faculty Senate can make a choice on how we wish to work with the document. When we have the finished document from the task force, we can make choices regarding how we will work with at that point. Dr. Burchard will speak with Dr. Frank whether there is anything that can be reported now that might be able to reassure the faculty and put some of the anxiety to rest.

Faculty Handbook

Dr. Burchard requests all senators to please study the handbook not because she doesn't think senators don't know it but because it really needs to be "the first go to" for question of most types and it would be much better for the faculty as a whole if more of us were more familiar with the handbook. She invites us to join her in studying the handbook and becoming more familiar in what it contains.

IV. Student Government Association

Student Body Vice-President Nicole McGaha

Ms. McGaha outlined the following SGA actions and initiatives:

- Freshman senators are in place and learning the duties of their positions
- There are openings for a senior and a commuter position If faculty have any students in mind that they believe would be interested in one of the two positions please send them to the SGA office to fill out an application
- Currently working on a faculty election series
- Preparing for Commuter appreciation day
- Considering Commuter parking decals - Instead of the flat rate per year for parking, commuters would have the option to purchase a certain number of tickets
- Working to get the polls on campus for local election convenience for UNCA community
- Had an outing to clean up the French Broad River last Saturday
- Looking ahead to the Spring Faculty Series where faculty will talk on special topics

V. Space Allocation including OneStop, Financial Aid and Admissions relocation vis-a-vis Ramsey Library

Dean Krumpke came at the invitation of the Executive Committee to report on the current space allocation plans that are being considered especially the OneStop, Financial Aid and Admissions relocation. Since there is a litany of projects, Dean Krumpke opened the floor up for a Q&A in order to address the senators' interests.

Questions:

Dr. Burchard ask for an update on the relocation plans for OneStop, Financial Aid and Admissions to Ramsey

Provost Fernandes provided the context within which we are thinking about the relocation of those three departments. One of the reasons why the relocation is under consideration is that the Division of Student Affairs has an urgent need for a bigger cafeteria. The second, and more important, reason is our cafeteria is extremely outdated and needs a lot of work to become current.

We need a bigger cafeteria because we have a new residence hall and more students living on campus and we plan to have more dorms for our students to live on campus. Our cafeteria is too small especially when we have visitors and this make it difficult to feed our students while being a welcoming host to visitors. Many times last year, Academic Affairs was prevented from inviting visitors to dine in the student cafeteria because our own students would not be able to get in and out of the cafeteria in time. For example, we had a group of students from Asheville High School, and we could not allow them to have lunch in the cafeteria because our own students couldn't get in for the lines were too long. This hurts our relationship with these students in the long run. In addition to size, the more compelling reason for the need to move three departments out is that our cafeteria equipment and operations are severely out of date. Updates, renovations and improvements are needed. Several times a year the cafeteria leaks into the admissions office and the smell is not pleasant. More harmful is the impression this makes on prospective students and their families who visit us during these episodes.

In sum, Admissions, Financial Aid and OneStop have to move this year, either to Ramsey or to another location on campus. We are trying to do this in timely way so we will not have a crisis.

The Library is desirable for Admissions, Financial Aid and OneStop because the three can be located in the same place. They work more efficiently when housed together. That amount of space is not available in

many places but it is available here (in Ramsey Library), given certain moves and renovations. If they do not move here, they will be moving somewhere. So we are exploring all options.

Dean Krumpe followed up with more details. Dean Krumpe was asked to coordinate the effort to determine the feasibility of this. He met with UNC Asheville folks in Design & Construction and they selected a designer who has come to campus a couple of times already to get a sense of the space. They toured the lower floor of Brown Hall, toured the Library, and met with the leadership staff from OneStop, Admissions, Financial Aid and the Library (Pat McClellan, Shannon Earle, Beth Bartlett and Barb Svenson and Anita White-Carter initially from the Library). They began to go through the design process.

The key points of the current proposal:

1. It is feasible from space prospective in terms of managing things for the three entities and the library.
2. When Leah Dunn, the new librarian, came on board, we brought her into the process so she has been involved with the design process.
3. The library has looked at ways of consolidating holdings in various places of the library downstairs. We are still working on that part of the feasibility study.
4. The foundation of the plan would be that the front end of Admissions, which is the public face of Admissions, would occupy the front part of Ramsey where you walk in the front door which would include the Red Oak Room, the Whitman Room, and half of the lobby on the same side of those two rooms.
5. The back end of admissions - where all the paperwork is done, where all the files are reviewed and stored, where the counselors would have their offices – that would be downstairs along with Financial Aid and OneStop. So if you go in the library and immediately turn right and go downstairs, you would come out where the media center is. Basically where the Square D classroom, microfiche, microfilm, and media center that turns into an L-shape and goes over to the small classroom, four viewing rooms back there. In addition this space would be pushing out to where the science stacks are. The science stacks can be consolidated and relocated to another portion of the library. This would be the space for OneStop, back end of Admissions and Financial Aid.

Dr. Kormanik expressed that to him a library is central to the academic endeavors of the institution. He asked Dean Krumpe the following questions:

Who have you engaged in this discussion about moving those folks in the library and using the library facilities on campus?

We have a policy on allocation of academic space. Have you been following that and have you discussed with folks this move and responded to your policy which they are recommended to do in writing?

Who have you engaged in the discussion and have you had any responses yet? Are there other alternatives?

Dean Krumpe first discussed the alternatives:

- **Carmichael** has undergone a fairly substantial minor renovation to make it functional. The roof has been replaced. The asbestos was removed; new tile was installed and painted. However, that building is still slated ultimately for demolition and is our number one capital project. It cannot house all three sections. We would have to consider other buildings as well like Owen Hall.
- **Owen Hall** is in the same situation as Carmichael. They do not have a sprinkler system and they are not up to current code. In any major renovation to a building like Owen, we would have to invest significant money to bring it up to the current code. There isn't a life safety system in either in Owen Hall or in Carmichael.
- There isn't money to renovate either Carmichael or Owen Hall. There isn't money identified for the relocation project either. That is why we are doing this feasibility study to see if it is possible.

Regarding who has been engaged in this feasibility study, Dean Krumpe reports he has consulted with the following: The Provost, those designing the construction, the leadership in Admissions, Financial Aid and OneStop, and the leadership of Ramsey Library. We have talked and have had meetings. We have had conversations with the staff involved to find out what they need and the implications if it turns out that it is feasible.

Dr. Galloway asked whether they considered acoustics and noise level – not that libraries have to be quiet all the time (She likes music to be played personally). However, it does seem like a noisy thing to put in the library. She wonders if that is being considered.

Dean Krumpe said where they are in the process; they can answer the question “Will it all fit? Can we do the jobs that OneStop, Admissions, and Financial Aid has to do AND allow the library to continue to do their job from a space perspective?” We have come to a consensus that we are there and the designers have reached out to their consultants regarding the electrical and access to the building to see if that portion of our consideration is also feasible.

Regarding the library proposal, the planning committee is moving onto security and we are trying to determine the coordination of opening/closing times that each section operates and acoustic sound will be part of that. The rationale for where different functions are is implicit in that. The part of the building where the general public comes will be separate from what is housed on the ground floor which will not be open to the general public.

In considering this, members of the planning committee are coming to a consensus that having more students in the library for whatever reason is a good thing.

Also the concept of the library is dramatically different today than it was when many of us were students. Libraries have become gathering places, a place of more noise for students to gather and work together. You see that when you walk in there where the big monitors are and students are huddled around the laptop.

We are sensitive to the noise issue but it is not the same library environment anymore.

Mr. Bowen asked now that you have your space question answered, is there a proposed timeline? Will it start with the cafeteria?

Dean Krumpe emphasized that this is all being driven by the dining services renovations. Our dining services contract is up for renegotiations. The timing is that these entities have to be relocated out of there before that renovation can start. The projected timeline is a decision is made by end of the semester, the work is done over Spring and Summer semesters, and all completed before Fall 2013 starts. Dean Krumpe said he has been involved in enough construction projects, and certainly Rhoades Hall is one of them, to know that timelines are negotiable that we usually do not have much say in them. Construction happens at its own pace. However, it is the cafeteria renovations driving the process.

Dr. Burchard has asked if any thought has been given to the uniqueness of this room (the Red Oak Room in Ramsey Library) and the uses for which it has been equipped and what will we do without this room given that many of those uses are ongoing. If we are being relocated, where are we (Faculty Senate) being relocated – is it to a place like this?

Dean Krumpe could not speak to that right now, but he can say that when he was first asked to begin this effort this space (the Red Oak Room) was not in play. When we first started, we were considering only downstairs of the library. However, we quickly realized that having the front end of Admissions downstairs was not in the university’s best interest. Yes, Dr. Kormanik’s point is excellent that this is the only library we have, but without students, we don’t need a library. Without a functioning and effective admissions office, we are in trouble as a university. In that recognition, we really couldn’t make this work downstairs.

Also, Ramsey Library was neither the first suggestion nor the only space under consideration. Dean Krumpe has done calculations, taken measurements, and looked at other buildings like Phillips Hall.

The reality is we have a space shortage on this campus. Until the economy changes enough that capital projects are being funded by the General Administration and the Legislature, we have to get creative. We do not have an answer on where the senate will meet in the future because we do not know if this project will

move forward.

Provost Fernandes has been in several conversations where we discussed the importance of this room and we would desire to create something like it. Perhaps not like this exact room but something else that would function like this room. Plus, we are very sensitive to the Chancellors' portraits. They are very symbolic and important so we have to find a place for them. One thought is to do a renovation of Brown Hall that might include a room like this where people could meet.

Dean Krumpe relayed that when the designer first walked into the library, he looked up in the lobby and in the Red Oak Room, and his first words were, "Boy, this is a lot of wasted space!"

One of the things the designer threw out, which the Provost and Dean Krumpe thought was a wonderful idea, was to put in a second floor in here and expand that into the library. The view from that second floor out over the Quad and looking west would be spectacular making that space a prime piece of real estate for there already is a hallway up there to access that space from. One possibility would be to make that space a space like the Red Oak Room.

The bottom line is our dining hall is too small and out of date. Vice Chancellor Haggard says that the manufacturer of the dirty dishes conveyor no longer exists and they do not make parts for this conveyor any longer. When the conveyor breaks, they have to have parts custom-made to fix the conveyor. That issue is on top of the leaking sewage issue.

Dr. Meigs wondered if there has been consideration to rearrange Highsmith to make room for Financial Aid and Admissions where Highsmith is a prominent building that is easy to reach and find.

Dean Krumpe says the issues of considering Highsmith is that it is a Student Affairs facility where meeting room space is very challenging. They have not considered Highsmith yet.

Dr. Kormanik pointed out that this is a concern to student affairs as well as academic affairs. There seems to be a broader effect on campus and so broader solutions are called for.

Dean Krumpe says he was charged with finding space within academic affairs for these academic affairs functions. The Provost and Dean Krumpe have had a meeting with the Vice Chancellors of Financial/Operations and Student Affairs just recently about this project. We may be moving and evolving beyond what Dean Krumpe has described to the Senate. As an example, when the renovations are done to Brown Hall, there might be a welcome center put in where visitors can come.

As Dean Krumpe stated at the outset of his presentation, there is nothing here that is a done deal. Yes, we enlisted the help of a designer but that was the only way we would get the right information to make a smart decision.

Dr. Burchard thanked Dean Krumpe for his report and expressed the senate would appreciate if they could be kept in the loop going forward. Dean Krumpe said, "Absolutely."

VI. [Faculty Assembly](#)

Dr. Lothar (Till) Dohse

Dr. Dohse thanked the senate for allowing him to speak. You have expressed that you wish to connect more with the faculty at large and the Faculty Assembly has the task of connecting with faculty when they returned from GA. Dr. Dohse wanted to briefly go over his notes.

This year there is a five year plan that will be rolled in January 2013. Retention, increase enrollment, and increase the number of graduates will be major priorities for the university system.

There is an Academic First document coming out where they are trying to make sure all the universities in the UNC system are in sync with their standards in regards to withdrawal dates and replacement of grades. They are looking for a system-wide standard.

There are five subgroups within GA and three of them will be giving feedback on student success and retention while upholding quality. One of the subgroups is determining student success. Dr. Dohse is on the Articulation Agreement subgroup where we decide how well transfers work and what will we accept by law. The third group is International Studies and Lora Holland is a member of that subgroup.

Questions:

Dr. Ray asked if the Academic First document replaces the UNC Tomorrow document. Dr. Dohse believes that the document builds upon the other document for a change in direction and is not a replacement of the UNC Tomorrow document.

Dr. Egger asked if we know the primary reasons students leave our institution.

Provost Fernandes replied that students self-report that they primarily drop for two types of reasons: family and financial reasons. From other surveys, we know that 50% of the students that come here say that at the time they enroll that they do not intend to graduate from here, but eventually a lot of them do stay here. Some leave because of majors we do not offer and probably will never offer like nursing and criminal justice. We would never want to do that. Those are the primary reasons for students leaving.

The Provost also elaborated that we have two positive indicators of retention. One is if a student lives on campus as a freshman, he/she has much higher rates of retention than students who do not live on campus. The other positive indicator is timely feedback on academic performance from faculty. Regular communication on academic performance from faculty is a primary predictor of retention.

Dr. Dohse was asked if he has a sense what does increase enrollment means for us?

Dr. Dohse does not know what that means for us. He just knows that President Ross mentioned that presently 25% in North Carolina have a Bachelor degree and he would like that number to be 30%. How he plans to get from 25% to 30% has not been relayed yet.

Provost Fernandes said that we support President Ross' goals for everyone wants more educated people. But UNC Asheville intends to remain at its current enrollment. We simply cannot enroll more students without more money for faculty; we are at the breaking point. We will work to do better at retention and graduation and we anticipate positive outcomes of the curriculum review process. If we graduate more students in a timely manner, that allows more slots for new students to be enrolled.

Dr. Burchard thanked Dr. Dohse for his report and being our representative.

VII. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee

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

FWDC continues to work on committee assignments. One of the issues raised is in regards to the Distinguished Scholars Committee where one of the members get voted on by the Senate. Four full professors are elected from the faculty at large. Unfortunately, when we voted, one of the professors we voted for was not a full professor. So the committee would like to nominate Randy Booker, who is willing to do it.

Passes without dissent.

Tenure, Reward and Promotion Documents: We have forwarded one that defines scholarship and scholarly activity to the Provost Cabinet and was well received there. We are waiting on feedback from that. However, we are moving forward on engagement, on teaching and service documents. We continue to make progress on that and this will be the driving force for most of our work this semester.

Questions:

Can Senate see a draft of the scholarship documents?

Mr. Bowen said that they would like to see the feedback first from the Provost's Cabinet and then we would like to get all the documents together and present to the entire faculty before going to APC and Faculty Senate.

Dr. Hook asked can we share a labeled draft document. Mr. Bowen said we can share it as long as we recognize it is a work in progress that will change.

Dr. Hook will send it out and enlist Lisa's help in putting a watermark on the document [mission accomplished].

VIII. Institutional Development Committee / University Planning Council Reports:

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

[UPC Minutes 9-20-2012](#)

Dr. Meigs notes from the UPC meetings:

1. University Hall was renamed Brown Hall in honor of former Chancellor Brown. The dedication event was an amazing community-building opportunity
2. Ribbon Cutting Ceremony for Overlook Hall is September 27
3. UNC CH Chancellor Holden Thorpe has announced his resignation:
 - Terrific colleague, served UNC CH for 5 years
 - Took a disproportional share of the UNC wide \$400 million budget cut, which helped soften the blow to the rest of the schools
4. UNC system strategic planning going – UPC intends to make sure that UNC Asheville’s strategic plan is in alignment with the UNC systems strategic plan
5. The Observatory/Astronomy Lab building bids have come in high so the original timing of opening the facility in January 2013 is unlikely
6. Consultant, Rob Nelson, gave presentation on [wayfinding and signage](#) and Dr. Meigs encourage that faculty read the manual in the UPC minutes (link to manual hooked in wayfinding and signage above)
7. What are we going to do with the 525 Broadway Property use?
 - No academic uses for the space; preserve the academic core in the heart of campus
 - Choose a use that links the campus to the larger community
 - A greenway would provide that link and connection to the community
 - Student apartments would be ideal
 - Family housing for non-traditional students, as well as faculty and staff, with an on-site child care facility
 - There is a shortage of recreational space; carving out one more intramural field would be terrific
 - Make it a multiuse space, for students, faculty/staff, and the community
 - We will need to think creatively about parking
 - Safety will need to be a priority since it’s on the campus periphery and consider lighting, traffic flow along Broadway, increased campus police patrols, etc.
 - There is a community need for a concert hall in Asheville for people drive to Cullowhee and Brevard for performances - there are donors who would get on board with this project
 - Continue to keep Montford Community in the know about our plans

IDC Meeting

The main topic of the IDC meeting has been how we want to deal with issues of degree programs or certificates that have gone completely through or have gone partly through but have not gone through as mandated in the faculty handbook and various aged senate documents. How is this process supposed to occur?

What IDC decided to do and has done it is put together a statement, not a statement of policy but a statement of the best way to handle this. Our goal is to make sure that there is a very clear and precise well laid out policy that is not scattered among several senate documents and various parts of the faculty handbook using different language. IDC put together a statement, not policy document, but a statement to make sure there is a laid out policy that is clear and easy to follow to try to fix this situation.

They also wanted to address these proposed degree programs Art History and Jazz and Contemporary Music majors. Dr. Meigs wants to be crystal clear that IDC is not trying to write blame on anyone's head for he has had nothing but transparency from the individuals who spearhead these efforts. Dean Ashburn and Dean Katz have been very honest and accept responsibility on every level and that is very much appreciated. IDC just wants to get this fixed so that it is clear going forward.

First Reading

[IDC 1:](#) Institutional Development Committee (IDC) Statement on Planning and Approval of New Degree and Certificate Programs at UNC-Asheville

IDC wants to lay out a clear path for two different programs. The first part is degree programs where you have to go through GA and IDC. One discovery is that the GA process, understood to be a 12 month process, is a 4 month process. As a result, any process we create needs to be streamlined and easy to follow that is not held up with a lot of roadblocks. Can this be a friendly amendment?

As far as the certificate programs, there is a Senate Document 18 that states certain parameters for a certificate program. IDC feels certificate programs are academic curriculum programs. As such, without going through the GA process, the certificate programs should go through the same standards as the degree programs in order to give the certificate programs the same scrutiny as degree programs. The certificate programs are given a calendar year to go through the steps outlined in Senate Document 18.

It is all about good communication.

Questions:

Dr. Bill Miller expressed that twenty years ago that this was the process to propose new programs and ask when and why did it change. Dr. Meigs sense is that it didn't change but IDC feels that these many senate documents need to be consolidated so the procedure is crystal clear.

Dr. Eggers asked about the part of the proposal regarding suspensions. She wanted to know what happens to students in these suspended programs. Dr. Meigs said this is not a suspension but an internal probationary period which should not impact students in those programs. We want a clear path "out of the woods here" while acknowledging that there were things not done.

Dr. Miller suggested if suspension sounds threatening then give it a different name.

Dr. Eggers further inquired while during this probationary time will there be recruiting during that period

Dr. Kormanik emphasized that this needs to be resolved soon. He just found on the website an offering of a certificate in Climate Change and Society where a student can earn graduate certificate without enrolling in a fulltime degree program here. Graduate programs are going to become an issue at UNC Asheville and we need to be thinking about this for folks are seeing this, enrolling and getting a certificate. He is not sure this "jives" with admission into the MLA program because there are inconsistencies that Dr. Kormanik doesn't understand. Since folks are currently doing this, this needs to be addressed quickly.

Dr. Kaplan stated that this is not an issue that will go away for we are going to have a whole bunch of certificates offered for various reasons.

Dr. Meigs expressed that is why we want a clear path and make sure it goes through IDC, APC and Faculty Senate before it begins taking in students. Dr. Meigs feels like we can get a good resolution.

Dr. Katz said that it was his intention to do what needed to be done. When he became aware of Senate Document 18, the 1984 document, his intention was to correctly follow the process.

IDC will make revisions and welcomes input from the senate for they want a living document that is fair and positive where programs get a close scrutiny that the faculty wants.

Other Matters:

IDC has received the Provost's response to HERi survey and IDC is still in the process of reviewing and tailoring a response to the provost to be completed at the end of their next IDC meeting. They intend to present to the Faculty Senate in November.

Dean Krumpe gave an update on the possible development of a Masters of Public Health program at UNC Asheville that would be in partnership with the UNC Chapel Hill Gillings School of Global Public Health.

Dean Krumpe expressed that this is in the early discussion phase. A suggestion has been made to coordinate through the graduate center. This is all still in the talking phase.

The Provost shared at that meeting that the Board of trustees is interested in serving UNC Asheville community (students, faculty and staff) with regard to attitudes of the potential different graduate programs that might emerge at UNC Asheville. The board is interested in taking everyone's temperature on how we feel about graduate programs. They would like their survey to be completed by March 2013. Dr. Meigs did not know when that would be initiated or whether Faculty Senate would have the opportunity to look at it before it goes out to folks.

Provost Fernandes said the survey will be a needs assessment for communities to let us know their needs for programs and will be a market analysis of what other schools offer in this region and who we would fair in a competition if we offer a similar program. Faculty, staff, current students, alums and community members will be the groups that receive the survey. It is not known whether the Faculty Senate will review the survey, but we are looking for outside vendor to do work. We will take some time to work through this and then work on next steps.

Dr. Meigs asked if it is possible for senators could suggest questions. The provost said that if faculty have questions or suggestions, they are welcome to talk with her.

IDC is interested in the periodic survey of UNC Asheville administrative offices. They had the notion that this would be embedded in the climatic survey that will go out in 2012-2013. There is clarification from the provost that the climatic survey has some but not all of what would normally be on a survey of administrative offices. Archer Gravely has provided IDC with the most recent institutional climatic survey questions – one is for faculty, one is for students and one is for staff. IDC will review these questions for it is their opinion that a separate survey of administrative offices is warranted and important to be done.

IX. Academic Policies Committee Report

Dr. Sophie Mills reported for the Academic Policies Committee.

Overview of APC discussions this Fall:

- Academic First with Ms. McClellan where UNC Asheville is in compliance and where changes and new policies are needed, Ms. McClellan is working on those documents
- Double BAs questions where currently at UNC Asheville if you have a BA already, you can't get another one in a different field which is illogical and so Ms. McClellan is working on a policy to change this rule for there are a few students each year who deal with this issue
- A new format cover sheet for submitting proposals to APC that is much more detailed but much clearer what the proposals are and simplifications than the previous cover sheet and will also consider documents that are not catalog changes but other procedures
- Online submission of documents – a very important goal for this academic year

First Reading

[APC 2](#): Sunsetting Courses

Standard annual document to say farewell to courses that are no longer taught. There will be a friendly amendment for second reading BIOL 336 Parasitology will be brought down to the courses that will be taught soon. Dean Krumpe is engaging someone to teach it next summer.

Second 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. Lisa says that this now part of the autonomy now and not needed.

This document has been in the works for more than a year having been requested by many department chairs. This document just takes this requirement off from across the board while permitting particular departments to have the requirement as they see appropriate for their academic programs.

Dr. Roig had sent email to the senators asking that this document be tabled. The chair asked senators if they had read Dr. Roig's email and they said they have. No one brought a motion to table document to the floor so the Committee Chair, Dr. Mills proceeded. Motion made to approve document and it was seconded. There were no questions.

APC 1 was approved without dissent and became SD0412F.

VI. Administrative Reports

Academic Affairs: Provost Jane Fernandes

The Provost did not have anything to report but introduced Dr. Friedenberg to give report on the Reorganization of the Student Learning Outcomes.

[Reorganization of the Student Learning Outcomes](#)

Dr. Lisa Friedenberg, Professor of Psychology and Director of Academic Assessment

Dr. Friedenberg had been working with a group that was funded by the Teagle Foundation that works on the assessment of student learning and development of the student learning outcome plans throughout the country. She had a great opportunity this summer to serve as a consultant for a small group for the US military academy at West Point on their rating program.

In the course of this, we spent a lot of time talking about the development of focus in the construction of learning outcomes and attention to separating goals and outcomes from assessment components. That got Dr. Friedenberg thinking about the way UNC Asheville has their learning outcomes currently and how to reformat and reframe that information so that the outcome statements themselves are the long term goals we pursue and the subparts are the various indexes or indicators that we might actually assess and report on as evidence of our progress towards these goals.

This document is a proposal to use that type of frame of reference that has become a very popular best practice nationwide for our outcomes. Dr. Friedenberg has brought it to receive input, feedback and get a resolution of support.

Dr. Burchard asked about the first paragraph, last sentence where it refers to "attitudes." She understands tying something to these skills but is not clear of what attitudes mean.

Dr. Friedenberg says it is the attitudes and values but it really is the thoughts and feelings that people have rather than the actual behaviors that they demonstrate when they talk, write and etc. These are more internal that can't be measured rather than the behaviors that can be measured. Dr. Friedenberg says she is always open to those who have better wording to offer.

Dr. Ray asked if decisions about this any way tied to decisions made about the curriculum.

Dr. Friedenberg said that this was independent from the Curriculum Review Task Force. She emphasized that this is literally a reorganization or a reframing of words that already exist in a slightly different order on our webpage. Dr. Hobby likes the simplification and has a friendly suggestion under outcome 1, the fifth item is not parallel and not sure it fits in the same procession as the other things so needs something about seeking connections between.

Dr. Friedenberg welcomes faculty to send suggestions of rewording and she will return a revised document. At this point, Dr. Friedenberg is primarily interested in is support of the concept rather than final wording. Additional time can be taken to produce the final wording.

In regards to UNC Asheville's mission to cultivate good citizenship skills within its student body, Dr. Eggers suggested that faculty listen to the Ted radio hour which last night had a great speaker who articulated the value of a liberal art college and how it creates a more generosity of spirit among citizens than rote memorization and focus on capabilities means of education. Dr. Eggers recommended all to listen to that program.

Dr. Friedenberg emphasized that she did not subtract and added anything that the UNC Asheville

community endorsed. She focused more on the conceptual organization.

In regards to not taking anything out, Dr. Mills had looked over the old outcomes she noticed something missing. Under outcomes in the older version, students must develop mastery of a specific major which is not at all in this document. She found it paradoxical that that of all things is totally gone.

Dr. Friedenberg said that since students cannot graduate without a major, and this is true pretty much across the country, it is extremely unusual to have a statement in student learning outcomes to state that student must have a major.

Dr. Mills corrected that it says mastery of the major. Dr. Friedenberg said that part of the concern is we not graduate students who are not masterful enough and not sure we would want to go there.

Dr. Fernandes has a question in how this is tied to curriculum review. For example, theoretically speaking, if there were changes that led to a less clear path for students to understand connections among disciplines than we have now, it would be somewhat related to the work we are doing because we still have to assess whether students are able to do this, right? Ultimately, the university as a whole has to have programs in place that allows students to demonstrate their understanding of the connections among disciplines, that right?

Dr. Friedenberg agreed that there are some departments that have to commit to emphasizing that. However, it has not been our practice to require every academic program to be linked to every element of the every outcome. She would want to retain it even if there were a less clear required path.

The Provost pointed out that there is a connection between curriculum and these outcomes. Dr. Friedenberg agreed that student learning outcomes are to some extent living entities the way a curriculum is a living entity. As a curriculum changes and evolves, the outcomes of necessity will change and evolve as well. If that were to happen, we could still use this organizational framework. We would just be making some edits to some indicators in the two broad role statements.

Dr. Ray expressed his understanding that there isn't a requirement that we demonstrate movement in the direction of achieving these outcomes for every student on campus. So if there are selected departments on campus that are hitting one of these, we can use that as evidence that as a whole we are moving towards the goal.

Dr. Friedenberg confirmed that our approach to assessing the University Student Learning Outcomes includes both measures at the institutional and programmatic level. So we do have some institutional measures both direct and indirect. For example, we have collegiate learning assessment and now the California Critical Thinking Disposition Inventory which we are using across campus as well as things being done in our departments and programs. Between the two levels, between the direct and indirect evidence, we believe that we actually can make statements about each of these indicators, even today.

Dr. Subramaniam endorsed the document. For those that attended the Chancellor's meeting earlier today, Dr. Subramaniam was encouraged and heartened by the enthusiastic support from Peter Hans, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the unique mission of UNC Asheville which is the Public Liberal Arts University and he recalls Dr. Hans explicitly identifying critical thinking and engaged citizenship. Dr. Subramaniam thought it was a good thing to move in the direction of people who are out there supporting us.

Dr. Friedenberg welcomes emails regarding the wording of the document.

The chair asked Dr. Friedenberg what procedure she wished the senate to follow. Dr. Friedenberg is uncertain and would like to first consult with the provost and other related offices before bringing a document through the senate. Her understanding is there isn't a senate document concerning Student Learning Outcomes.

Dr. Kaplan corrected [SD1310S](#) – Student Learning Outcomes (2009-2010J). The document came through Executive Committee and was prepared under the guidance of Dr. Friedenberg and had first gone to the campus faculty for feedback before coming before the senate.

On behalf of the senate, Dr. Burchard expressed that Dr. Friedenberg is on the right track and the senate thinks she should proceed.

Dr. Friedenbergr thanked the senate and she is sincere in asking for suggestions in regards to the wording of the final document.

VII. Old Business

VIII. New Business

Having taken the step to remove computer competencies from the across the board requirements, Dr. Friedenbergr has been approached by department chairs who have interest in considering discussions regarding the other across the board university competencies. Before going forward, Dr. Friedenbergr first wanted to bring this to the senate, and if there were considerable objections to this, she would not go forward.

Dr. Ruppert's understanding that reason computer competency even came to the table was that computers were so integrated naturally across department, where we are not asking computers to go away. We do not have the computer competency standard for computers are embedded in all we do. Regarding these other competencies, are you saying we don't need standards? Dr. Friedenbergr stated that there isn't any SACS requirement for these other competencies. Dr. Friedenbergr understands from a SACS expert that today there isn't a required oral competency.

Mr. Bowen expressed that he was told that these WERE legislative competencies by GA or campuses. The secretary was assigned to research and find the rationale for these competencies.

IX. Adjourn

Dr. Burchard adjourned the meeting at 5:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by: Lisa Sellers
Executive Committee