

University of North Carolina at Asheville  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
Minutes, March 6, 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, K. Ray, M. Stratton, J. Wingert; J. Fernandes.

Excused: R. Roig, S. Walters.

Visitors: G. Ashburn, P. Catterfeld, L. Cornett, T. Dohse, E. Katz, J. Konz, K. Krumpe, K. Maitra, P. McClellan, H. Parlier, K. Peterson, C. Pons, D. Race, A. Shope, W. Strehl.

**I. Call to Order:**

Dr. Burchard called the Faculty Senate meeting to order.

**II. Approval of Minutes:**

[February 20, 2014](#)

A motion was made and seconded to accept the minutes for February 20<sup>th</sup>.

No Discussion. Question called.

The minutes were approved without dissent.

**III. Executive Committee Report:**

Faculty Assembly Meeting. Although the Weather prevented Dr. Dohse from attending the last Faculty Assembly meeting, he was able to attend the Faculty Assembly Executive Committee via Skype. As a result, Dr. Dohse had only one important item to bring before the Faculty Senate.

The Board of Governors encouraged the General Administration to rewrite or edit the Post-Tenure Process. There was only one faculty member on the committee that revised this policy with three major changes:

- When you go up for a post-tenure review, they want a five year plan that will be used in future reviews to evaluate performance.
- Return to three tier evaluation: Does not meet expectation, Meets expectation and Above meeting expectations. Our current pass/fail system was implemented to avoid the conflicts of cutting hairs over who pass. It is hard enough to decide pass/fail. To go further to decide which half of those passing are better than the other half is more trouble than benefit.
- Post-Tenure Review Committee members who do the reviews must undergo training conducted by each campus using the training module prepared by the General Administration.

The lone faculty member was able to convince the other Committee members that the proposed mandatory 5% quota of faculty designated as fail each time was unwise. That proposal was not approved as a change. Dr. Dohse imagines Faculty Assembly will provide a response once they meet again. An email or video conference response is very hard to gather quickly.

Thank you to senate members for enduring the extra meetings to conduct the required business of the past month. Dr. Burchard thanked everyone saying she appreciated everyone's willingness to be present and conduct the business that was required.

Senate Orientation and Reception. The Executive Committee is putting together an orientation for new senators. In preparing its agenda, Dr. Burchard would like senators to share what they would have

found helpful as a beginning senator. Depending on the timing of the orientation, EC is hoping this semester's social event to occur immediately after the orientation.

The Executive Committee is also talking about doing another record writing party at the end of the semester. They are going to send out an announcement to the faculty at large to discern the interest in holding this again.

Faculty Senate Leadership for 2014-2015. Dr. Burchard reminded everyone to be thinking about the leaders for next years' committees as well as the chair of the faculty senate. Newly elected senators who have appropriate previous experience on the Faculty Senate can be considered for one of the chair positions.

New Background Check Policy. As there were questions about the new background check policy over the past couple of weeks, Heather Parlier, Associate General Counsel, was present to give context for the policy changes.

Associate General Counsel Parlier said that many schools and businesses are making changes such as these in response to the situation at Penn State so UNC Asheville is not the only campus doing this. The EEOC also issued recent guidance about criminal background checks in employment for they are seeing more cases where entities are being found negligent when an issue reveals they hired someone without doing a criminal background check. She opened the floor up for questions.

**Questions:**

Dr. Galloway asked if Human Resources regularly do background checks or does the department need to make a request.

The Associate General Counsel said Human Resources regularly do background checks and the department does not have to make the request to have them done. This is part of the hiring process.

When reading through the policy, Mr. Bowen noticed an employee could be subject to another background check and/or credit report check if their position changes. Mr. Bowen asked if the employee is notified of the results and whether there is a process for the employee to dispute the results.

The Associate General Counsel said the credit report is covered by the Fair Credit Act and there is a very specific process for this.

Dr. Diefenbach wondered if the policy needs some editing especially the part regarding termination for a felony which seems to bypass due process. It says any conviction and he wondered does that mean misdemeanors like skateboard on the sidewalk. Dr. Betsalel also brought up Moral Monday issues.

The Associate General Counsel Parlier said currently cases are taken on an ad hoc basis and this policy is needed to create our process and put this committee in place.

Dr. Diefenbach said that a license can be revoked for unpaid fines and medical reasons and so care is needed when bringing an employee in front of a committee.

Associate General Counsel Parlier said that under C2 of the policy, the revoked license pertains to employees who have driving responsibilities as part of their position.

Dr. Betsalel asked for the status of this policy and the timeline for receiving feedback.

The Associate General Counsel said they are receiving feedback now. She thanked everyone who has sent emails so far. The next policy review committee meeting is over spring break where it can be adopted and instituted.

Dr. Betsalel asked for more time to consider this policy and offer feedback.

Neither motion nor second came.

Dr. Hook said that we have 5 more days to offer feedback and already have had 10 days. His understanding of this policy is to formally put a policy and a committee in place to be more responsible to employees.

Dr. Eggers agreed for the policy said that felonies had to be in regards to the position and responsibilities. Dr. Eggers asked the associate general counsel if a person could be fired for a felony that wasn't related to their job responsibilities.

Associate Counsel Parlier said there isn't a blanket prohibition against all felonies. Each has to be considered on a situation by situation basis. If a person has a felony regarding a violent crime, we may have to terminate because we have students, faculty and staff to protect.

Dr. Betsalel asked if a person could be prevented from being hired under this new policy for trespassing by participating in a Moral Monday demonstration.

Associate Counsel said it depended on the position.

Dr. Hook said the committee would decide as opposed to the current practice of the counsel making the decision on a person by person basis which counsel is uncomfortable doing.

Mr. Bowen said the old policy was really ambiguous and very poorly worded. Although Mr. Bowen has concerns, this policy seems to be trying to answer questions and be more explicit about the process. This has come about because people with prior convictions were being denied access or positions at universities.

This policy elevates the decision beyond department heads to avoid bias that may exist which is what you want.

Dr. Burchard thanked Associate General Counsel Heather Parlier for coming and answering the senate's questions.

The Associate Counsel reiterated that they really appreciate the feedback that has been provided so far regarding this policy.

Student Success Project and CREDO. Dr. Burchard said there seems to be lots of questions regarding the Student Success Project and CREDO. She suggests it goes on the agenda for the next meeting to give senators time to consider and converse before discussing. There were no objections to this and the senate moved on to the next agenda item.

Faculty Senate Moodle Forum to discuss issues. Dr. Burchard asked Ms. Lisa Sellers to give a brief overview of the Faculty Senate Forum she has been working on with Laurie Miles.

Beginning tomorrow, a new "course" called "Faculty Senate" will appear on the senators' Moodle Homepage. This is not a course but the Faculty Senate's new space to engage each other regarding upcoming senate business. The purpose of the forum is to give senate leadership as well as all senators a heads up on issues senate members see in the upcoming legislation so they can consider, research and discuss before the meeting. Moodle was chosen to keep this work separate from the senators' email accounts. It is the Executive Committee's hope this forum will make senate meetings more organized, informed, efficient and effective.

As an example for tomorrow morning, Ms. Sellers will upload the documents for the Student Success Project and create a forum/chat room regarding CREDO, collect feedback for Senate Orientation, and fix up a space for FWDC 11 discussion so Dr. Hook will know the issues prior to April's meeting. This forum will allow all senators to be on the same "page" regarding senate business prior to the senate meeting.

Ms. Sellers worked with Laurie Miles on this project and discovered prior to John Myers' announcement that UNC Asheville currently is on version 1.9 of Moodle and will upgrade to version 2.5 by the end of the semester. As a result, Ms. Sellers decided to take a more conservative implementation while exploring the huge Moodle world, learning the new 2.5 interface and implementing new applications that will become available. All senators and the senate's Administrative Assistant have Teacher's rights to the space so either the senator can add to the space or the assistant can put the items up for the senate.

Dr. Burchard said she doesn't know how many of the senators are familiar or comfortable with using Moodle, but Ms. Sellers would be happy to help anyone get more familiar with the new site. We hope to make this a really useful tool for the senate to begin to try to change the senate culture with regard to discussions. Dr. Burchard thanked Lisa for doing this work.

## IV. Academic Policies Committee Report:

Dr. Charles McKnight

### First Reading

- [APC 60](#) Add Music Business as a concentration in Management
- [APC 61](#) Require PHYS 121 as a corequisite to PHYS 101; Require PHYS 122 as a corequisite to PHYS 102
- [APC 62](#) Add new LANG courses: LANG 350, Academic Publishing, LANG 354, Professional Writing
- [APC 63](#) Change the title and description of LANG 120; Change the description of LANG 260; Change the descriptions and credit hours of LANG 361, 363, 365, 366, 368, 461, 463, 466; Delete LANG 497 and 498, replacing with LANG 494
- [APC 64](#) Delete LANG 367; Delete LIT 321, 322 and 323
- [APC 65](#) Change the descriptions and credit hours of LIT 246, 328, 329, 340, 346, 349, 357, 359, 363, 364, 365, 367, 368, 369, 440, 443, 445, 446; Delete LIT 483, 485, 487 and 489, replacing with LIT 488; Delete LIT 491 and 492, replacing with LIT 494
- [APC 66](#) Add narrative for the major in Literature
- [APC 67](#) Change the requirements for the Concentration in Literature, Concentration in Creative Writing, English with Teacher Licensure and Creative Writing with Teacher Licensure; Change the requirements for the Minor in Literature and the Minor in Creative Writing
- [APC 68](#) Add new capstone course for Classics majors: CLAS 493
- [APC 69](#) Change requirements for Classics Major
- [APC 70](#) Change to description of MATH 167
- [APC 71](#) Change descriptions for CLAS 101, 102, 103 and 104
- [APC 72](#) Add new courses: DRAM 201, 202, 203 and 204, replacing DRAM 105 with these courses in the Drama major and minor [Attachment A](#) [Attachment B](#)
- [APC 73](#) Limit DRAM 105 to non-majors and non-minors; Delete DRAM 106

### Second 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

Dr. McKnight presented fourteen (14) documents for first reading, Documents APC 60 through APC 73, which all were approved unanimously by APC. There were neither questions, nor discussion.

For second reading, Dr. McKnight presented APC 32 through APC 59. Dr. McKnight asked for a motion to approve these documents. The motion was made and seconded.

**Discussion:**

Dr. McKnight opened the floor for discussion.

Dr. Hook said his questions do not relate to a particular document. He is wondering what impact these migrations have on the university as a whole, and what plans does the university have in regards to the transitions to 4-credit hour programs. The departments who have made or are making the transitions have considered the impact for themselves. However, he wonders about the impact to programs like the Humanities and the 178 courses. He doesn't know what plans we have as a whole to evaluate these moves (he noted he does not know to whom he is addressing these questions).

Dr. McKnight said that APC has been discussing that very question and they have not come to any conclusions and do not have documents. Who is evaluating this so far? Apparently no one.

Dr. Hook asked if there is a plan to evaluate and who would do the work?

Dr. Stratton, who is a member of APC, said that each time APC has received a 4-credit hour proposal, new issues have come up that is not necessarily specific or germane to that program's proposal. Members of APC are looking to the deans, the provost and other faculty for counsel and discussion on these points of the impact a 4-credit hour model, when it is incrementally implemented versus a universal approach. At the moment, APC has more questions than answers. Dr. Stratton believes it requires this body have a discussion

since it was dropped from the CRTF proposal. Yet, we see departments move more quickly in that direction. There isn't a systematic approach or evaluation of the impact.

As Director of Humanities, Dr. Hook is concerned about issues of staffing this program down the road as these moves are made. That is why he is wondering who is evaluating and if there are plans for the university-wide programs as the 4-credit hour model is incrementally implemented.

Dr. Burchard asked if APC could make a list of the questions they are considering that are likely to have the most impact. Then the Faculty Senate would know what questions need to be answered and give the Faculty Senate a place to start.

No further discussion.

APC 32 through APC 59 was approved without dissent.

## **V. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee:**

Dr. Brian Hook

Dr. Hook sent email to the Faculty Senate late last night regarding some editorial changes to the Faculty Handbook. The preface of the handbook distinguishes three different kinds of changes: a change in academic policy requiring a document for Senate approval, a change in administrative procedure or non-academic policy, or simple editorial revisions that do not require notice of the senate. Although he feels like these are editorial changes, he felt the Faculty Senate should see them.

In our current handbook, the language regarding administrative search committees in [Section 10.6.3](#) reads:

“Faculty serve on the search committees for the position of Chancellor and the various Vice Chancellor positions. Faculty typically are appointed to these committees by the Provost and VCAA or the Chancellor in consultation with the Faculty Senate.”

This Section correctly outlines Vice Chancellor positions; however for the position of Chancellor, this policy is contrary to The Code and is not our practice. The Code says (Chapter 100.1, Appendix 1, Section I, Paragraph D):

“In the event of a vacancy in the chancellorship, the board of trustees shall establish a search committee composed of representatives of the board of trustees, the faculty, the student body and the alumni.”

That is in fact what we did so it is an editorial change. However, since it concerns this particular chancellor search committee about which we have been talking, Dr. Hook brought this to senate not for a vote, but to keep everyone informed of the change in wording to bring us in compliance with *The Code*:

“Faculty serve on the search committees for various Vice Chancellor positions. Faculty typically are appointed to these committees by the Provost and VCAA or the Chancellor in consultation with the Faculty Senate.

Faculty also serve on the search committee for the position of Chancellor. Faculty are appointed to this committee by the Board of Trustees in consultation with the Faculty Senate.”

Dr. Burchard thanked Dr. Hook for bringing this before the Faculty Senate to make them aware of the change and to clarify why the change was needed.

## First Reading

### FWDC 11

Articulation of Transitional Oversight for the Liberal Arts Curriculum and Establishment of the Transitional Faculty Liberal Arts Core Committee (LACC)

Dr. Hook introduced FWDC 11 for first reading. FWDC 11 implements oversight for LAC. The implementation of LACC is different from the implementation of ILSOC. ILSOC was created before ILS was passed. As a result, FWDC had to interpret APC's work and decide on its implementation.

Partly due to the nature of APC 1 to reduce oversight, FWDC could not easily determine what an oversight committee would do. FWDC could not write the responsibilities for an oversight committee when they were not entirely sure what the oversight should be.

In agreement with other contributors to the discussion (members of ILSOC, the deans, and Lisa Friedenbergl regarding assessment), FWDC decided to name next year's committee as a transitional committee. Over the next year, this committee's responsibility would be to determine exactly what the oversight for LAC would be.

Although it appears FWDC is handing the job off to next year's oversight committee and they are, FWDC is doing this because they thought it was the best thing to do.

Due to the importance of this document, Dr. Hook sincerely asks each senator to read closely and thoroughly consider FWDC 11 before coming to April's Faculty Senate meeting. He also asks that if a senator has concerns or questions to please notify Dr. Hook well in advance of the next senate meeting because he is not sure this document can be corrected on the fly. So Dr. Hook is asking the senators to read the document next week and give him feedback the week following. By doing that, Dr. Hook and FWDC can come prepared to the senate meeting for the discussion.

Dr. Burchard urged the senators to post the Moodle website so all the senators can see the concerns and what questions are being raised. Perhaps, we can do some of our discussion in advance. This is a good opportunity to try out the new forma

Faculty Elections. Dr. Reed Roig is chairing a search committee and could not attend Faculty Senate meeting today. Dr. Roig asked Dr. Hook to read a statement from him to the senate. Dr. Hook does not agree with Dr. Roig's need for his statement, but Dr. Hook is complying with Dr. Roig's request to read this statement:

"I wish to apologize to the Faculty Senate for the problems this year with the Faculty Senate and Post-Tenure Review Committee elections. I take full responsibility for the election problems we have had. I was aware there had been a change in IT personnel assigned to assist Faculty Senate (i.e. me) with elections, and I did not take the time to ask the necessary questions to ensure the voting website was properly set up. Although Gmail delivery issues that followed were beyond my control, they would not have affected elections if we had not had the initial problems with voting we did on Monday.

I made the decision to void the results of these elections and run them again this week based on the emails I received Saturday, March 1<sup>st</sup>, and on the number of voters who participated in the elections which was detailed in my email to the faculty on Sunday, March 7. It appeared to me that we had not allowed all faculty the opportunity to actively participate in the election. These elections seem to be proceeding smoothly this week.

The choice to rerun these elections should not affect the remaining elections unless we require runoff election for the Post-Tenure Review Committee. Because of the order of the elections as specified in the Faculty Handbook (that is Tenure, PTR, Hearings, and Grievance); a runoff election for PTR will require me to move the election for Hearings and Grievance to accommodate them."

Dr. Hook told Dr. Roig he would be happy to read his statement if Dr. Hook was allowed to say afterwards:

"Reed [Dr. Roig] does astonishingly good work with this, and I think, although he could have proactively gone and asked the new person if they knew everything; however, until the program ran and fail, I don't know if the new person could have possibly known that it was not setup properly."

“For the minutes, I want to say, and I assume we all feel the same way, a great thanks to Reed for running the elections.”

Dr. Hook highlighted that Dr. Roig’s email today said that 53% of the faculty have voted in the senate elections, which is higher than it had been last week. Thus, the decision to cancel and rerun the elections this week has been the right decision.

Dr. Burchard agreed that she believes it is clear that was a good decision.

**VI. Institutional Development Committee:**

Dr. Gregg Kormanik

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

[IDC Report: March 6, 2014](#)

**VII. Administration/Academic Affairs:**

Dr. Jane Fernandes

[Position Allocation Committee Report](#). The Position Allocation Committee has met. The last time the provost made a report to the senate was last March. They have met six (6) times so far this year to review all the requests from departments and programs for non-tenure track, time lecturers on a time limited appointment, tenure-track assistant professors, and visiting assistant professors. PAC reviewed comparative data reporting current faculty FTE as well as student credit and contact hours for the department as a whole and for each faculty individually. This data was not the deciding factor in PAC recommendations but was considered as part of the whole body of information on each request.

The provost emphasized that in the last biennium we lost 9.5 faculty lines due to mandated budget cuts. We cannot recover these. The money and the lines associated with them are gone. Last year, we lost an additional 4.27 faculty lines due to a lack of enrollment growth. The total loss to us is 13.77 FTE which is quite dramatic for us. We are challenged by a growing number of faculty eligible to retire. Regardless of whether they choose full and phased retirement, we have been challenged to achieve the faculty generational shift in a seamless way. We are struggling to manage it well due to both the loss of faculty lines and ongoing budget issues. She stressed that we are managing as positively as possible. New faculty hires have kept pace with retiring faculty though there is less than one position is left unfilled (.8858 Faculty FTE). We are very excited about the wonderful new faculty colleagues we have brought to our campus who have almost immediately begun to impact us in so many positive ways. The most obvious way to increase enrollment is two-prong: admit more new students and retain more current ones. The provost hopes the CREDO Student Success Project will help improve enrollment by working on retention to allow us to generate Faculty FTE.

**Discussion:**

Dr. Kormanik has one concern about the student credit hour data and student credit hour per faculty member data that was passed out in their chairs’ meeting in October. A number of faculty in the sciences had questions about those data. He knows the provost said this data was not the major determinant by PAC in terms of allocations of positions. However, he is still concerned for just today he got a revised set of those data and there were significant changes. He hopes that the best data possible is available to PAC when they make determinations regarding who gets positions and who gets replacements.

Dr. Fernandes said she did receive that document and will look at it more closely. However, she doesn’t think the revision will change the decisions made.

Dr. Kormanik said, as an example, the Biology student credit hours went up by 82% and 2 credit hour per faculty member went up 86%. Those are significant differences.

Dr. Fernandes said it is likely that the Biology decision would not have changed, but she appreciates that we will work to refine the data and PAC will convene to review it soon.

Dr. Betsalel said he needs to ask this question on behalf of his constituency in the social sciences. Are tenure track positions within departments and is International Studies a department or are those hires located in other specific departments?



Dr. Fernandes said they are hired to Interdisciplinary Studies and asked Dr. Katz to speak to this.

Dr. Katz confirmed they are anchored In Interdisciplinary and International Studies, but faculty are really tenured to the university and not to a specific department.

Dr. Betsalel said he thought the hiring process is through the departments not through programs.

Dr. Katz confirmed that the tenure track is through the university, but the positions are housed in Interdisciplinary and International Studies which are programs.

Dr. Galloway asked the provost to pass on any information that would be extremely helpful in increasing Faculty FTEs.

Dr. Cameron asked for a clarification on the PAC report. If a department is in both the authorized and denied columns, does that mean they had submitted two requests? For example under fall 2015, Computer Science is listed as authorized and denied.

Dr. Fernandes confirmed that two positions were requested. Dr. Fernandes welcomes input regarding searches authorized for new hires to begin in Fall 2015. Please review the searches and get back to her if you have any comments to share.

Dean Krumpe and Provost Fernandes' visit to NC State. Chancellor James Woodward, who led the process of Chancellor Ponder's recent 4-year evaluation, suggested that many community members in Western North Carolina are confused about what mechatronics means and its tremendous value to workforce development. Mechatronics has a tremendous track record of graduates who are hired months before they graduate and into well-paying jobs. Chancellor Woodward suggested exploring other options for specializations within engineering that would be more understandable to the public. One suggestion he made was to look into bioinformatics. We are grateful for Chancellor Woodward's assistance and recommendation that we visit NC State University.

For Provost Fernandes, it was a mind boggling visit with the Dean of Engineering. They explored new options for Bachelor tracks in engineering including bioinformatics as one of several possibilities. They also discussed graduate programming. Nothing concrete was decided and she will let us know if there are more concrete details to report. Overall, there are many possible ways we could work with NC State in the future.

Dr. Burchard said that presumably anything suggested would have to go through IDC first and the usual proper channels.

Dr. Fernandes said absolutely.

CREDO and Student Success Project. Dr. Fernandes apologized for anything she did that caused faculty to be anxious or distressed in relation to the Student Success project. CREDO has worked with Admissions previously and UNC Asheville has had success in working with them already. Discussions naturally evolved to the point that they could help us with retention. Whether we like it or not, we know our budget will increasingly be contingent on how well we do with retention and graduation. CREDO has said that many of the schools who work with them experienced a 4.0% increase in retention. Four percent would be significant for our university. In reference to the conversation about faculty lines and other needs, increasing retention is one way to generate more faculty and resources. Four faculty lines mean \$320,000.00 salary and benefits plus program money. It would be a blessing if the Student Success project could lead to this positive outcome.

She asked that faculty to participate in the survey, and attend the April 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> meetings if asked to do so. If any faculty or staff wants to volunteer to participate, please let her know.

Associate Provost McClellan is going to send some requests to faculty and staff for data and information about classes and curriculum programs. Please help her with this work.

The survey process and CREDO's work will be over by the time of the next Faculty Senate meeting. Now is the time to express concerns in order to have a change in the project.

**Discussion:**

Dr. Eggers said when she read this, her thought was, "Isn't this what Administrative Departments do to improve retention and figure out how to do these processes better?" Her question is, "What does this have to do with the faculty?"

Dr. Fernandes said most of the work is in OneStop. We won't know the impact on faculty until CREDO gathers data and does the research. From the data, CREDO will have recommendations to make to us on May 15th. Faculty are invited to the May 15<sup>th</sup> meeting when the recommendations will be shared.

Dr. Cameron said that she sent out the copy of the PowerPoint presentation from last fall because a number of the senators attended the session in September. The session emphasized that retention is not just a staff problem or administration problem but an institutional problem. She feels she shares some of the responsibility, along with other senators who attended the fall sessions, for not getting the word out to the faculty at large.

Dr. Fernandes added that CREDO does the work that we do not have the time to and will give us a package of data-driven recommendations that we will decide to implement or not.

Dr. Betsalel thanked Dr. Fernandes for her explanation. He asked her one question for it is a question that was asked of him by his constituency. Why a consultant to evaluate this process?

Dr. Fernandes replied that it is because we do not have anyone here who is capable of doing this. No one on campus has this expertise or capability. Associate Provost McClellan 's units are already overwhelmed.

Dr. Betsalel's asked if the provost is confident about CREDO and whether other schools that have used their services have used them to a positive affect.

Dr. Fernandes has complete confidence in CREDO and believes schools have had positive results with them. What makes the provost most positive about CREDO, however, is not the work with other schools but with that done in partnership with our Admissions office. We have had excellent results with them. There has been mutual education since they work primarily with private institutions. We have had to educate them about what makes public education distinctive as they have taught us how to improve our admissions results. She is aware that several COPLAC universities with enrollment challenges have engaged with CREDO.

Dr. Betsalel thanked Dr. Fernandes for taking the time to explain this.

Center for Diversity Education Report. Deborah Miles said the Center for Diversity Education started as a project of the Jewish community in 1995. After three years, it became a separate center and moved to Pack Place. While at Pack Place, she worked with many folks at UNC Asheville like Dwight Mullen. After a period of time, they moved to an office in Zagier for the university understood this partnership could grow in other ways if the center was on the campus. Deborah Miles has done the work herself including raising the annual funds of \$100,000 that they need to operate this 502(c)

Chancellor Ponder has worked to bring the center closer to the university, and her next step is to make the Center for Diversity Education completely within the umbrella of the University of North Carolina at Asheville.

The Center for Diversity Education is now creating a three to five year strategic plan. Their work began with the K-12 work programming around Central Standards and Common Core. They now have been working around the QEP and ILS deliberately building relationships within the community, where it fits with the service learning and collaborative work. They hope to finalize that work in the strategic plan with a faculty/staff certification as part of their Equity and Inclusion training. They would like to promote their training not only to individuals but to organizations and corporations to certify they know how to have hiring procedures that retain and promote people of color, women or anyone who are perceived as being locked out of a promotional system.

They would like to become the North Carolina Center for Diversity Education where people from across the state to the university to become certified in a graduate program. There are many undergraduate research possibilities in this area. This kind of work needs to be done in every state, and if the University of North Carolina at Asheville doesn't do it, somebody else in North Carolina will do it.

Executive Director Miles opened the floor up for questions and suggestions.

**Discussion:**

Dr. Ray suggested she plan out learning outcomes and assessments.

Dr. Kaplan agreed. He applauds the work. It would be great for it to work at the state level and would help keep UNC Asheville in the public eye in a good way. He also suggests they think about contingency planning as well.

As a non-profit, Ms. Miles would like to get away from asking people for money and move to the business of people buying services.

Dr. Betsalel applauds and respects the work of this organization. He hopes the communication between the Center for Diversity Education, the Key Center and the academic departments stays open.

Dr. Eggers asked if the view of diversity is only related to race and ethnicity or whether sexual orientation might be included.

Executive Director Miles said the Center for Diversity has adopted the Diversity Action Council's definition of diversity which is very broad. Their council statement is broad and includes all gender, sexual orientation and other pieces. It has action verbs. It is not about a kind of a person but how we approach critical thinking.

Dr. Kaplan read the statement:

"At UNC Asheville, diversity means creating and supporting an inclusive and sustainable community, one in which people of all backgrounds interact respectfully and in which each member is valued. To reach this goal requires that we enhance the range of human diversity on campus, including but not limited to dimensions such as race and ethnicity, age, religion, disability, socio-economic status, gender expression, gender and sexual identity, national origin, culture and ideological beliefs."

Executive Director Miles said that race is one of the hardest to deal with for it is a growth process and the work is never over. That is why race is listed first.

Dr. Burchard wanted to reiterate Dr. Betsalel's point for the center to be open and connected to all the other committees which work on diversity issues on campus so not to be duplicating efforts.

Executive Director Miles said they are in the middle of the strategic planning, and she will send a note out to the community asking that they complete a survey and be involved in focus groups.

Dr. Burchard thanked Deborah Miles for her presentation.

#### **VIII. Old Business.**

The senate went into closed session to approve the minutes of the closed session of January 30, 2014.

#### **IX. New Business.**

#### **X. Adjourn**

Dr. Burchard adjourned the meeting at 5:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by: Lisa Sellers  
Executive Committee