

University of North Carolina at Asheville  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
Minutes, February 20, 2014 (3:15 pm)

Senate

Members: M. Burchard, C. McKnight, G. Kormanik, B. Hook, K. Betsalel, L. Bond, R. Bowen, M. Cameron, D. Diefenbach, D. Eggers, M. Galloway, B. Hobby, S. Kaplan, R. Roig, M. Stratton, S. Walters, J. Wingert; J. Fernandes.

Excused: K. Ray.

Visitors: G. Ashburn, P. Catterfeld, L. Dunn, J. Konz, K. Krumpke, P. McClellan, H. Parlier, J. Perkins, D. Race, A. Shope.

**I. Call to Order:**

Dr. Burchard called the rescheduled Faculty Senate meeting to order. She said that the Executive Committee's report would be postponed until the March meeting in two weeks.

**II. Approval of Minutes:**

[January 23, 2014](#)

[January 30, 2014](#)

The minutes were approved with editorial changes without dissent.

**III. Academic Policies Committee Report:**

Dr. Charles McKnight

**First Reading**

- [APC 32](#) Change titles, credit hours and descriptions of GERM 110, 120;  
Change credit hours and description of SPAN 130
- [APC 33](#) Change titles, credit hours and descriptions of PORT 110 and 120
- [APC 34](#) Change titles, credit hours and descriptions of SPAN 110, 120;  
Change credit hours and description of SPAN 130
- [APC 35](#) Change the titles, credit hours and course descriptions of FREN 110 and 120;  
Change the credit hours and course descriptions of FREN 130, 300, 340, 341, 400, 435, 445, 460, 499 and French Special Topics;  
Delete FREN 210 and 220, replacing with FREN 230; Delete FREN 310 and 320, replacing with FREN 325
- [APC 36](#) Change the Major and Minor Requirements for French
- [APC 37](#) Delete PHIL 213 and PHIL 402
- [APC 38](#) Add new course to the Philosophy curriculum, PHIL 230
- [APC 39](#) Change Credit Hours and Course Descriptions of PHIL 100, 101 and 200
- [APC 40](#) Change credit hours and description of PHIL 214, cross-listing it with INTS 214;  
Change credit hours and description of PHIL 312
- [APC 41](#) Courses in the History of Western Philosophy;  
Change Credit hours and Course Descriptions for PHIL 250, 255, 260 and 352
- [APC 42](#) Courses in the History of Non-Western Philosophy;  
Change description and credit hours of PHIL 313, cross-listing it with Asian Studies;  
Add new courses, PHIL 315 and 317, cross-listing them with Religious Studies and Africana Studies
- [APC 43](#) Change credit hours and descriptions of PHIL 303, 304, 305, 307 and 310
- [APC 44](#) Change level, credit hours and description of PHIL 220;  
Change credit hours and description of PHIL 302;

- Change credit hours and description of PHIL 365, cross-listing it with WGSS
- [APC 45](#) Change in Credit Hours for PHIL 499 and PHIL Special Topics Courses
- [APC 46](#) Change the Major and Minor Requirements for Philosophy
- [APC 47](#) Change the descriptions and credit hours for ANTH 100, 225, 323, 325, 336, 339, 350, 353, 357, 361, 365, 380, 499
- [APC 48](#) Add new courses to the Anthropology curriculum: ANTH 280, 355, 360, 385, 390, 420
- [APC 49](#) Delete ANTH 338, SOC 260, 385 and 402
- [APC 50](#) Change the descriptions and credit hours for SOC 100, 200, 210, 220, 221, 225, 240, 280, 302, 312, 340, 357, 358, 359, 362, 364, 365, 380, 390, 410, 420, 480, 499
- [APC 51](#) Add new courses to the Sociology curriculum: SOC 387, 388
- [APC 52](#) Delete SOC 335 and 337, replacing with SOC 338;  
Change title, credit hours and description of SOC 393
- [APC 53](#) Renumber ANTH 400 and SOC 400 to ANTH 305 and SOC 305, respectively, and change descriptions and credit hours
- [APC 54](#) Delete ANTH 455 and 465, replacing with ANTH 464;  
Delete SOC 455 and 465, replacing with SOC 464
- [APC 55](#) Change the major requirements for Sociology and Sociology with Teacher Licensure;  
Change the declaration of major requirements for Sociology;  
Change the minor requirements for Sociology;  
Change the major requirements for Anthropology and Anthropology with Licensure;  
Change the declaration of major requirements for Anthropology;  
Change the minor requirements for Anthropology
- [APC 56](#) Change course number of POLS 247 to POLS 338
- [APC 57](#) Delete POLS 366, 369 384, 401 and 450
- [APC 58](#) Add new courses: POLS 240, 261, 311, 316, 391, 393 and 394
- [APC 59](#) Change Requirements for the Major in Political Science and Political Science with Teacher Licensure; Change Requirements for the Minor in Political Science

For first reading, Dr. McKnight presented the twenty-seven (27) documents listed above. All documents were passed unanimously by APC. There were neither questions, nor discussion.

**IV. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee:** Dr. Brian Hook

Dr. Hook asked Dr. Roig to update the senate on the faculty elections.

Faculty Election timelines.

Dr. Roig said the Committee of Tenured Faculty results are in and the following faculty were elected:

Sophie Mills (Humanities)  
Chuck Bennett (Natural Science)  
Patrick Foo (Social Science)

Next week will be the Faculty Senate and Post-Tenure Review elections. The only worry is they need a Natural Science nomination for the Post-Tenure Review election. Without nominees, there is more of a possibility of run-offs. There are a fairly substantial number of nominees for senate. As he has noted, the nomination process is just to get the ***bold italic*** on the ballots. However, as Dr. Roig also noted in email, that shouldn't stop a faculty member from announcing their candidacy. Their name just won't be italicized. The rest of the elections will commence after Spring Break. Dr. Roig said that the election process is going relatively smoothly.

Dr. Roig was asked what percentage of faculty voted in the Committee of Tenured Faculty election. Dr. Roig said 126 faculty members participated, which is around half of the eligible voters.

**VI. Institutional Development Committee:**

Dr. Gregg Kormanik

[UPC Minutes: February 17, 2014](#)

UPC, with IDC, met a couple of days ago. At that meeting, there was a report of the Chancellor Search Committee. Dr. Kormanik believes all are informed so far by an email from the co-chairs of the search committee. There will be a website with various updates so the UNC Asheville community can follow the progress.

Sonia Marcus made a presentation on sustainability and Rob Nelson also gave a [report on the campus master plan and the progress made](#).

**VIII. Old Business.**

**IX. New Business.**

[Letter to President Ross from the emeritus and retired faculty of UNC Asheville](#)

Dr. Kormanik presented the new business regarding the letter to President Ross from the emeritus and retired faculty of UNC Asheville. Basically, it is a request to the search committee and to President Ross that we have an open search for the new chancellor. They outlined their reasons and rationale in their letter. Doug Orr and King Prather, co-chairs of the chancellor search committee, have subsequently sent two emails regarding how the search committee is going to proceed. Dr. Kormanik read the following from the February 18<sup>th</sup> email:

“The committee also made the decision that this search will be a non-public search; only the search committee and its consultants will be aware of the identity of the candidates. Our collective consensus was that this approach would yield more and better candidates willing to apply to be our next chancellor. When finalists visit, the committee will search for opportunities for appropriate additional introductions on campus, and will require the execution of confidentiality agreements from all participants.”

After this letter was sent, the decision was made to have a closed search. Although a request for an open search may now be moot, Dr. Kormanik thought perhaps there will be other opportunities for engagement and involvement and drafted [Faculty Senate Resolution \(FS 3\)](#).

Dr. Kormanik wanted to know if the senate would be interested in supporting the notion of an open search or as open a search possible given the constraints. He also mentioned that Scott Walters elegantly wrote about his reasons that an open search would be a good idea.

Dr. Kormanik made a motion that Faculty Senate accepts this resolution (FS 3). The motion was seconded.

**Discussion:**

Dr. Burchard agreed with Dr. Kormanik that the Faculty Senate should encourage all opportunities for open engagement.

Since the February 14<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Chancellor Search Committee was a public meeting whose minutes will be on the website, Professor Bowen said he felt he could talk as the senate representative about that meeting.

Dr. Burchard said a short update would be fine.

At that Chancellor Search Committee meeting, Professor Bowen said all faculty representatives argued in favor of an open search. The administration, SGA's representative and all three of the consulting companies were in favor of a closed search/confidentiality for they said it brings out the best candidates and cited several examples. One of the best examples was about the prospective candidates' livelihoods. If word

gets out that they are looking at another institution, their relationship changes with their current institution. That is asking a lot of any candidate who is just being considered and not offered a job.

The search committee seemed to be open to a hybrid search though they have not discussed this yet. It is a possibility and changes could be made since they have not advertised the position yet. Recently, at Western Carolina University, sixty (60) people got to meet the candidate upon signing a confidentiality agreement.

President Ross met with the search committee and he seemed to be in favor of a closed search. He met with some of the retired faculty who wrote the letter; however, none of them have gotten back with Professor Bowen regarding their meeting with Tom Ross.

There are three companies they are choosing from as consultants. The university had used two of the companies before, one for Dr. Fernandes' search and one for Chancellor Ponder's search. The company they chose was the firm of Witt/Kieffer. Professor Bowen was impressed with this firm since they said it was important that faculty feel they have a say in this search. They also believed in shared governance and transparency.

There will be meetings with staff, community and faculty next week to hear what UNC Asheville is looking for in a chancellor. We have not made our leadership statement yet, and this is our first opportunity to offer input.

The makeup of the committee is outstanding in Professor Bowen's opinion. The concern is the timeline. Assuming one candidate can be selected by fall, it would be asking a lot to abandon where they are and within a month move to be ready this fall. We may have to have an interim chancellor for a short period of time.

Dr. Betsalel asked at what point does the search open up. Will some of the faculty get to meet the top three candidates?

Professor Bowen said the top three candidates will be invited to campus. Before then, there will be "neutral site" interviews. He believes that is the point some faculty will be able to meet the candidates.

Professor Bowen was not aware until recently that we do not select the new Chancellor. President of the UNC system, Tom Ross makes the selection. The rules say we are to put up two candidates, but President Ross said he wants three, unranked candidates. We said we are going to rank them whether he pays attention to it or not.

Dr. Betsalel asked when did closed chancellor searches begin. Is this how we have chosen all of our chancellors?

Dr. Walters said the last chancellor search was the first closed search.

Dr. Betsalel asked what evidence is there that the closed search produces better candidates, and he does not understand how contacting people jeopardizes their position for people are contacted all the time.

Dr. Hook and Dr. Stratton explained how that protects the candidates' current position.

Dr. Walters believes that is a myth and that 80% of the world has to deal with this every time they apply for another job. Why is it we coddle the top when it is not a tradition on this campus nor the corporate environment?

Dr. Roig pointed out that the open process did not hurt Alabama's Coach Nick Saban at all. It helped him where he was a good candidate, and Alabama didn't want to lose him. In fact, they were aware he was looking and made efforts to keep him. If we are trying to get a pool of good candidates that are exactly like Saban, Dr. Roig doesn't understand why it has to be a closed search.

Dr. Betsalel agreed and said an argument could be made that we are attracting candidates who believe in concealing information as part of their character by using a closed search approach.

Dr. Hook thinks a closed search is just being sensitive to the candidates' current positions, their families and present communities. Dr. Hook would like to meet the finalists, but he does not know what this resolution is asking.

Dr. Walters does not believe currently the faculty and the UNC Asheville community will get to meet the candidates. He understands that the finalists are going to be brought to campus in a secret way. From his understanding from serving on the last chancellor search, their preference is to not bring the candidates to our campus. They wanted to be in a neutral place with only the committee and a few extra people. This is problematic because the chancellor's job is to interact with the people on this campus. It is not to interact in a corporate setting with corporate community people.

Dr. Hook understood that three of the candidates will be brought to the campus.

Dr. Cameron pointed out that it isn't open to the campus, according to the email:

"When the finalists visit, the committee will search for opportunities for appropriate additional introductions on campus, and will require the execution of confidentiality agreements from all participants."

Dr. Hook said they are bringing the candidates to the campus while recognizing the sensitivity of the situation.

Dr. Cameron said it is selecting a subset and somebody gets to select that subset of appropriate people. She believes the concern many faculty may have with the current arrangement is the "chosen ones" may be selected to benefit a certain candidate, who may be the favorite.

Dr. Stratton asked what specific practical requests we wish to make.

Dr. Betsalel would like general talks to the faculty, the campus and the public. This is a fundamental question of political legitimacy in knowing who the constituencies are on campus. He believes the last chancellor experienced issues due to this process. By missing out on establishing all the campus constituencies during the chancellor search process, there were lots of catching up to do once hired. To his knowledge, closed searches are a relatively recent phenomenon. He doesn't believe these closed searches serve the chancellor-elect well to be brought into the campus community this way.

Dr. Burchard asked that the discussion moves to address a proposed change to the resolution.

Dr. Hook supports resolution due to its general wording.

Dr. Burchard believes these are important issues, but she wants to respect the time the people need for committee work today. Dr. Burchard is not sure the senate has any power over how open the search will be.

Dr. Kormanik understands everyone's concern. There are degrees of openness. In the past, we had the final three candidates come to campus and everyone knew who they were. Then we went away from that. If we can express our desire for the search to be as open as it can be, perhaps the search will become more open. Instead of meeting with only 2 people secretly with confidentiality agreements signed, maybe they will meet with fifty (50) on campus with confidentiality agreements. Perhaps, the final three candidates would say they are happy to be considered by UNC Asheville and speak openly to everyone. If they all three agreed, though not likely, is a possibility.

Dr. Eggers made a suggestion to be more specific like to strongly encourage the use of confidentiality agreements to allow as many faculty as possible meet with the candidates. This resolution is too general.

Dr. Betsalel thinks it is a real mistake to have certain people sign away their right to talk. He does not believe this is the way to go. This is a public institution that has a different relationship to our work. It is not a corporation.

Dr. Galloway believes the confidentiality has to do with the rights of the candidates. She wonders if they could relinquish their rights when we get down to 3-6 candidates like they do in their faculty searches. She asked Professor Bowen if they have decided how many they will consider in the final cut. Professor Bowen did not know.

Dr. Betsalel would like the last three to be open. He believes the last three candidates should be proud enough to say, "I am interviewing at UNC Asheville." Even when you don't get the position, it is a

proud accomplishment to be among the final three for consideration. Dr. Betsalel wants people who are proud to come here.

Dr. Eggers asked whether it would be okay to sign a confidentiality agreement.

When down to the last three, Dr. Betsalel says forget the confidentiality agreements and the search becomes open. At what position, do we have this secrecy at a liberal arts college which is about openness and communication?

Dr. Hobby wanted to thank Dr. Kormanik for writing the resolution. The sentiment of compromise is a great one where you are attempting to reach a middle ground. He also thanked Dr. Betsalel for expressing his desire for the search to be open. Dr. Hobby's concern about the resolution is that the paragraphs, as nicely worded and well-intended as they are, do not have substantive content that will mean anything concrete to the people running the search who have said it is closed. The last paragraph simply authorizes them to do whatever they want to do. If we want something specific, as Dr. Eggers has suggested, we need to provide what we want.

Dr. Kormanik feels "Free and open communication is fundamental to and a characteristic of the Liberal Arts University" has substance and sees the resolution as a statement of belief and principle as opposed to specific requests. The intent is to say we realize there are reasons for having the proceedings closed, but be as open as you can.

Dr. Eggers said if we want the final visit of the three candidates brought to campus to be open, we should put it in the resolution.

Dr. Kaplan thought to add one sentence at the end of the resolution, "Moreover, as a faculty, we request the finalist candidates have their visit be an open visit." This doesn't mean they have to or they are under obligation. However, they would know the faculty thinks that would be a good idea.

Dr. Hobby asked, in regards to the agreed length of this meeting to be within 30 minutes, if there was an urgency that this resolution is passed today.

Professor Bowen said it was necessary to pass it today for next week the search committee will have meetings with faculty and staff to work on the leadership statement. Then the search goes public around the first week of March.

Dr. Hook asked to be excused since he had guests to attend for his FWDC meeting, which he told them would be at 4:00 p.m.

Dr. Eggers made a friendly amendment to the resolution to add an additional sentence at the end of the resolution, "We request the Chancellor Search Committee make the final candidates' visit to campus open to the university community."

Dr. Kormanik accepted the friendly amendment.

No one opposed the friendly amendment.

The question was called.

The Sense of Senate Resolution FS3 passed as amended, without dissent and became [SSR0614S](#).

## **X. Adjourn**

Dr. Burchard adjourned the meeting at 3:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by: Lisa Sellers  
Executive Committee