

**University of North Carolina at Asheville  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
Minutes, November 8, 2012 (3:15 pm)**

Senate

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

Excused: R. Bowen, N. Ruppert

Visitors: P. Catterfeld, V. Derryberry, L. Friedenber, E. Katz, J. Konz, K. Krump, N. McGaha, P. McClellan

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

Rob Bowen and Nancy Ruppert are excused from this Faculty Senate meeting.

**Faculty Senate Reception slated for November 14.**

Dr. Burchard announced a reception for faculty and staff on Wednesday, November 14 from 4:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. in the Red Oak Room. There will be snacks and beverages. The flyer will go out this week to Faculty and Staff. This is an effort to make senators available in different venues. Dr. Burchard would like senators to encourage people to come.

**II. Approval of Minutes**

- [October 4, 2012 3:15 p.m.](#)  
Approved without dissent.

**III. Executive Committee Report – see Faculty Assembly report below**

**IV. Student Government Association**

Student Body Vice-President Nicole McGaha

Ms. McGaha outlined the following SGA actions and initiatives:

- Have full senate, and last night, SGA initiated their last senator.
- Have been busy with their hosting different discussions and forums relating to the 2012 presidential election
- Now looking into future events coming up.
- Tomorrow night UNC Asheville basketball plays Western Carolina University and SGA worked with Athletics to come up with a Fan Jam. That event starts at 4:30 tomorrow tonight. So come out if you are interested!
- Hosting Association of Student Government on campus this weekend where delegates from each NC system school will be here.
- Formed a committee to go over the constitution and bylaws to refresh those.

**V. Faculty Assembly**

- Dr. Burchard reported that UNC system has a committee comprised of the chairs of the faculty senates from across the system that meets monthly. Dr. Burchard went to their meeting this month and found this gathering a useful resource for UNC Asheville faculty to take advantage for there is a lot of useful information being shared there. They have an

active email discussion in that group.

- [GA Strategic Planning Initiative](#): The next five year planning process is going on at GA and there is a faculty advisory committee for it, made up of people from Faculty Assembly so we will have voice in this process at GA. Dr. Burchard sent out a survey to faculty and hopes they will have time to fill it out to send feedback on what it is we think is valuable about what we are doing given UNC Asheville has its unique mission. Questions? Discussion? None.
- A report from Faculty Assembly's discussions last month with regard to part of the GA planning initiative: there is development of a new set of [criteria for assessing the economic impact of the UNC University on North Carolina](#). Dr. Burchard thought that senators would be interested in seeing this. The survey identified five areas or "pressure points" that could be looked at for they are important for assessing economic impact:
  1. Education
  2. Leadership for the New Century
  3. Health Care and Wellness
  4. Competitive vibrant communities and quality of life (magnets for attracting talent, lower crime rate, highly rated school system)
  5. Economic Prosperity

This could drive UNC Asheville over this next period to produce some measurable forms of economic impact in each or some of these areas. It is important for us to be aware there is a move in this direction where we are being asked to think in terms of the literal economic impact that our teaching, research and service creates so we can be proactive with regard to how we will shape our university's proposed measures. Dr. Burchard says it is good for us that we have the strong Health Care and Wellness program for that is one area they are extremely concerned about. They also want to talk about the preparation of teachers for K-12, and of course, we have that as well. She thinks we should be able to come up with the kinds of measures that they want. They are working on what they call a metric of measures that break these things down into sets of criteria that are more specific that we will be able to check off and collect data. This looks like where they are going and Dr. Burchard thought it would be useful for us to be aware of that and be able to talk about it.

**Questions:**

Dr. Ray asked if they have a timeline yet.

Dr. Burchard said the timeline for the strategic planning initiative is the beginning of the year, so in January or February 2013 is when they want all of the data in for the strategic plan.

Dr. Ray asked is the metric they are talking about already designed and is it available, and are they asking for anything from the university at this time to fine tune their plan.

Dr. Burchard said we are not asked to do the assessment at this time. What they want is to have everything to go into the strategic plan ready for the first of the year. The Faculty Advisory Committee to the GA strategic planning committee is trying to gather this information from the faculty in the system as soon as possible in order to shape some response to what has been suggested and have as strong a voice as possible in the crafting of the strategic plan. If you have filled out the surveys, then you have done all that has been asked at this time. Dr. Burchard believes she has one more survey to distribute.

Dr. Kormanik is confused about the document for it is a draft so it will have to be modified, accepted and then incorporated. Dr. Kormanik wonders about our opportunities for we are fairly unique as a campus. Looking the document over, he sees Health Care and Wellness, but they ask for the number of graduates who have successfully certified licenses in Health Care and Wellness, and our answer is zero because that is not what we do. We do not have any programs that do that.

Dr. Burchard said this is why she brought this up in a faculty senate meeting so we can aware of where this measuring is going to go, know how this works and have the opportunity to offer input to the

advisory council. If we have input to the advisory council, we can send that at any time.

Dr. Ray echoed what Dr. Kormanik said and hoped that the UNC system recognizes there are other metrics beyond what is stated in this document that makes more sense and points to economic development and impact.

Dr. Burchard's suggestion is for faculty to read through it and think about input they would like to have in the process and suggesting other appropriate measures. She would be happy to provide the email address of the chair to the UNC system's Faculty Assembly. The senators are also welcomed to email their suggestions to Dr. Burchard, and she will forward on the suggestions. In addition, the senate could put together a collective senate response.

## VII. First Reading

### [Principles of Shared Governance](#)

**Background:** Adopted in 2005 by the Faculty Assembly (UNC system), there is concern in the present Faculty Assembly that these principles are not being strongly supported and it would be wise for all of the campus faculty senates to incorporate and/or clarify these principles in their Faculty Handbooks. Our handbook does talk about Shared Governance but as far as Dr. Burchard could see we do not have a statement of Principles of Shared Governance. Dr. Burchard feels such a statement would be a good clarification for our handbook and give us a strong and fairly clear, concise statement on what shared governance actually means. This is coming from the Faculty Assembly with their encouragement that we adopt it as policy. Dr. Burchard's assumption is we could have a first reading on this and then have time for everyone to think about it until the next meeting where we would have a second reading and vote.

#### **Discussion:**

Dr. Burchard opened the discussion by asking the senators if this process is okay with them.

Dr. Kormanik asked if this is to be incorporated as policy, then that would put into play a certain sequence of events according to how we develop and establish policies so there may be more to it than just approving it and saying, "Let's put it in the handbook." To become university policy, the proposed document needs to go to the policy committee.

Dr. Burchard clarified that it could be university policy that needs to go through the policy committee as well as its current path. The preface to the handbook articulates the types of policy that are in the handbook and how things become policy in the handbook. Dr. Burchard's reading of the preface was that since this document is a document that originates in the UNC policy manual or other sources outside of UNC Asheville; consequently, the document does not require senate action to be included in the faculty handbook, unless internal policies are revised to comply with external directives. Dr. Burchard is not sure if that was the route that applies to this document. The second one says changes in administrative procedures proposed by Academic Affairs to implement academic policies that appear in the Faculty Handbook should be reported to FWDC. If FWDC wishes, the proposed document goes to Faculty Senate before submission to the editor of the Faculty Handbook. The same protocol is followed for changes in policy which are not under the purview of Academic Affairs which appear in the Faculty Handbook such as those originating in the General Assembly, UNC General Administration or other divisions of the university. Dr. Burchard felt this document would fall under one of those two categories.

Dr. Kormanik said we can look into it and figure out exactly how to dispose of it.

Dr. Meigs felt it is important that people should read this first before we decide how to process this document. After first reading, maybe some different ideas will come forth where we could better align ourselves with what was agreed by the Faculty Assembly which is a very thoughtful group from all of the campuses.

Dr. Burchard appreciates Dr. Kormanik's and Dr. Meigs' comments and she is happy to defer to whatever process seems correct depending on what we decide to do with this document.

Dr. Roig pointed out that the preface of the Faculty Handbook begins by talking about the Principles of Shared Governance so this concept is introduced in less detail. If we are going to incorporate in the

handbook, it should be along those lines.

Dr. Hook said that he believes the Faculty Senate has incorporated this document into the Faculty Handbook and the items excluded were excluded for a reason. He believes this was discussed in 2005 or 2006. There are reasons it is not in the handbook as written by Faculty Assembly, and if this document goes forth, Dr. Hook believes we are in for a lengthy discussion at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

Dr. Burchard's proposal is to adopt the Principles of Shared Governance "as-is" presently. She did look at the Faculty Handbook and does not see the issues that Dr. Hook sees.

Dr. Hook said he would bring up two. Under Administration-Faculty Collegiality:

"3. The chancellor and other senior administrators should consult in a timely way and seek meaningful faculty input on issues in which the faculty has an appropriate interest but not primary responsibility, including but not limited to the following:

- a. the university mission, emphases, and goals
- b. budget**
- c. campus master plan or strategic plan
- d. building construction
- e. enrollment growth
- f. tuition policy
- g. student discipline
- h. intercollegiate athletics
- i. faculty and staff benefits
- j. libraries and other research facilities"

Item b, the budget is the issue.

The other significant issue is in the same section, number 10:

"10. The chancellor or provost, in consultation with the faculty senate, should establish effective procedures that enable members of the faculty having voting privileges to regularly evaluate the performance of senior administrators. This evaluation should be in addition to and independent of the mandated periodic evaluation of administrators by the chancellor or the board of trustees."

Dr. Hook feels those two issues are sufficient to illustrate how this will be a very long discussion. To adopt "as-is" is to ask the administration to do things that are not currently done. He believes we need more information before trying to adopt this "as-is."

Dr. Miller asked Dr. Hook if a body has already looked at this document. Dr. Hook said yes, in 2006, Dr. Hook's first year on the senate. Dr. Miller thinks that there should be a group to look at this first before bringing this document before the Faculty Senate especially if we know about issues and inconsistencies. Passing this would open a can of worms. Dr. Hook clarified that he isn't saying not to look at this document again, but to read this and compare it to the work in 2006 to highlight what was included and what wasn't and become familiar with what the discussion was previously so we are not doing the same work again.

The senators were having problems finding the discussions in 2006.

\*Note: The Secretary will research and email.

Here are the results of her research bundled in a series of five documents:

[Series 1](#)    [Series 2](#)    [Series 3](#)    [Series 4](#)    [Series 5](#)

Dr. Konz offered that he was on Faculty Senate in 2006 and his recollection is that Dr. Pamela Nickless was chair when this came through. He suggested that Dr. Burchard have a conversation with her. Dr. Konz remembered that it was used as a checklist to see where we are fulfilling these principles and where we are

not. There were issues that we found we clearly are not doing this. As opposed to the document itself going in as an operative document, it was viewed as a checklist of finding the things we need to address. Dr. Konz also could not find the minutes though his recollection that it was Spring 2006 when the discussions took place.

Dr. Burchard concluded that more preparation needs to be done before it is brought as a proposal of any kind since it is not clear what type of proposal it should be. Dr. Burchard will talk to Mr. Bowen and FWDC about what needs to be done and appreciates the suggestions regarding how to go forward with this.

#### **VIII. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee**

Dr. Brian Hook reported for the Faculty Welfare and Development Committee.

Dr. Burchard said that Mr. Bowen is sick with the flu and has asked Dr. Hook to give the report for him.

Dr. Hook says that FWDC does not have any documents to come before Faculty Senate. He gave an update on their progress of the last several meetings. They have been finishing off details of committee assignments, both elected and appointed. Dr. Hook commended Dr. Roig for all his work he has done. This process is really unnecessarily complicated and FWDC is looking for ways to simplify it. Simply put, the reason things are done is Dr. Roig.

FWDC's time has been spent on writing documents that will be brought to the Faculty Senate to incorporate the recommendations of the Review of Tenure and Reward Systems Committee (RTRS) that was chaired by Karin Peterson.

In spring 2012, FWDC met with the Provost's Cabinet to discuss those recommendations, and at the end of the semester, the goal was to work in smaller groups over the summer on these documents to incorporate the recommendations. That has been pretty complicated. FWDC addressed it by tackling the areas of scholarship, service and teaching separately.

At the last meeting, Dr. Hook was asked to send out the draft document regarding scholarship for the senators to see. Dr. Hook sent out the scholarship document to Faculty Senate. Regarding the other two documents on service and teaching, FWDC is still working on them. Those documents are harder because a consensus did not emerge from the discussions with the Provost's Cabinet. There were a lot of differing opinions by division so FWDC is simply working through the recommendations. FWDC is fortunate that Dr. Eggers and Dr. Kaplan have served on RTRS and can approve the usefulness of the clarifications. Dr. Eggers is also collating all of these documents in order to make the final edit which is huge to ask. In the end, FWDC believes it will produce a single document because the three categories are folded together in terms of faculty evaluations, tenure review and promotion. That is the goal.

Members of FWDC have been assigned to different subject areas and they are working with others outside of FWDC. Dr. Roig is working with Dr. Melissa Himelein and Ms. McClellan to work on teaching. Teaching is the most important thing we do at UNC Asheville. They are looking seriously at different ways to evaluate teaching and looking at different inputs and sources of evaluation and how we might make that part of the process.

Any timelines on this work are long past and FWDC does not know when this will be ready for the Senate; however, they are looking at early next year for the document to be ready.

#### **VIII. Institutional Development Committee / University Planning Council Reports:**

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

##### [UPC October 25 Minutes](#)

Dr. Meigs notes from the UPC meetings:

- Our Board of Governor's Liaison, David Powers, came and had positive things to say about the marketing efforts and the general focus of UNC Asheville in regards to the Liberal Arts

mission and our distinctive nature.

- There was a panel presentation on the strategic plans of all these universities in the UNC system and we were cited as a really positive example of a strategic plan.
- Strategic plan in UPC/IDC is being discussed as being dynamic because there is going to be a strategic plan template in place with the UNC system which was thought would be complete in January. Whatever that says then we will look at our strategic plan and align it with that plan to make sure that what we are doing with our strategic plan is in agreement with the kinds of metrics that we would use to decide if we are doing a good job or not.
- BOG chair Peter Hans came and spoke at the Chancellor's briefing and was very positive. Dr. Meigs gets the impression that the BOG is pleased with what UNC Asheville is doing and sees us going in the right direction.
- As a basketball fan, Dr. Meigs highlighted that VP Biden and Michael Jordan were here on campus on the same day. It was easier to get to talk to VP Biden than it was to get to talk to Michael Jordan.
- Osher Lifelong Learning Institute's Dr. Catherine Frank gave an update on the OSHA Lifelong Strategic Plan. We formerly called it the North Carolina Center for Creative Retirement. Things of interest to us - they want to know how to align with UNC Asheville's mission and they want to look into some research endeavors that they are doing aligned with other faculty research here. That is important for that organization would have access to good research ideas and potential funding resources. Anyone who does research on any campus knows how tough it is to get dollars to do research. If OLLI can help us to hook up some ways to get some funding for different research projects that align with their institute, then that is great. Dr. Frank seemed positive about that idea.
- Strategic Plans benchmarks surveyed what is our academic reputation, looking at enrolling and non-enrolling students to figure out why students are accepted here decide to go somewhere else. The problem is the last survey of non-enrolling students only had a response rate of 17.4% so the results of the survey are inclusive due to low response rate. There is a proposal being prepared to suggest looking at incoming Fall freshman applicants with SATs scores or ACT equivalent of 1,185 and higher as a measure of academic reputation since it can be measured with near perfect accuracy.
- [UNC Asheville's smoking policy](#) has been made a priority by UPC and Dr. Haggard gave a presentation on the history of the smoking policy on campus. UNC Asheville is a trend setter in banning smoking in their buildings before other schools had. Centering on education of policy and reminding violators of the policy (which is part of the policy). Dr. Meigs passed out a two-page argument against smoking, citing the dangers of second hand smoke. Smoking at any level is a health hazard; see the [Surgeon General's Report](#). Scientific data is overwhelmingly evident and should be taken seriously. UPC will continue to come up with a resolution.

Dr. Subramaniam said that the policy we have in place right now is toothless and asked how we can enforce a smoking policy. Dr. Meigs said that UPC is working on how to have effective enforcement. For now, education has been the effective method of change. Dr. Haggard has said he is going to reconvene the Smoking Taskforce and start to deal with this again.

Dr. Subramaniam offered that if we follow the science as Dr. Meigs is suggesting that we should be at least equally concerned about second-hand smoke as we are about asbestos-related issues and think of it in terms of the larger picture of public health for our workplace.

Dr. Miller said [the Washington Post](#) (see [11/26/2012 article](#) also) reported a year or two ago when Towson State University (in Maryland) was going through the very same thing we are going through where

they had in place a plan like ours which they found did not work so they went to no smoking at all. Dr. Miller also found it interesting that Mayland Community College which is in the center of tobacco country is a non-smoking community college and he believes that Blue Ridge Community College is also a non-smoking college.

Dr. Miller said that Dr. Subramaniam's comment about asbestos is interesting for most people think that non-occupational exposure to asbestos causes cancer which is not true. Turns out that the only way that you get mesothelioma is if you are exposed occupationally to the amphibole asbestos that is used in only 5% of cases and you smoke. If you smoke, you can get asbestosis which is a scarring of the lungs but you do not get cancer. It is a common public misconception.

Dr. Meigs said that by that logic then second-hand smoke is an even bigger concern than asbestos. Dr. Meigs just wants to make the point that when you smell second-hand smoke – congratulations, you have just received what the Surgeon General defines as a dose of it which has effects on your vascular tone, the lining of your lungs and things of that sort and puts you in immediate risk of heart-attack just from getting that nice, big lung full of smoke. Dr. Meigs believes that the campus community needs to be aware of the hard science that supports this and has compelled the Surgeon General's Office, not noted for being an outfit known for hyperbole, to put out something like this. This has been out for several years. Dr. Meigs appreciates everyone giving this thought.

Dr. Ray added he appreciates the way Dr. Meigs is approaching this because historically although science has been part of the equation in making decisions about policy, often times the political implications outweigh the science and this is an opportunity to really drive home the science so the science drives the policy instead of the political.

Dr. Meigs said that it is not a loss to him of the irony since he did his post-doctoral training at a university that was built on tobacco dollars.

Dr. Eggers asked is there a difference is breathing in smoke from tobacco products from smoke from wood-burning products which are used in fire pits. Dr. Meigs said that is what we would have to discern whether we want a smoke-free campus or one with designated smoking areas.

## **Second Reading**

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

Dr. Meigs passed out the latest IDC 1 which now has two friendly amendments. One change was regarding the length of the timeline from intent to plan new degree. The change was from one year to four months to be in line with the UNC system. The other change is a change of language not process where they are changing the use of the word "probation" to "internal review status."

### **Discussion:**

Dr. Mills asked about when will this start and the backdating.

Dr. Meigs said this can start upon passage. However, he is not sure what the role of this document is for IDC considers this document as an IDC statement, and they think it ultimately needs to be part of the Faculty Handbook which means this becomes a recommendation to FWDC. Then FWDC would create their new documents that are based off of this document. We also need to consider the impact on APC before it is placed in the faculty handbook. In summary, IDC 1 isn't a change for the handbook but a recommendation that we hope will be made swiftly.

Dr. Roig asked for clarification regarding the Request for Authorization to Plan which at this point is only announced to the Senate so it doesn't go through an approval process in the Senate.

Dr. Meigs explained the Authorization to Plan goes through IDC and this is all based off of earlier senate documents and then at other points it goes through APC and the Faculty Senate. If IDC saw a serious problem, they would bring it to the senate to get full input.

Approved without dissent and becomes SD0512F.

IDC is still working on their response to the Provost's detailed and thoughtful response to the 2010-2011 HERI survey where IDC had concerns that had us stand out from the other institutions that responded. IDC is crafting a response to the Provost's document and they are making progress. At their last meeting, they had great discussions and are working on a document to bring before the Faculty Senate of needed changes. Dr. Hobby has done some great writing on this to come up with a document that will be satisfactory to the full IDC and they hope to have that done very shortly.

Campus Climate Research Survey: This is the number one item for their next meeting. IDC is discerning whether it would include enough information to where they would need or not need a separate perception of administrative offices survey for UNC Asheville. They are going through the pros and cons of such a survey. There are thoughts put forth that perhaps if as faculty survey the performance of administrative offices that perhaps we should limit it to just those administrative offices that the faculty have direct dealings, or perhaps, we divide it up to where a certain subset of administrative offices that fall under the same umbrella where each year a different subset of administrative offices is surveyed.

#### **IX. Academic Policies Committee Report**

Dr. Sophie Mills reported for the Academic Policies Committee.

There are fifteen up for first reading which passed APC unanimously. There are a couple of particular interests of change for UNC Asheville's curriculum. The first one of substantial change is APC 4; a proposed change of concentration in Art History will bloom into a full B.A. in Art History. The other one is APC 17, the most significant proposed change of all the documents we are bringing forward because the proposal is to delete the current general music and jazz studies and replace with a B.F.A in jazz which will be a quite heavy credit hour B.F.A. at 62 hours. With the current talk in Curriculum Review, you may want to read that document very carefully as well as the other music courses changes. APC was really impressed with what the music department had to say about why these were good ideas and passed it unanimously. Any questions? None.

#### **First Reading**

- [APC 3:](#) Change prerequisite for PSYC 412
- [APC 4:](#) Change in major from B.A. in Art with a concentration in Art History to a B.A. in Art History; [Appendix A](#) [Appendix B](#) [Revised Appendix C](#)
- [APC 5:](#) Change course description for ECE 220
- [APC 6:](#) Change credit hours for ECE 301 from 4 to 3
- [APC 7:](#) Add two new courses:  
EGM 484, Senior Design Project in Mechatronics Engineering I, and EGM 485, Senior Design Project in Mechatronics Engineering II
- [APC 8:](#) Change the semester of offering for ECE 456, ECE 460, EGM 482 and MAE 206
- [APC 9:](#) Make editorial adjustments to the major requirements for the joint degree in Engineering
- [APC 10:](#) Change description of MUSC 131
- [APC 11:](#) Change descriptions of MUSC 231, MUSC 232, MUSC 331
- [APC 12:](#) Change titles and descriptions of MUSC 293 and MUSC 294,  
Keyboard Harmony and Improvisation I and II
- [APC 13:](#) Delete MUSC 364 and MUSC 365, Jazz Theory and Improvisation I and II;  
Replace with new courses, MUSC 393 and MUSC 394,  
Harmony and Improvisation III and IV
- [APC 14:](#) Delete MUSC 351, MUSC 352, and MUSC 353;



Replace with MUSC 348 and MUSC 349

[APC 15:](#) Change credit hours of MUSC 357

[APC 16:](#) Add new courses to the Music curriculum:  
 MUSC 235, Contemporary Writing and Production;  
 MUSC 343, African American Music: Slavery to Swing;  
 MUSC 344, African American Music: R&B to Hip Hop;  
 MUSC 345, Defining the Beatles: Music, Image and Influence;  
 MUSC 346, The Grateful Dead: Music, Counterculture and Society  
 MUSC 347, Transatlantic Jazz

[APC 17:](#) Edit the narrative description for Music;  
 Delete General Music and Jazz Studies Emphases in Music,  
 replacing with B.F.A. in Jazz and Contemporary Music;  
 Change the requirements for the B.S. in Music Technology;  
 Adjust the piano requirements for admission to the major in Music;  
 Edit the requirements for the minor in Music

### **Second Reading**

[APC 2:](#) Sunsetting Courses

This is the annual ritual of cutting courses that have been taught for some time. The top nine courses are the only ones proposed for cutting at this time. Questions or Discussion? No questions nor discussion.

Passes without dissent and becomes SD0612F.

### **X. Administrative Reports**

Provost Fernandes asked for the Faculty Senate's advice on a matter which has been discussed at a recent department chairs and program directors meeting. The question relates to the December meeting of the faculty where the December graduates and recipients of Latin Honors are normally approved. On the day this year that it is scheduled, the Provost will be out of town for business. One option is she can appoint a proxy to have a meeting here which she can do. However, the Provost wonders if it would be acceptable to have an online vote so the faculty does not have to go in person to the meeting. The Handbook establishes an expectation of a faculty vote at a meeting but does not specify the type of meeting through which the vote must take place. The Provost doesn't want to do something that is against policy; she intends to comply with the spirit of the Handbook. At the same time, the meeting in December is typically not well attended. In the Provost's time here to date, the meeting has been very small with less than ten people who attend the meeting. She is not sure this is an overwhelming concern of faculty to actually be at the meeting in person to vote. The Provost asked for input from the senators.

Dr. McKnight expressed he would rather have the meeting online.

Dr. Kormanik wanted to add that faculty meetings are a great time to share information with each other, and if there is information to share, then it is a good reason to meet.

The Provost explained that there isn't anything major coming up in December of which she is aware. If there were, then the meeting would have to be in person. Is there a strong objection to the online voting concept? This is what the Provost wants to know. If the Senate is okay with it, then she will go with that idea.

Dr. Burchard expressed a concern that this sets a precedent for online meetings and she is not sure that we want a precedent for online meetings to be set. Dr. Burchard would want to see if this is stated as a one-time occurrence to be made clear in the announcement and not the beginning of a new tradition. Ms. McClellan and the Provost confirmed that we have already done online voting

once before.

Dr. Kaplan said that he believes it is the Provost's call.

Dr. Fernandes said this is not a precedent, but is a step borne out of the particular circumstances surrounding this meeting. The Provost stated that she enjoys the Faculty meetings and looks forward to having many more to come.

## **XI. Old Business**

Dr. Kaplan asked for a sense of senate of Dean Krumpe's report at the last meeting on the update on space issues. We have enormous space issues on this campus that are not going to go away even if the state suddenly gives us a lot of money to build a few buildings for by the time we built the buildings we would have like six new programs and we would need space for them. Where does the Senate stand on the space issue? Do we have concerns? He would like a sense of senate for he does not know where anyone stands. If we have consensus at the table, then it may be appropriate to enter a sense of senate about the issue of solving such a short term space issue around the admissions offices by putting it in the library which would be permanent changes to the library for a temporary fix.

Dr. Kaplan's sense of senate is that the senate should strongly discourage it. He is not saying that the library is inviolate or some completely sacred space that could not be home to an admissions office. He wouldn't strike or burn anything down. But it strikes Dr. Kaplan as a pretty serious move that should not go unnoticed if the senate had a strong concern about it.

Dr. Kaplan opened the floor to discussion on that old business. If there is a consensus, then we can draft the appropriate statement.

Dr. Miller asked what the alternative is. It seems that the move is needed due to the great need to fix the cafeteria. Are there other alternatives? Is this a permanent change?

Dr. Kaplan sensed from the meeting a hesitation to go into the student union where there is space.

Dr. Fernandes confirmed that the move of admissions is not considered to be permanent. However, wherever it goes, it will likely be located there for a considerable time. In the long run, the University plans to locate Admissions in a reconstructed Carmichael. However, it may be several years before Carmichael is on the road to reconstruction. Her understanding related to Highsmith is that since Highsmith was paid for with student fees, the programs within it have to be student related. Locating administrative offices in a building paid for with student fees is not permitted, so this isn't just Dr. Haggard's preference. He is not allowed to let administrative offices use a building that was paid for with student fees.

Dr. Kormanik's concern was the modification of the library. If it is temporary, that is one thing. Dr. Kormanik is concerned about the comments of the designer that Dean Krumpe quoted. When the designer looked at this space, he said, "Wow, what a great waste of space." Once you put in the second story here, this would no longer be a temporary solution but a permanent change. He is concerned with the permanent changes to the library that would destroy this space.

Dr. Kaplan is concerned about these permanent changes to a building for a temporary change of location for admissions. Moreover, once that becomes an office dominated space in the library, Dr. Kaplan has an additional concern that once they eventually move out that it would be perceived on campus that we need to put a different administrative office in there as opposed to returning it to library space.

Dr. Kaplan does not know where the Senate stands. Does anyone have concerns? Have you thought about it since last month?

Dr. Mills likes the idea of the Admissions going right to the academic heart of the community. That is really symbolic and lovely.

Dr. Kaplan asks for a sense of consensus. None is offered.

Dr. Galloway asked for a schedule of when things will happen. Could the Senate have that?

Dr. Fernandes said we do not have a timetable as of yet. When she has a timeline, she will share it. Right now the options are still at the exploratory stage.

Dr. Meigs asked how rapidly is this situation in Brown Hall eroding. He understands the space needs fixing. Is there a timeline for Brown Hall?

Dean Krumpe said two things about the timing regarding Brown Hall. One is the food service contract on campus is getting ready to expire and any work that would be done to renovate Brown Hall would be folded into the new contract. That is the main driver of this. Second are the points expressed in the report at the last faculty senate meeting regarding the outdated dishwasher conveyor and the sewage leakage issue in Brown Hall. The contractor will drive the whole process.

Dr. Meigs' followup question would be when the major work will be done. Dean Krumpe says they are looking for summer 2014 when the renovations will take place; however, that is not a guarantee. That is Dean Krumpe's recollection.

Dr. Ray suggested to Dr. Kaplan that the Faculty Senate could ask to look at the design to make sure whatever is done is viewed as effective for the purpose intended but doesn't take away from the structure of the building and the long-term view.

Dr. Kaplan replied we could do that but at that point it is almost too late to say that we hate it and then they say they can't change it now. Ultimately according to the Faculty Handbook, it is the Provost's responsibility to make decisions about space. It isn't the Senate's responsibility. He is new to the Senate and so this is all iffy to him but in the Standing Rules, it says one of the faculty's responsibilities is to participate in the institution's development by providing input into the ongoing planning. This seems like ongoing planning and an opportunity for us to give input. The last time we heard about it that was like a first reading. This meeting looked like an opportunity to get input.

Dr. Kormanik stated that this is an issue that could be presented to the University Planning Council by IDC. To him, utilization of space is a planning issue and we could ask that it be placed on the agenda. If the Chancellor agreed to have it placed on the agenda, then it could be discussed there.

Dr. Eggers agrees with Dr. Mills on her comment and yet she understands about losing this significant space as well as concern over the ratio of office to classroom space. She would like to see an exit strategy for the use of this space afterwards.

As follow-up to his presentation at the last meeting, Dean Krumpe said the idea for second floor addition was neither for Admissions nor Financial Aid but to provide additional space to the Library for student use. It was never intended to put offices up there and there has been no discussion of that. Dean Krumpe said there hasn't been any formal discussion regarding what would happen to this space afterwards. The current plan for the Red Oak room, the Whitman room, the lobby and downstairs does not involve removing any walls. There will be walls put up but we are not changing the formal existing footprint, largely because the walls that exist are firewalls and doing so would exponentially increase the cost. The designers took substantial time to design around the existing walls due to the temporary nature of the relocation.

Dr. Burchard is wondering if it would be useful for people to be able to think about the alternatives to moving these offices to the library. If there are other locations being considered, maybe knowing those would help people think about whether this is the best option we have or another option is better.

Dean Krumpe welcomes everyone to do exactly what he has done which is to consider every building on this campus. He has literally looked and considered every building. He welcomes other sets of eyes and creative minds looking at this. There are square footage issues which he is very happy to give people regarding the number of people, the number of offices, and the amount of space necessary for each entity.

Dean Krumpe seriously welcomes the participation and input from the Faculty Senate.

In terms of the design for this space and having creative minds thinking it through, Dr. Ray asked whether if that had been done to the fullest extent or would it benefit from the thoughts of this group.

Dean Krumpe said he is happy to share what drawings they have and have people comment on them. They have shared them with the leadership of each of the entities and the Provost's Cabinet has seen the plans. Dean Krumpe would be happy to bring them to the next Faculty Senate meeting and present them and open them up for ideas. (Lisa will reserve the needed technology.)

Dr. Fernandes confirmed that we could have the presentation at the next Senate meeting to get more ideas.

Dr. Burchard asked the Senate if they would like to see the presentation.

Dr. Miller would like to see a presentation whether there are alternatives, and if there are alternatives, then have a little verbiage about the pros and cons. He felt Dean Krumpe described the use of this space pretty well.

Dr. Kaplan expressed that this is the only space to have all three departments together. However, if this is a temporary move, does it have to be convenient? Could it not be housed in two or three buildings? It could be fantastically inconvenient but all the more impetus to get the building done and get those offices back together.

Dr. Fernandes said they considered that Admissions needs to be in one place for optimum counselor communication and application decision-making. She thinks it would hamper their operations if the Admissions Office is split up. It really is a priority to keep Admissions in one location together. On many campuses, the admissions office is the prime showcase of the university. We will do the best we can with the limited options available and we welcome any ideas you have. We must have a fully functional Admissions Office. Everything at the University depends on it. Everything you are saying is good.

Dr. Eggers asked if there are plans for the space that will be vacated in Brown Hall. She wonders why not have truly temporary solutions like cubicles.

Dean Krumpe said that the plan for Brown Hall is to renovate/reconfigure the existing dining hall space and expand the dining hall space into the floor below. Some suggestions include making larger rooms for University functions and banquets so that events may be held in the same building where the food is cooked. At the present time, you can hold functions in Highsmith but that involves food transportation.

Ms. McGaha suggested that they do not move Campus Police and the Health and Counseling center to the MAHEC building. Leave those two offices on this campus and move Admissions to the MAHEC building.

Dean Krumpe said that all of the University Advancement Division is slated to go over to the MAHEC building also. The other two departments needed to move to obtain a facility that will help with their certification.

Dr. Meigs pointed out that wherever Admissions and Financial Aid go we don't want it to look to prospective students and families that it is temporary for we do not know how long it will be temporary in this economic environment.

Dr. Fernandes said that is why we do not want cubicles for Admissions. A temporary holding place cannot be what future students and parents see about us the first time they visit. However, we do not want to put a huge amount of money into a temporary solution either.

Dr. Galloway asked what is going into the third floor of Owen Hall when Advancement moves.

Dr. Fernandes replied that Academic Affairs takes the third floor of Owen Hall back but she does not know what will go there as of yet. Dean Krumpe added the conference center room has been used recently by the Art Department for big lectures and it will revert to that type of space when Academic Affairs resumes control. The offices in Owen Hall will also return to Academic Affairs spaces.

Dr. Burchard suggested we have the presentation at the next meeting. She asked Dean Krumpe to please bring the images of the space which helps to show people what type of space we are talking about and also the best alternatives considered that are the most promising second alternatives.

Dr. Kaplan thanked his colleagues for this discussion and engaging this issue with him. He recommended that we let this go without any further action and he appreciates the senators engaging this discussion.

Dr. Hook asked about the status of HLH. Ms. McClellan said it will not be ready by January. She said Dr. Fernandes may have more information. Dr. Fernandes did not have any new information. Most of the work being done now is being led by Finance and Operations. She is aware that Finance and Operations, via Vice Chancellor John Pierce, will hire experts to assess what needs to be done to clean the mold out the building. Her understanding is that the roof renovations addressed the root cause of the mold problem inside the building but it did not clean out what was already inside. Vice Chancellor Pierce and Chancellor Ponder will have to assess what the cost is to address the situation vis-à-vis the seats, the ceiling tiles, the carpet and the HVAC system versus the overall benefits. When the university has completed a cost-benefit analysis, a decision will be made whether to invest more money to do that or to take the building offline. This is definitely not going to be ready in January. It will be months of work inside the building before it would be ready.

## **XII. New Business**

### **X. Adjourn**

Dr. Burchard adjourned the meeting at 5:06pm

Respectfully submitted by: Lisa Sellers  
Executive Committee