

**University of North Carolina at Asheville**  
**FACULTY SENATE MEETING**  
**Minutes, December 6, 2012 (3:15 pm)**

Senate

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

Excused: B. Schaffer, N. McGaha

Visitors: G. Ashburn, E. Bares, W. Bares, C. Canejo, P. Catterfeld, L. Dunn, V. Derryberry, B. Felix, W. Kirby, J. Konz, K. Krumpe, P. Laughon, P. McClellan, L. Rundquist, A. Shope, L. Taylor

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

Bryan Schaffer is excused from this Faculty Senate meeting.

**II. Approval of Minutes**

- [November 8, 2012 Faculty Senate Minutes](#)  
Approved without dissent with editorial changes.

**III. Executive Committee Report: Dr. Melissa Burchard**

The Reception that the Faculty Senate had last month was very successful with a significant number of people in attendance. More than fifty people, including faculty and administrative staff, dropped in over the course of the evening to chat and partake of the lovely refreshments. Faculty Senate will continue to hold this very nice event once a semester. Dr. Burchard thanked everyone who helped make this a success highlighting Lisa Sellers' work as well as those who stayed to clean up.

Research on the Shared Governance documents revealed that the [Standards of Shared Governance](#) have already been approved by Faculty Senate [SD3007S](#) (Approved by the Faculty Senate on [February 8, 2007 – see minutes](#)). As a result, Faculty Senate does not have to go through the process of approving it in order to put it in the Faculty Handbook.

An issue has been raised regarding the SD3007S cover sheet. The cover sheet was not signed as approved by the Provost or the Chancellor. On the line of the coversheet where the Provost or the Chancellor normally signs, the SD3007S cover sheet says "Received" rather than the standard "Approved" or "Denied." Attached to the back of SD3007S is a written response by the Chancellor. Her response to the senate document is a weak affirmation at best and does not actually say she approves SD3007S.

Since this occurred in 2007 which was almost six years ago, Dr. Burchard wondered if the Senate could ask the Chancellor for an affirmation of Standards of Shared Governance.

Dr. Kormanik said this document is passed by Faculty Assembly (of the UNC System) as a set of standards, not a set of must statements or rules, that provides guidelines and principles that many people view as important and to be taken seriously. He believes that faculty should be aware of its existence so he moved to include the Standards of Shared Governance in the Faculty Handbook. Motion was seconded and the chair opened the floor up for discussion.

**Discussion:**

Several senators wanted to table the issue until they could closely consider the standards and the historical documents relating to them. However, Dr. Kormanik's motion was seconded and a majority of the Senators wanted to continue the discussion.

Dr. Kormanik said the reason he made the motion to include the Standards of Shared Governance in the Faculty Handbook is this document has been created and approved by the Faculty Assembly. While the standards do not express all the things we do here nor do all the standards apply, they are standards we aspire to meet. Since everyone should know about these standards, they need to be in a visible and obvious place so people can see its sense and significance. That is his intention for incorporating the standards into the Faculty Handbook.

Dr. Burchard, in support, added that the standards already have been endorsed by our Faculty Senate. (See [Minutes for February 8, 2007](#) for the endorsement, see [Minutes for March 15, 2007](#) for the approval of [SD5107S](#) which is the Sense of Senate Resolution directing FWDC to incorporate the standards into the standing rules, and see [Minutes for September 13, 2007](#) where Faculty Senate incorporated the Shared Standards of Governance into the Faculty Senate's [2007-2008 Standing Rules and Rules of Order \(SRRO\)](#)).

Dr. Kormanik stated that regardless of its past deposition there was a first reading last meeting and presumably a second reading this meeting though it is not on the agenda (\*Note: Secretary's understanding of last meeting is that Dr. Burchard did not want the document to go through two readings until Faculty Senate had discerned the document's final form that would be put through two readings for passage). Dr. Kormanik's point was that whatever Faculty Senate did in the past can be modified by what the senators choose to do now. Dr. Burchard concurred.

Dr. Kaplan asked Dr. Kormanik for confirmation of his understanding of the motion. He understands Dr. Kormanik's motion today is to have the Standards for Shared Governance in the Faculty Handbook so they are more visible so that when faculty and administration are dealing with issues they may refer to these standards and evaluate how well we are meeting the standards presently.

Dr. Kaplan added the standards would go through FWDC to prepare an appropriate introductory paragraph in the handbook to make it clear to anyone that these are standards and not rules or requirements.

Dr. Kormanik concurred and offered that the standards could be presented with its given title, an introductory statement prepared by FWDC and the standards as passed by Faculty Assembly.

Dr. Eggers asked if Faculty Assembly documents are normally placed in our Faculty Handbook. Dr. Burchard said that Faculty Assembly documents are not automatically included in UNC Asheville's Faculty Handbook.

Mr. Bowen relayed that [Section 1.1.3](#) of the UNC Asheville Faculty Handbook, which describes the history of UNC Faculty Assembly, their bylaws and charter, are the only Faculty Assembly documents included in our handbook.

Dr. Meigs noticed in the Chancellor's response back in 2007 that she states, "I suggest this is just the sort of topic for a recreated University Planning Council. Let's consider using this statement as good guidance and then also asking UPC, once it has gotten well underway, to review it and to make sure that our statement about shared governance serves us optimally."

Dr. Meigs, as co-chair of UPC, will bring this up and see if this actually has happened, and if not, this can be added to UPC's topics for the spring semester.

Dr. Burchard reminded that the motion on the table is to place this document in the Faculty Handbook. Dr. Kormanik added that any UPC changes would be an entirely different document that says what we want to do and how we are going to do it on our campus. Dr. Kormanik's intention is to include this document as worded as a strong statement of what the Faculty Assembly and other faculty members across all our institutions believe.

Dr. Burchard also offered that other campuses do have the standards incorporated in their Faculty Handbooks. At the October meeting of the Chairs of Faculty Senate, all campuses were strongly urged to reaffirm this statement of Principles of Shared Governance and incorporate it into their documents to give it as much force as possible.

Dr. Galloway asked if there was a reason to not place the standards in the Faculty Handbook and Dr. Hook said he couldn't think of a reason not to include them. His impression is UPC would look at it to see in what ways it is a viable document in respect to the particulars of our campus which is a matter of interpretation and understanding.

Dr. Kaplan reiterated that his understanding of Dr. Kormanik's motion was to place Faculty Assembly's document in the handbook as written by the Faculty Assembly. If UPC at some point decides to take that document and translate it into a language that is more relevant for this institution, those changes could be incorporated later.

Dr. Meigs sees two things: he felt it was fine to include the standards by the Faculty Assembly in our Faculty Handbook as long as it is extremely clear these are Faculty Assembly standards. He also felt it was fine to change particulars that UNC Asheville wants to modify for various reasons as long they articulate what the changes are. What came out of assembly is extremely important and has the weight of many faculty from many campuses. For that to be visible in our handbook, saying it is a statement and not necessarily UNC Asheville policy is perfectly fine.

Dr. Meigs thinks it is important that UNC Asheville articulates any differences from the Faculty Assembly document they incorporate in our Faculty Handbook.

Dr. Roig recommends a friendly amendment to Dr. Kormanik's motion to remand the statement to FWDC to provide the introductory language and a place for it in the Faculty Handbook. Dr. Kormanik found the friendly amendment acceptable.

Dr. Fernandes wanted to know if the administration of the UNC system has agreed with these principles that the Faculty Assembly approved and whether this is a shared agreement or whether this is a statement of the Faculty Assembly's belief that was not signed on to by the administration. She also wanted to know if Faculty Senate felt that Chancellor Ponder endorsed the Senate's document.

Dr. Burchard said that it appears that Chancellor Ponder did not approve the resolution.

Dr. Fernandes wonders if we should try to get a neutral agreement between the faculty and the administration and put that in the handbook.

Dr. Kormanik offered that Dr. Burchard's opening remarks were in that direction, not to necessarily build something together, but to get an updated and stronger response from the Chancellor on her positions, which does not preclude including or not including the Faculty Assembly's Standards in the Faculty Handbook. Dr. Kormanik and Dr. Burchard believe these are

separate issues.

Dr. Hook said from looking at the Chancellor's response that he would not say she doesn't endorse it. He reads from her response: "Let's try it." That is one of the sentences in her response.

Dr. Hook read the Chancellor's response to SD3007S in its entirety:

"The statement appears to be quite good as a guiding principle, one which describes many, indeed most, aspects of our assumptions about governance. I have reviewed this statement with the newly reelected chair of the UNC Faculty Assembly, Brenda Killingsworth. Here at UNC Asheville, we already do quite well with many aspects of this statement. So, let's try it. Let's try to live within it—to live up to it. However, this statement has not yet been shared and discussed with General Administration, the Board of Governors, or the leadership on the individual campuses, and these are presumably the constituencies with which governance is intended to be shared. Our faculty senate has not yet engaged in consultation with similar constituencies on our campus. I suggest this is just the sort of topic for a recreated University Planning Council. Let's consider using this statement as good guidance and then also asking UPC, once it has gotten well underway, to review it and to make sure that our statement about shared governance serves us optimally.

And because this statement addresses the specific approval of honorands, a process that is well underway for this year, I will confer with the faculty senate about how to uphold the spirit of this provision as we go forward."

Dr. Meigs said that the Chancellor may have changed since she wrote her response in regard to what other schools are doing. An important factor is to know what other schools have done with this.

Dr. Kormanik says that she says to make sure "our" statement about Shared Governance serves us optimally. Dr. Kormanik's motion is to include the statement of Faculty Assembly, not "our" statement.

Dr. Subramaniam said his sense of what he is hearing around the table is many senators would like the opportunity to revisit why we are putting this into the Faculty Handbook. He does not know whether it should be tabled, but the senators should have the opportunity to actually look at these standards again and to consider the issues that Dr. Meigs raised about what the other campuses have done with this that might be informative as well.

Dr. Kormanik reiterated that the motion is to put it in the Faculty Handbook with the friendly amendment to send to FWDC for an appropriate introductory statement to provide background as to what it is. That is the motion on the floor as amended. To table this is the wrong thing to do, for to table puts it in the dust bin until it is taken up again.

Dr. Subramaniam said that we own the Faculty Handbook here and that is our document and he thinks it would be part of our responsibility as the Faculty Senate to make sure of everything that goes into Faculty Handbook to have the proper oversight over what it is.

Dr. Meigs said he sees this as two things. No matter what we talk about, the assembly's document is going to stand as it is. That is not going to change. Other factors will come into play when we do our own separate version. He advocates putting it in the Faculty Handbook as the Faculty Assembly has approved.

The second thing is in regards to our version we incorporate. Dr. Meigs believes that as long as there is complete clarity these are Faculty Assembly Standards, which we do want to be visible, and make it clear that our policy is still in the works in how we treat this information.

Dr. McKnight reminded that the document from Faculty Assembly is a statement of principles, not a statement of policy, and we are responsible for the policies. The principles under which we draw up those policies have been approved already so he does not see any problem with including the Faculty Assembly document in the Faculty Handbook.

Dr. Burchard called the question and vote on the amended motion to put the Faculty Assembly Statement of Principles of the Standards of Shared Governance on the 16 UNC campuses into our Faculty Handbook as a document with appropriate introductory language to be drawn up by FWDC.

The motion is approved with 14 in favor and 3 opposed.

#### **IV. Student Government:** no report

#### **V. Dean Krumpe's presentation**

Dean Krumpe informed the Faculty Senate that late last week we found out that the target date for being out of Brown Hall for Admissions, OneStop, and Financial Aid is the beginning of May 2014 so that renovation may proceed over the summer and be ready for the students to eat in the newly renovated dining hall in the Fall of 2014.

As a result of that and some cost issues, a decision has been made to table any consideration of moving Admissions and Financial Aid out of there for right now and going back to ground zero to find appropriate locations for Admissions and Financial Aid. The plans for the Whitman Room, Red Oak Room and the Lobby of Ramsey Library are now off the table and those areas will remain as they are. They were taken off the table as result of conversations with the Faculty Senate, consideration of costs, and consideration of ADA accommodations requirements – there were a number of reasons that went into the decision.

A decision has been made to begin the design process to relocate OneStop to the ground floor of Ramsey Library. Dean Krumpe showed the pertinent schematic design document of the ground floor of Ramsey showing where OneStop is being relocated.

There has been much conversation about moving student support/academic services into the library. There has been a number of conversations with Leah Dunn, University Librarian.

Ms. Dunn talked about the rationale of OneStop in the library and its impact as well. She sees OneStop being a service for students that meshes well with other types of services that would bring students to the Library as center of campus. Though unconventional, it is not a far stretch and she feels overall that it will be a positive experience for us to have something that would bring students into the library and into our space.

Dean Krumpe first explained the schematics before Ms. Dunn explained the impact of OneStop in the library.

As point of reference, Dean Krumpe described the schematics in terms of what is currently located on the bottom floor of Ramsey Library. Begin at the stairs across from the circulation desk that come down to the media center. If you look at the space to the left, that space is historically where microfiche and microfilm is stored. Behind that is the Square D teleconference room that is currently used by engineering and Kent Thompson's video production studios and to the right are the science stacks.

OneStop is moving into what is shaded as blue on the schematic drawing. In the media center reception area is where the reception desk for OneStop will be duplicated where students can get quick questions answered. There will be a waiting area with computers so students can search schedules in the back area. OneStop cashiers and finance staff will have 3 three offices to the left where the microfiche is now. This will be where students go to pay for items such as tuition and library fines.

Then there is a series of offices and a vault for student records. The offices have not been permanently assigned but there will be a more visible space for Study Abroad, for the school wants to expand more opportunities abroad. They also want to dedicate a space for disability services and testing for students who need accommodations.

The one fundamental difference, other than location, is everyone will have an individual office rather than cubicles so students can have the required confidential space to speak.

In terms of impact, the media center (TLTR) is moving back to the corner near the education area in the technical services area of the library.

The second impacted area will be the science stacks, microfilm collections and educational materials. Leah Dunn has been looking specifically at the science stacks utilizing a widely-used book analysis software to identify the core collections as they weed out books. This collection in particular has not been weeded in over a decade. Since science materials become outdated quite quickly, it will be a positive thing to remove the outdated books. As a result, they do not anticipate much of an impact there. In terms of the education materials, they are in contact with the Education Department about relocating some of the curriculum materials. Juvenile collections will not be impacted.

The third impact is to the study space. Dr. Fernandes has given them permission to move forward with a library space study to look at study space which would include the study space on the lower level. At the moment, the lower level study area is configured for individual study where the library would like to have a better mix of individual and collaborative study space.

Dr. Meigs asked if they are going to try to do renovations to Brown Hall while Admissions and Financial Aid are in another part of the building or are they going to still try to get them out of there before renovations begin.

Dean Krumpe said, as we hit the reset button and go back to the very beginning, our goal is to make every attempt to try to come up with a solution that would relocate them prior to the renovation. While we actually have been commended by the consultants that we used for Admissions purposes about what we have done with that space (and they have seen the space prior to how it looks today), it is still not an ideal place for Admissions and Financial Aid. It doesn't take a lot of imagination to realize as you drive or walk up to that space that you are in what was a parking garage. There still are issues of the pipes as well as issues of Admissions and Financial Aid being

located below and around food preparation.

They are going to make every attempt to go back to the drawing board to find an alternative location for Admissions and Financial Aid.

Dr. Meigs asked a follow-up question. He asked if whether there are more locations on that floor in terms of dire straits and leakage and other issues or was OneStop the most acute problem area.

Dean Krumpe said they have slightly different problems but both are equally bad issues of the facility. One of the practical reasons that is also driving these moves is the university is slated to go out in January with an RFP for proposals for new food service contractors which include the renovation of Brown Hall. We want to be far enough along in our considerations, and try to get them completely out of there, to let the food prep experts and their designers come in and tell us this is the best way to deal with the space. As citizens of the university, we can offer suggestions but we are not designers, architects, nor food service people. We are going to get the best we can for the resources we have if we turn it over to them and let them do what they do. We would really like to tell them when they come to start this process the square footage they have and they can design what they wish to design.

Dr. Ray asked, after the dining hall is remodeled, will it be on both the ground floor where OneStop is now and the current dining room floor. Will it take up both of those spaces?

Dean Krumpe said he has not been in meetings about that specific issue but what he has gleaned from conversations with Dr. Haggard and a few others is recognition that when Highsmith Center was designed, Brown Hall was envisioned to be a banquet facility. Having that facility in a different building from where the real kitchen is located is a real problem. There are a number of issues driving space like the support of the advancement efforts to accomplish that.

There are many ideas to potentially use the top floor, what we think of as the eating hall as the real the eating space. When all our beds are full, we will have 300 additional students from what we have normally, and in the strategic plans, there are plans to build additional dorms so we need the capacity and more open space. In terms of a dining hall operation, there is a desire to move away from the traditional industrial kitchen and do what more and more schools are doing where food is cooked right in front of you. Some of this is a competitive issue when students come to visit our campus' dining halls and they look at Duke and Chapel Hill's dining halls. The current idea is food consumption on top floor and below is the industrial kitchen space as well as larger venues like banquet halls on the next floor.

Dr. Ray asked Dean Krumpe to confirm in the midst of these plans that Admissions and Financial Aid will not be going back to Brown Hall.

Dean Krumpe said that can't be guaranteed right now. After we return from the holidays in the beginning of January, we need to begin in earnest and really look at this to put all the things on the table and ask what we can do. Then we may find ourselves saying there are no other options and temporarily have to put them back in Brown Hall. We just do not know yet. We do know that the library is off the table for consideration.

Any further questions? None. Thank you.

## **VI. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee Report: Mr. Rob Bowen**

Update on Tenure, Reward and Promotion Documents.

The committee continues to work on tenure and review. They are in the process of putting everything they have in way of scholarship and scholarly activity, engagement, teaching and service into one document and see where we are deficient and then upon committee review, we will share that document with the senate prior to sharing it with the faculty as a whole. They are making steady progress but as this semester is drawn to a close, it has slowed a bit.

Update on Records moved to a “cloud.”

Earlier Mr. Bowen reported to the Senate the desire to possibly put Faculty Records online or submit them digitally for easier review and the possibility of putting all the files for candidates for promotion and tenure in a form that could be accessed by the Tenure Review Committee without spending countless hours in Phillips Hall.

Several of the senators attended a presentation from Perceptive Software and their Image Now software which seems to be an extremely flexible program that could meet our needs in this regards but there would need to be some programming done. The Faculty Senate would have to decide what they wish the software to specifically do. This software package interfaces well with Banner but is much more flexible than Banner so it can be used in personnel hiring and file transfers. E-forms can be established and updated at every juncture and shows a lot of promise for things working within Financial Aid and HRC.

Mr. Bowen would like to do further research with Jeff Konz and Jeff Brown and talk with universities within our system that may be using it as well for the same purposes that we are looking at the software to do for us. Then we will need to decide what we want it specifically to do and implement it. He doesn't think this will be able to happen this semester but it may be possible to have it in place next year. It is going to first integrate it with Banner and use with modules that work with HRC and Financial Aid, and hopefully, we can get it to adapt for our needs as well shortly thereafter.

One of the things that was brought up by Jeff is that we both don't know for sure is where those files are stored, whether they are stored on campus or somewhere in a digital file. From what Mr. Bowen has seen, their security looks to be very, very good but you can't make it fool proof.

**First Reading**

[FWDC 3: Changes in 10.4.15 Transportation Committee \(SD3106S\)](#)

This document restructures the Transportation Committee regarding who it reports to and is submitted as FWDC 3.

**VII. Institutional Development Committee/University Planning Council Reports: Dr. Ted Meigs**

[UPC November 29 Minutes](#)

Received update from Chancellor Ponder on certain activities of the GA and Board of Governors (BOG). The BOG continues with their strategic planning process. They have reduced the number of themes they are covering in their strategic plan from 7 to 5. They continue to work on this, and of course, their concrete plan is going to dictate some of what we do on UPC as far as our strategic plan.



Once BOG finalizes their strategic plan, we will look at our strategic plan carefully and align with theirs as best as we can.

Concern that GA is looking at the community college agreement with the UNC system school and they are considering the implementation of the Standardized 44 Hour Uniform General Education block to meet the general requirements for all of the UNC system schools. The Chancellor voiced some concern over the impact of such a policy on our unique Liberal Arts curriculum. So we will keep an eye on this very carefully for this is a concern, and since we are in the midst of the curriculum review, this could shape some of this as well. The Chancellor said this will be a positive rare education opportunity to get across our unique mission when compared to the other schools since 60 percent of the legislators are serving their first or second term.

UNC Smoking Policy possibilities. There were several recommendations that were summarized by Vice Chancellor Bill Haggard. One option was to return Tennant Park with the gazebo to a non-smoking area. Another option was to develop a better communication plan to raise awareness of the smoking policy. Another option is to consider reduction of the smoking areas. And lastly, to publicize the science that emphasize secondhand and primary smoke are unequivocally health hazards on any level. Bill Haggard is going to convene a smoking policy group composed of representatives of the senate, the Chancellor's Staff Advisors Committee, SGA, UPC, and Health and Wellness Department. Bill Haggard said he feels UPC has clear, important sense of direction. A motion was made that UPC proceed to the most restrictive policy allowable by our peer institution and was approved with one dissention.

Debbie Griffith talked about a change in the metric in our dashboard to monitor our progress and lack in progress. One of them is the academic reputation benchmark. They had been basing this benchmark on the number of students surveyed but now they are changing to the number of students who apply to UNC Asheville each year who has a SAT score above 1185. A motion was made that we look at setting that at a percentile instead of a raw number which changes from year to year. The idea is we can measure academic reputation by the number of students actually applying to UNC Asheville who are at a certain caliber of high school performance. This is a benchmark we can maintain. UPC approved and the Chancellor supports this as well.

#### **IDC Business:**

##### HERI Survey Response.

A document was handed out which was a response sent to the provost regarding her response to the HERI Survey. IDC seeks Faculty Senate advice. Dr. Meigs encourages the senators to read this between now and their next senate meeting. He asks senators to think about how to proceed and whether the senate would like to issue a sense of senate resolution. IDC is extremely appreciative that Provost put so much time into this and she put a lot of detail in her response to the survey results. The senators have seen the response which has been distributed previously a couple senate meetings back.

IDC has their concerns broken down to three categories:

1. Teaching load and curricular sustainability;
2. Shared Governance and Group Dynamics and Morale; and finally,
3. Communication between faculty and academic administration.

IDC did make several recommendations specifically:

1. Seek a means of providing course reductions and course releases for faculty, particularly for those involved in Faculty Senate and time intensive administrative duties like undergraduate research, collaborative projects with various local entities and other important tasks outside the classroom. As possible, advocate for faculty at the level of the UNC system. IDC is not saying this isn't being done but they want this to continue to be given a high priority.
2. Draft and circulate an advisory document concerning outside the classroom academic pursuits and their accounting in terms of teaching credit and reassigned time. This can wait until number 1 crystalizes.
3. Whenever possible, provide information to faculty in advance of faculty meetings and help to develop a culture in these meetings that increases participation and comments by faculty and encourages their involvement in decision making.
4. To provide counsel and suggestions to IDC and Faculty Senate in developing and administering evaluation/survey of academic leadership by faculty members.
5. Take appropriate steps to assure UNC Asheville participation in the upcoming cycle of this survey which will be 2013-2014.

IDC put the document together and sent it to Provost Fernandes and we will now like to see what the Faculty Senate thinks of this and see if the senate would like to endorse it, add to it, change it, etc. as well as additional feedback from the provost on this.

Survey of Administrative Offices.

IDC understands that a survey of administrative units has been done in the past. We discussed whether such a survey should be reprised or whether a separate survey of faculty on the administrative leadership would be valuable. A major topic is whether this is common practice at our peer universities and other UNC system schools for this is important to IDC because they want to do "Best Practices" where if it is a good practice by our peer institutions to have faculty to give that feedback on academic leadership then they are given a chance to do so. IDC asked Jessica Dunsmore to identify and inform IDC on survey tools that were used at other schools for review of the administration by the faculty.

IDC believes it is very important that such a survey be developed and administered by the Faculty Senate rather than by staff. They also feel it is very important that this should be done in a collaborative, open way with the administration, with plenty of input from the Provost, the Deans and the Chancellor.

The rationale for this is IDC feels as faculty we live in a culture here at UNC Asheville in which assessment and feedback are embraced and we feel that this system of values extends to all levels of the university. That was what prompted us to decide to make that part of our HERI response. We seek all sorts of open communication on whether this is a good idea, how to go about it, ways it can provide feedback of all aspects of the campus where leadership can get a sense of where faculty feel

about certain things and how to make for better communication. We always want to drive this in a positive direction and that sincerely, on a personal level, that is Dr. Meigs' hope of where all of this is coming to where communication is made better and the university improves as a result of it and everything becomes better in terms of the way we operate as an institution.

Dr. Burchard let Dr. Meigs know that the Chairs of Faculty Senate of the UNC campuses are asking this question on their email discussion list. Almost all of the campuses have weighed in with their current practices and she can forward to Dr. Meigs that email chain. Dr. Meigs said he would appreciate that for that would be very important for IDC to see and thanked Dr. Burchard.

#### Update on IDC 1.

IDC also has an update on IDC 1 (SD0512F) which was approved by senate last time. Mr. Bowen and Dr. Meigs are checking the existing language of the Faculty Handbook to figure out a way to incorporate IDC 1 into the Faculty Handbook so that it does not contradict anything that is already there.

#### Board of Trustees Survey.

IDC also talked about a Board of Trustees directed survey to engage opinions on our campus about the development of graduate programs at UNC Asheville.

Several questions arose in their discussion that Dr. Meigs shared:

- Who are we as an institution?
- What is our identity?
- What do we want our identity to be?
- Do we want our identity to stay just as it is or do we want change in our identity?
- IDC believes that the issue of the graduate programs does speak to our identity as a university and we have to think of it in those terms.
- What would be the resource implications, financial costs, and effects as money started to roll in as a result of programs?
- How would it roll in?
- Do we start these up and then the money comes in?
- Concern over the potential detraction from what has made us nationally recognized in undergraduate education and research. If we develop graduate programs, are we messing with basic institutions here that have worked to make us have national recognition?
- What is the possible negative impact on the relationship or rapport between faculty and undergraduates?
- What are the justifications for developing graduate program?
- Why is the survey being driven by Board of Trustees? IDC is not sure why the Board of Trustees is driving this particular survey.
- If we do develop more graduate programs at UNC Asheville, how can we keep them unique and not less developed versions of what is already available at our regional institutions like Western Carolina or Appalachian State? What can we do to make these unique?
- In regards to the issues of faculty workload, how do we account for this?

This discussion is far from finished in IDC but Dr. Meigs wanted to share what has come up and Dr. Meigs welcomes input from fellow IDC members for anything that he may have forgotten to say. No other comments.

**Questions:**

On this issue too, in interest of continuity, Dr. Burchard wanted to remind IDC that we had a discussion about this issue five or six years ago. There was a committee that did a study and made a report. It would be useful for IDC to look that up and make sure those ideas and recommendations have been taken into consideration again.

Dr. Meigs thanked Dr. Burchard very much for bringing that up and appreciates any relevant information.

Dr. Kaplan added that the Board of Trustees' minutes are online and they have a section on Graduate Programs from the July 9 and 10 meetings. In those meetings, they make the recommendation to conduct their survey.

**VIII. Academic Policies Committee Report: Dr. Sophie Mills**

Dr. Mills said that first is for the senators' holiday reading pleasure is the first reading documents that will be up for second reading on the first Spring Semester Faculty Senate Meeting, January 24. Most of these documents are quite department specific. There are three that might have a slightly broader application. An example is APC 30 changes the criteria for receiving credit for LANG 120 which may help students to place out of the requirement. Dr. Mills pointed out the numerous documents from the Dance Program which radically streamlines that program which will change what we offer in terms of dance here. Particularly interesting, APC 37 brings Chinese formally into the list of languages that are offered as a foreign language.

**First Reading**

[APC 18:](#) Add new course, ECON 242, Economics of Food

[APC 19:](#) Revise entry for ECON 245, Land Economics

[APC 20:](#) Delete POLS 390, Political Analysis;

Add new course POLS 290, Political Analysis

[APC 21:](#) Change requirements for the major in Political Science

[APC 22:](#) Add the requirement for a new concentration of  
Broadcast Meteorology in Atmospheric Sciences

[APC 23:](#) Removal of the prerequisite for ATMS 113,  
Understanding the Atmosphere

[APC 24:](#) Addition of a corequisite for ATMS 310,  
Atmospheric Kinematics and Dynamics

[APC 25:](#) Remove cross-listings between BIOL 340 and ENVR 340, and  
BIOL 442 and ENVR 442

[APC 26:](#) Remove cross-listings between ENVR 341 and BIOL 342, and  
ENVR 348 and BIOL 348

[APC 27:](#) Add new course, ANTH 323, Storied Anthropology

[APC 28:](#) Add new course, ANTH 339, Intersections of Gender in the Americas

- [APC 29:](#) Add new course, ANTH 357, Disrupted Lives:  
The Anthropology of Social Suffering
- [APC 30:](#) Change the criteria for receiving credit for LANG 120 from Advanced Placement;  
Add a minimum SAT I Writing and/or ACT Writing test score as an option to receive  
LANG 120 credit
- [APC 31:](#) Delete the following courses from the Dance Curriculum:  
DAN 130, 131, 132, 133, 215, 230, 231, 260, 261, 262, 320
- [APC 32:](#) Add new courses, DAN 140, 240 and 251
- [APC 33:](#) Delete DAN 135 and 235, replacing them with DAN 136 and 236, respectively;  
Change the title of DAN 137; Change the title and description of DAN 237;  
Change the title of DAN 138; Change the title and description of DAN 238
- [APC 34:](#) Delete DAN 335, replacing it with DAN 340; Delete DAN 337 and 338,  
replacing them with DAN 341
- [APC 35:](#) Delete DAN 310, replacing it with DAN 312; Change the title and term  
offered for DAN 330; Change the description and reduce the credit hours  
of DAN 345
- [APC 36:](#) Change the requirements for the Minor in Dance
- [APC 37:](#) Adjust the number of required hours for the Foreign Language requirement; Add  
ASIA 101 and 102 to the list of courses that will fulfill the Foreign Language  
requirement

### **Second 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

#### **Discussion/Questions.**

Second Reading documents all came unanimously endorsed by APC. As such, Dr. Mills stated the senate can approve this body of documents in one vote unless there are documents they wish to pull out to consider separately. The senators confirmed that they wished to consider the Music department's documents separately (APC 10 – APC 17).

Motion made and seconded to accept APC 3 through APC 9. No questions or discussion.

[APC 3 through APC 9 approved without dissent becoming \[SD0712F through SD1312F\]\(#\).](#)

Dr. Mills asked Dr. Kirby from the Music Department to introduce the proposed documents APC 10 through APC 17, explain why these are proposed, what it is going to do and what the benefits are.

Dr. Kirby said that the Music Department currently has a Bachelor of Science in Music Technology which has plenty of graduates and plenty of enrollments. We also have a Bachelor of Arts degree with two tracks: General Music tract which is highly unproductive and a BA with a concentration in Jazz Study track which is more productive. What we are proposing is to close out the Bachelor of Arts programs and in their place institute a BFA with enough coursework that our students will be able to go out and function in the music industry, which is not the case now. Also, BFA students will be able to integrate with the Bachelor of Science program so the students in the BFA program will be recorded by the Bachelor of Science students and the Bachelor of Science students will have an opportunity to work with high quality students that UNC Asheville will attract as the result of getting the BFA.

Dr. Eggers asked if this is a trend of music departments to move in this direction. Dr. Kirby says this sets us apart in that it is Jazz/Contemporary music so we are not limiting ourselves to Jazz but other forms of contemporary music including R&B, Funk and Blues. There are also musical theater and other art forms which are contemporary 20<sup>th</sup> or 21<sup>st</sup> century forms. UNC Asheville is unique

additionally in that we are providing this in the context of a Liberal Arts school. Most of the other programs in Jazz are Bachelor of Music programs with many more classes and the courses in music specifically. The BFA is a fraction of what a Bachelor of Music would require.

Mr. Bowen pointed out that The National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) endorses a Bachelor of Music as a professional degree in this particular area. Mr. Bowen asked if the BFA is a preprofessional degree or how are you characterizing it in that regard. Dr. Kirby said they are educating the students so they can function in the industry. UNC Asheville could shoot for a Bachelor of Music degree here but it would be shot down for it is a 100 credit hour major plus General Education. Dr. Kirby says we can do what we need to do with the courses we are suggesting. We have a spectacular music faculty.

Dr. Kaplan has been talking to various people who say they feel the BFA would make our students more marketable after they leave UNC Asheville without breaking the bank, unlike the Bachelor of Music which would have us worried about sustainability on campus. Dr. Kaplan asked if it is necessary to drop the Bachelor of Arts degree. What is the impact on your faculty in terms of their workload? Will they be able to do more or less now? What about students interested in Education? Dr. Kirby said that UNC Asheville has never had an Education degree so that would not be impacted. Dr. Kirby said the BA is unproductive and the student comes here, enrolls in the BA, and when they leave they can't function in the industry. As a result, it makes sense to jettison a couple of these tracks and put something else in its place that is economical and does not spread our faculty too thin in terms of workload.

Dr. Burchard asked Dr. Kirby to clarify for he is talking about degree programs and not degree tracks. Dr. Kirby clarified they are replacing one degree, a Bachelor of Arts which has two tracks so that could be considered two degrees. We have two degrees now and we will have two degrees, perhaps, after we leave here. We are just replacing the BA with a BFA.

Dr. Burchard asked Dr. Kirby to confirm that when he says unproductive, does he mean there were not that many majors. Dr. Kirby says the word unproductive comes from a report that he has to fill out when the Music Department does not have the magical number of graduates they are required to have. The report is called the Unproductivity Report.

Dr. Burchard asked Dr. Kirby to elaborate on the differences between a Bachelor of Music and a BFA in Jazz and Contemporary Music. To Dr. Burchard, the BFA in Jazz and Contemporary Music sounds like it is limiting options for students.

Dr. Hobby replied, "The BA is an odd bird for music." For undergraduate musicians to go onto anything else is they either have a BFA or a Bachelor of Music so to have a Bachelor's degree that is an Arts degree in music is very strange. Dr. Hobby has seen again and again students who are very talented graduate with the BA degree but not be able to go to graduate school for the degree does not bear with it any credibility.

Dr. Ashburn echoed support of Dr. Kirby and Dr. Hobby's comments by relaying that Melody Galloway had worked hard and did a study for a year on some of our students who came to her who majored in BA who thought they could do licensure but UNC Asheville could not afford to institute licensure in music. It required too much instrumentation and more faculty than UNC Asheville has. This is a better thing for who we are and what faculty we have to offer a degree we can offer really well instead of disappointing students. Mars Hill, Appalachian, and Western have licensure. This

gives us an identity with our music department and goes well with our BS in Music Technology, for our musicians will also know production and other aspects of the music business so it seems like an excellent fit for us.

Dr. Kormanik pointed out that the title, “Edit the Narrative Description for Music” is an understatement. What this document is really doing is creating a new degree called the Bachelor of Fine Arts. Dr. Kormanik said that Dr. Kirby spoke eloquently to IDC about the significance and the importance of this and the benefits to the students. Dr. Kormanik needs clarification of the number of hours. Dr. Kirby confirmed there are 6 electives but they are included in the 62 total credit hours required. Dr. Kormanik has concerns about the 62 hours when Curricular Review Task Force is capping hours to 60.

Dr. Kirby said they squeezed down the total number of hours to as close to 60 as we possibly could and 62 total credit hours are the closest we could manage.

Mr. Bowen stated that the rationale on this particular document is really consolidated. He has heard from many people who gave good reasons why this program should be started but that reasoning is not in the rationale of the APC document. Our institutional memory is shrinking every semester. Departments need to tell us why we make the decisions we make. He would like Dr. Kirby to reconsider and put the eloquent statements into the rationale.

Dr. Kirby said he will do whatever it takes for passage.

Dr. McKnight confirmed that Faculty Senate likes to hear that.

Dr. McKnight wanted to briefly answer one of Mr. Bowen’s questions. You asked if all these individual changes were dependent on document 17 and Dr. McKnight can speak to APC 14 which is the change in the Music History layout and it is not dependent on the adoption of the BFA.

Dr. McKnight wants passage of APC 14 regardless of whether APC 17 passes. What APC 14 does is replace 3 two-hour courses with 2 three-hour courses. Same content just different layout which makes scheduling a lot easier.

Dr. Kaplan asked if anyone else could speak to the other documents APC 10 – APC 16.

Dr. Felix confirmed that along with APC 14 that APC 10 – APC 16 are not contingent upon the passage of the BFA (APC 17).

Dr. Kaplan made a motion to pass APC 10 through APC 16. There was a second. No further questions or discussion.

APC 10 through APC 16 approved without dissent becoming [SD1412F](#) through [SD2012F](#).

In regards to APC 17, the problem with having Dr. Kirby bring back an expanded language version is this has to get back down state by December 15 (next Senate meeting is January 24).

Dr. Ashburn explained that General Administration just enacted a change on how individual campuses send in new degree proposals. They used to accept your Appendix A and then you had a year after they accepted your Appendix A. Now that has been changed to four months, we only have until December 15 to get the documentation submitted. Dr. Eggers motioned that Faculty Senate rely on the minutes of this meeting to provide the institutional memory and clear rationale for why we are asking this new degree to be passed.

Dr. Mills was agreeable to that solution. There was a second.

**Questions/Discussion:**



Dr. Hook expressed that he will vote for this new degree; however, he becomes nervous when he hears discussions of professionalization in context of the liberal arts college. We are in a sense all collaborating on one product, and that is part of what makes us different. As a member of the Classics Department, he is sympathetic to the designation of "Unproductive." On the other hand, Dr. Hook would hate to see all of our decisions being more and more driven by that determination because he believes that would change our institution in ways that we do not want to continue to talk about over and over.

Mr. Bowen asked to read into the minutes an email which to him provides the great rationale for the new degree. This is from Charles to Scott Walters:

From: **Scott Walters** <[swalters@unca.edu](mailto:swalters@unca.edu)>  
 Date: Tue, Dec 4, 2012 at 9:44 AM  
 Subject: Charles on the BFA in Jazz  
 To: Robert Bowen <[rbowen@unca.edu](mailto:rbowen@unca.edu)>

Sorry to take so long to get back to you. Here's the story. The BA in music has low graduation rates for the past 10-15 years. GA is unlikely to let it continue which leaves us without performers. The BFA addresses that in jazz and contemporary music. Getting Brian and Bill was part of that plan. The Chancellor and Provost are enthusiastic about it. It will be a unique program in the UNC system and give us greater community visibility. It already has: see the monthly UNCA nights at the Altamont. Our course offerings have already increased with full enrollments in things like the Beatles, the Grateful Dead, and Bill's specialty, eco-jazz. So all in all we eliminate a feeble program and replace it with a robust one. Bill's participation in HUM is worth the price of admission. Almost all their courses (from 179 to the upper level ones) are WI or DI courses. So it doesn't fit the traditional profile of a liberal arts music program but it does have a number of advantages.

Thanks for paying attention.

Charles

Dr. Kormanik asked Dr. Mills how did APC vote, and Dr. Mills relayed that APC voted unanimously for it. APC had similar questions as Faculty Senate and feel it will be a great addition to the university.

[APC 17 was approved 16-1 becoming SD2112F.](#)

#### **IX. Administrative Reports - Dr. Jane Fernandes**

##### Update on status of Humanities Lecture Hall.

The Provost's Cabinet discussed the status of the Humanities Lecture Hall (HLH) a month ago. John Pierce explained several options for possible steps that could be taken. We have agreed that the university will invest about \$250,000.00 to clean out the mold in HLH and do some asbestos abatement. The goal of this work would be the Humanities Lecture Hall will be functional for 10 more years. That is as good an outcome for which we could have hoped. Hopefully, the Humanities Lecture Hall will be back online for the start of Fall semester. However, with renovation, you never know when the work will be completed, due to delays that inevitably occur.

##### Other spaces for Admissions and Financial Aid.

The gist here is that there was a whole series in a domino sequence of potential moves that

would have happened. That has been averted because we have been given approval to use a suite that is next to the Deans' suite that is currently vacant. There are plans by other parts of the university to use that space over the long term. We were successful in convincing them that right now it is more important for Academic Affairs to maintain some stability for which the Provost is very grateful.

There will be only one move at this time. The Asheville Graduate Center will relocate to the suite next to the Deans' office and everything else will stay the same. We will have to revisit this as further moves take place such as when Division of Advancement moves to the current MAHEC building. As space in Owen Hall becomes available, we will revisit options. For now, we will be on hold.

Dean Krumpe added two specific pieces and a more general statement. The specifics are the Asheville Graduate Center (AGC) is currently located in two fundamental locations. There are offices in Karpen Hall near where the WCU suite and the Asheville Graduate Center used to be (KH 111, 112, 113). They are moving out to make room for the Pharmacy School renovations. That will begin May 13, the Monday after graduation. Last year, AGC was also coupled with the Office of Sponsored Scholarships and Programs. They are now upstairs in Lipinsky. To allow AGC to do external testing, they require space where someone can work in an office and observing. There will likely be a shuffling of AGC people.

The general statement is, in light of the decision to go back to the drawing board on Admissions and Financial Aid, it does not make sense to have a whole domino series of moves which might be the right thing to do, but it didn't make sense to go ahead with those moves right now until we decide ultimately where Admissions and Financial Aid are going to go. Why make people move and then four months later make them move again. As the Provost said, AGC is the only thing moving to Phillips Hall and there may be a shuffling within AGC.

**Questions/Discussion:**

Dr. Kormanik asked if the AGC move frees the upstairs of Lipinsky where Gerad and Louis were for other kinds of activities. That is a nice space central to the campus.

Dr. Krumpe said the upstairs of Lipinsky will still remain AGC space. Louis and Gerad could potentially move out and someone coming from AGC in Karpen would move back into that space.

BOG 44-hour common curriculum.

Dr. Fernandes would like to reiterate what Ted Meigs discussed relating to the 44-hour common core curriculum. The Provost's understanding is that what is being discussed is a 44-hour common core curriculum that would apply to community colleges and UNC campuses so there would be one 44-hour common core curriculum for the whole State of North Carolina. This is rather disconcerting. She agrees with Chancellor Ponder that all of us have to keep our eyes on this because the Provost will personally bite and go down fighting against that.

If that is an actual move, this would be devastating to a campus like UNC Asheville for it would affect all our distinctive programs and our work on the Curricular Review Task Force. We would not have a Humanities Program and we would not have an ILS program – we would not have any of it. We would have one common 44-hour core. What concerns the Provost is the current talk system-wide about ease of transfer. This is a proposal that would make it easier for a Community College

student to take 44 hours and then transfer to any UNC system campus. This makes it easier to start anywhere and transfer somewhere else. UNC Asheville would lose its distinctiveness in such a system and philosophy of education.

This idea is in conflict with the idea that we are supposed to do better retaining and graduating students. If you are supposed to create ease of transfer, then you don't really care whether we are retaining students on this campus, for you are encouraging us to allow them to move wherever they want to go. You don't really care if they graduate from here or not as long as they graduate somewhere in North Carolina. You do that and you accomplish the goal.

The Provost does not understand nor does she have a clue regarding where all this talk is headed but this is a deep concern, and she asks that the Faculty Senate pay attention to these important conversations and take action, as needed.

[The Board of Governors' Strategic Plan.](#)

The Provost shared another disturbing discussion regarding the Board of Governors' strategic planning process. At a Chief Academic Officers' meeting, we had two discussions about two possible academic strategic project goals. One proposal was the idea of a warranty issued by the UNC provosts to all employers. Any employer who hires our graduates would receive a warranty from the Provost. If the student is not productive at the place of employment, the employer will turn in the warranty and the provost would take the student back and "fix them."

This was not a joke; this was a serious discussion. There were sixteen provosts attending the meeting. We spent more than an hour on the merits of the warranty idea. The Provost asserted that that a person is not the equivalent of a washing machine; one provides a warranty for a washing machine; one does not warranty a person. The provosts rejected warranty proposal but that doesn't mean that it won't survive in some form. The idea may live to see another day if the group responsible for the strategic planning process really want this.

They were told that it would be something very valuable for UNC campuses to say to the public of North Carolina and that the public would appreciate knowing that we guarantee our graduates. The Provost also stated that she already guarantees the graduates now but they want something more. This discussion calls into focus the disparity between what we as a UNC campus believe we are doing and what the people of North Carolina believe we are doing.

**Questions/Discussion:**

Dr. Kaplan lamented that we give graduates a degree and wondered why this is not considered something in writing. Dr. Kaplan asked if Faculty Senate has access to the 44-hour common curriculum and if they are allowed to submit input.

Dr. Burchard said there is a Faculty Advisory Committee specifically for this Strategic Planning initiative which is where the surveys come from that Dr. Burchard sends out to everyone. Dr. Burchard will resend the email address so the Faculty Senate may provide input at any time with regard to these measures.

Dr. Kaplan thanked Dr. Burchard and remarked, depending on what they decide, then all UNC campuses could be providing Humanities Programs.

Dr. Ray asked if the drivers of the new strategic planning process were the President and Board of Governors. Dr. Burchard said she could not fully answer that question. Her understanding is that it is coming strongly from the Board of Governors particularly from the business elements in the

Board of Governors.

The Provost agreed with Dr. Burchard and said that it seems to be increasingly more business people that are applying a business model which does not directly translate to a university. In addition, there have been high profile disasters recently in the business sector which does not imply that the business model is necessarily the one we should embrace.

Dr. Burchard said as an example President Ross was telling the Faculty Senate Chairs one of the things the Board of Governors wants is for all the campuses to develop some kind of entrepreneurial element to their curriculum in general. Some campuses have entrepreneurial programs and they would like to see this in all campuses.

Dr. Burchard asked what President Ross meant. Dr. Burchard explained her understanding of entrepreneurial is that it has to do with startup businesses but we are a Liberal Arts College. It is not our mission to talk about startup businesses though I am sure we do that in places where that is appropriate but it is not immediately clear what sense it makes for UNC Asheville to have an entrepreneurial program. His response was that Dr. Burchard was thinking too narrowly about the term “entrepreneurial.” There wasn’t anything else that came out of that dialogue.

Dr. Eggers has seen an article in a publication from Chapel Hill where they talked about their graduate students doing these entrepreneurial projects where the interpretation is extremely broad and really looks like working to solve real world problems with their research. If that is the interpretation, as an institution, we could say that we could do this. Dr. Burchard said we certainly could but she would want to resist that language for it concerns her what that might commit UNC Asheville to.

Dr. Kaplan suggested that maybe all our undergraduate research is really entrepreneurial. They are out there doing something new and different, complete research, put yourself forward, talk about it – isn’t that what you do when you start a business. Perhaps we would get more money if we call it entrepreneurial.

Dr. Ray asked about the sequence of events in regards to the strategic planning. Is there a timeline whereby the Board of Governors and the President establish a new set of strategic priorities and define them clearly? Dr. Burchard will have to go back to her notes to look at that. The senators can get this on the Board of Governors’ website. Dr. Burchard believes that they want a first draft of the strategic planning by the end of February, so they want to move on this very quickly.

Dr. Fernandes concurred with Dr. Burchard that it is either January or February. The Provost said she thinks they want to be done in February.

Dr. Ray asked if that is including the 44-credit hour common core.

Dr. Fernandes does not think the 44-credit hour common core is a strategic planning goal, but the work would be the result of a strategic planning goal.

Dr. Ray clarified that they could decide there would be a 44-credit hour common core in the plan and then later move forward in developing a plan. What it would look like and how soon it could happen?

Dr. Fernandes said they could but she suspects that many campuses, including UNC Asheville, will not cooperate with that. The UNC System would have a lot of feedback. The Provost does not imagine that we would go along with that. Dr. Burchard joined in that it couldn’t hurt to let them know ahead of time with feedback.

Dr. McKnight finds all of this very disturbing as he feels other senators do. He thinks back to the previous century where all of this jargon crept into the academy about mission and strategy and tactics. It crept in from we know where and now we adopted it and we use it unthinkingly. We talk about our strategic plans, objectives, and missions as though they were military operations. Now he sees this business model with its business jargon is creeping in to go along side it. Perhaps President Eisenhower was right. Dr. Burchard added that Dr. McKnight is suggesting that UNC system is becoming a military industrial complex. Dr. McKnight corrected, a military retail complex since we are issuing warranties for our products then it is a retail business.

#### Business Model.

Two weeks ago, Chancellor Ponder, Vice Chancellor John Pierce, Chief of Staff Christine Riley, Archer Gravely, IR director, Assistant Provost Pat McClellan and Dr. Fernandes were “sort of” summoned (nice phrasing by Provost) to a video conference where the topic was The Initiation of Active Academic Portfolio Management at the UNC campuses. To be honest, many of those above asked several times if we were using active academic portfolio management now, what would be doing and what does it look like. Basically, the answer we received is that it is what the Faculty Senate does every month. For example, we just at this meeting closed a BA degree program in Music and started a new degree – the BFA – in Jazz and Contemporary Music. We are already doing it: sunseting courses, sunseting programs, closing programs, starting new programs, heading in new directions. So all of us said that we already do that but there was an implication that there will be an initiative related to academic portfolio management which seems to be comparable to the finance strategy of of investment portfolio management. At the end of the meeting, none of us really understood what it was referring to. The Provost will keep the Faculty Senate posted.

#### GA Initiative to Double Chinese Language Offerings by 2019.

The General Administration has an initiative related to having a goal of doubling Chinese language instruction offered on UNC campuses by 2019. They are writing a large grant and right now the campuses are reviewing the grant to decide if we want to participate. This campus has not yet decided. The Provost thinks UNC Asheville will, but we have not confirmed.

The goal is for every campus to have at least one Chinese language instructor. Some campuses will have more than one. Some campuses will be designated to have Chinese majors. We are not designated as having a Chinese major nor are we designated to have anything new for we already have Chinese language and culture courses and a faculty member. This seems to be a huge initiative.

There is some conflict about it because of the directive or drive to close some languages on some campuses to propagate the idea of the online shared foreign language course initiative. The rationale as that we really do not need live people to teach; we can do it online or through video conferencing. So there is some conflict about this because now the GA is asking us to have live people on every campus, not just one teacher but several, to teach Chinese. The question is why does this not apply to other languages and the answer there are some 7,000 public school students now taking Chinese in North Carolina and the belief that UNC system needs to respond to their ongoing education once they get to a college or an university.

#### Workforce Development and Community Engagement.

Campuses will be asked to compile a detail data log regarding how we contribute concretely to workforce development in North Carolina and how campuses are engaged in the community.

Dr. Fernandes will send the Faculty Senate two links after the meeting so they can look at the reports for more information: [Community Engagement Metrics Taskforce](#)  
[Chinese Language Teaching Expansion Grant](#)

**X. Old Business**

**XI. New Business**

**XII. Adjourn**

Dr. Burchard adjourned the meeting at 5:26pm

Respectfully submitted by: Lisa Sellers  
Executive Committee