

University of North Carolina at Asheville  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
Minutes, September 12, 2013 (3:15 pm)

Senate

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

Excused Absence: L. Bond

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

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

**II. Approval of Minutes:**

[May 2, 2013 3:15 p.m. - Last meeting of 2012-2013 Faculty Senate](#)

[May 2, 2013 6:00 p.m. - First meeting of the 2013-2014 Faculty Senate](#)

The minutes were approved without dissent.

[The Standing Rules and Rules of Order – 2013-2014](#)

The Faculty Senate Secretary reported that she has not received changes from anyone, and the standing rules remain unchanged since approved last year.

The 2013-2014 Standing Rules and Rules of Order were approved without dissent.

**III. Executive Committee Report:**

Dr. Melissa Burchard

Dr. Burchard said it will be a busy year with the curriculum review work, ongoing policy reviews, and the graduate programs survey.

Student Government Report

Ms. Leigh Whittaker

No report.

Faculty Assembly Executive Committee

Dr. Lothar Dohse

Next week will be the Faculty Assembly's first meeting on Friday, September 20. Dr. Dohse is serving on the Faculty Assembly Executive Committee this year. He said the faculty of the UNC system faces many challenges this year in Chapel Hill as well as implementing the new strategic plan. The new strategic plan is being implemented in piecemeal by GA and the Faculty Assembly in coordination with many other committees of which UNC Asheville has representatives other than himself.

The Faculty Assembly focus will be on three items:

1. Articulation Agreement or the General Education Initiative where the courses between colleges should transfer more readily.
2. Assessment or Institutional Integrity's big topic is how to assess the new courses on the horizon like MOOCs (MOOC stands for Massive Open Online Courses). They are working on a unified front to explain what MOOCs are, what e-learning is, what is not e-learning and how to assess.
3. Communication Group of the Faculty Assembly is working with the present government to make sure the legislatures and the Board of Governors have the interest of the state and the universities in their minds. It is the role of the Communication Group to spend time talking to officials so they understand what we need.

Dr. Dohse requests that the faculty to please complete surveys they receive. The surveys provide important feedback to the Faculty Assembly.

He also asks that faculty gives timely feedback also to the resolutions that come from the Faculty Assembly. Dr. Dohse will send these documents via email to the Faculty Senate, and the Executive Committee will decide whether the documents need to be sent to all faculty.

**Questions:**

Dr. Walters asked about the survey regarding core competencies of General Education where 96.6% of the faculty thought critical thinking was important to higher education. What is the next step?

Dr. Fernandes learned about the proposed next steps at a CAO meeting at the GA and reported about this in the minutes from last May. The General Education committee is talking about adopting UNC systemwide outcomes so all UNC system campuses and students have the same three learning outcomes for general education. Campuses can have their own additional outcomes, but all students will have three universally common ones. All students will have an e-portfolio where they keep their best work to document their knowledge and skills for each outcome. The e-portfolio, within the schema discussed with the system provosts, would be reviewed and certified before the student may graduate. Through the e-portfolio, the institution can guarantee the student has the knowledge and skills outlined by the outcomes.

There is also talk about each student receiving an online “badge” for each outcome achieved. Dr. Walters said that Mozilla, who makes the browser Firefox, is creating a program where people can take an online class and demonstrate competency. When they prove that they are competent, they receive a “computer” badge to put on their resume.

Dr. Cameron asked who evaluates the e-portfolios and Dr. Fernandes said the campus faculty do.

Dr. Burchard thanked Dr. Dohse for his important work and his willingness to serve on the Faculty Assembly Executive Committee on the behalf of UNC Asheville faculty.

[Inquiry ARC Report:](#)

Dr. Lorena Russell

Dr. Russell presented her report on the progress of the Quality Enhancement Program (QEP). Critical thinking is an important goal and [the Inquiry ARC](#) has done considerable planning of the structure which is broadly applicable throughout the campus. She came before the Faculty Senate to remind them of the significance of this initiative and to solicit their support in sharing a word of the program with their colleagues. They are in the middle of an application cycle right now for faculty and staff who may teach courses and co-curricular programs. They are ahead of their numbers in terms of participation, but they want to make sure the program is sustained and maintains its momentum. She is optimistic for the work has been fabulous from the team of faculty and staff they have. Annis Lytle is a wonderful support person for them. She asks the Faculty Senate to remember the Inquiry ARC and encourages faculty to contact her regarding the implementation of QEP, and she welcomes any questions and concerns emailed to her. Dr. Burchard told Dr. Russell she is doing a great job.

**IV. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee:**

Dr. Brian Hook

[Dr. Hook's Prepared Remarks for the Faculty Senate](#)

**First Reading**

- [FWDC 1:](#) Animal Care and Use Committee and Animal Subjects Policy
- [FWDC 2:](#) Endowed Professorships
- [FWDC 3:](#) Updating Sexual Harassment and Workplace Violence Policies
- [FWDC 4:](#) Use of Department and Program Values Documents
- [FWDC 5:](#) Faculty Approval of Candidates for Graduation

Committee assignments. Dr. Roig presented the attached list of appointments for approval. The document shows who the nominees will replace. Upon Faculty Senate approval, Dr. Roig will notify the appointees.

Dr. Bowen motioned the acceptance of the nominations and the motion was seconded.

The appointments were approved without dissent.

Alternate Conciliator. SGA asked FWDC for another set of nominees to fill the open position of Alternate Conciliator for the newly elected alternate is now the Conciliator. FWDC offered up the three previous nominees that were not chosen as well as one additional faculty member:

- Charles Bennett
- Kathleen Garbe
- David Steele
- Rob Berls

A motion was made to accept the ballot to be sent to SGA which was seconded.

The ballot was approved without dissent.

Faculty Senate Election to fill a vacant Faculty Senate seat. Dr. Ruppert resigned due to class schedule conflicts and there are no alternates left who can serve. The Constitution calls for a special election in this event. Dr. Roig proposes holding the election the week of September 30th which gives him time to get nominations for the ballot. Dr. Roig proposed that the ballot only contains nominees who are willing and schedules allow them to serve as opposed to a ballot of all eligible voters due to the need to have this position immediately filled.

Dr. Hook asked how long will the term be. Dr. Roig said the term is one year or the same term as the senator who resigned. Dr. Ruppert had one year left to her term.

Dr. Roig will announce to the faculty tomorrow the needed election on September 30 with the process and term of service for the position.

Dr. Hook thanked Dr. Roig for his extensive work on the committee assignments and elections.

**VI. Institutional Development Committee:**

Dr. Gregg Kormanik

University Planning Council Report

IDC Report

[UPC Minutes](#)

Senate Institutional Development Committee Report. Dr. Kormanik submitted the following report to the faculty senate on behalf of IDC:

IDC met to introduce and orient new members to the upcoming as well as the ongoing issues considered by IDC. The previous Senate minutes note the ongoing activities of IDC, but a few activities loom large on the horizon.

Regarding the Curriculum, CRTF recommendations and their implementation will affect academic programs. IDC will continue to review survey data in order to assess the implications and make recommendations for program modifications. Previous review of numerous surveys suggests that some are redundant; sometimes the data is out of date; and some results are outside of our ability to control them. We will continue to review survey data but will additionally consider them for their utility so that redundancy and out of date information might be eliminated.

The graduate programs survey data from STAMATS is under review. IDC will meet and discuss the survey with company representatives in order to better understand and analyze the data, and to make recommendations in consideration of additional graduate programs at UNCA. IDC welcomes the senators to come to their meeting if their schedule does not allow them to come to their assigned session.

Regarding centers, the Center for Craft, Creativity and Design (CCCD) a UNC interinstitutional center that UNCA previously accepted as an institutional center, is being discontinued. The Senate Executive Committee was notified in May by the Provost that the elimination of CCCD was under consideration, but no further discussion was entertained and a few days later the Chancellor communicated the intent to discontinue to the CCCD Board President. The Director of the CCCD, Stephanie Moore, from speaking with Dr. Katz, noted the Chancellor was using her management flexibility to strike the GA allotment for CCCD as part of mandated cuts. The CCCD is currently reorganizing itself as a 501c3, has purchased a building downtown, and continues with support from the Windgate Foundation. The Director looks forward to a continuing relationship with faculty and students from UNC Asheville.

Regarding coordination with UPC activities, Dr. Meigs, past Chair of IDC, Christine Riley, Chancellor Ponder and Dr. Kormanik met to outline UPC activities for this academic year. Priorities include developing the University Strategy for Resource Allocation for the 2013-15 biennium. A continuing difficult and challenging financial environment is anticipated. Suggestions for future work include developing new Strategic Plan Benchmarks and understanding new UNC performance measures, their implementation and implications. UNC Asheville has submitted its current Mission Statement to UNC GA without revision at this time, but will continue to consider our mission as required in the light of intra- and extrainstitutional pressures and mandates. Continuing UPC topics from previous years include: Sustainability on campus; Admissions and the Five Year Enrollment Plan; and Diversity programs.

**Questions:**

Dr. Walters asked whether Dr. Kormanik can outline his impression of how the process regarding the craft center should have been.

Dr. Kormanik said that we had a process but he can't find the outlined process anywhere now.

Dr. Walters asked whether we needed one and Dr. Kormanik said IDC could consider whether we need a process.

Dr. Fernandes expressed that UNC Asheville followed all applicable policies and procedures, and she believed they had done due diligence every step of the way.

Dr. Kormanik said that as a point of history, when he was Chief Research Officer, oversight of the centers were in his portfolio. The Office of Sponsorship and Programs had documents that discussed the process for reporting and reviewing centers. That document has been pulled from that site and could not be accessed for guidance.

Dr. Fernandes said that they did ask the Chief Research Officer for a review. UNC Asheville faculty handbook expresses the role of IDC in *assessing* centers. All existing centers are currently assessed through unit IE (institutional effectiveness) plans and annual reports. These are available for IDC's deliberations at any time. UNC Asheville has no existing policy about closing a center. The UNC General Administration (GA) has policies for closing a center and UNC Asheville followed those. She did notice that our campus policies are not aligned with GA policies. She recommended that IDC looks into aligning our policies with the GA's. She would be happy to review the IDC's advice on how to make this process better as well as having the benefit of IDC reviewing GA policies and bringing ours into alignment.

Dr. Kormanik agreed that GA has policies regarding centers and then each institution needs to come up with their own process that aligns with the GA policies and also takes into account the needs of the students and faculty as well as weigh opportunities. IDC can put this on the agenda to consider.

Dr. Walters asked whether a new center has to be approved by the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Kormanik did not want to misspeak, but his understanding is that it does not come through the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Fernandes said, in this case, the Craft, Creativity & Design Center had been an interinstitutional center housed at the General Administration. President Erskine Bowles made the decision to decentralize all centers and to get the General Administration out of the business of administering centers. Today, there is only one interinstitutional center still at the GA. About three years ago, the GA asked us to take responsibility for the Center for Craft, Creativity & Design as a UNC Asheville center. At that time, there was an extensive

review wherein UNC Asheville weighed the pros and cons of accepting this center. After due consideration, we acceded to the GA's request because primarily, at that time, we still had hope for an expanded craft studies building on our campus. The alignment of the practice of craft through craft studies along with education and outreach about craft through the Center for Craft, Creativity and Design was appealing. However, due to the economic recession, the hope for a dedicated craft building was dashed and the Craft, Creativity and Design Center never fully integrated into our undergraduate education. During the summer, Michael Sherrill, president of the Craft, Creativity and Design Center expressed to Chancellor Ponder a desire to become an independent entity. For many good and well-articulated reasons, they asked to be separated from the administrative bureaucracy they perceived as part of the UNC system. Dr. Fernandes took the proposed closure of the Center for discussion with the Art Department chair and the craft studies faculty who had no objection. Everyone was lined up in support of the closure. In the end, with regard to the mandated budget cuts to Academic Affairs, this was the only cut we had to make. As a result, we were able to protect the academic core from any further harmful cuts. She viewed the closure of the Craft, Creativity & Design Center as a win for everyone involved.

**VII. Academic Policies Committee Report:**

Dr. Charles McKnight

Status Report regarding the APC/CRTF group's work

Dr. McKnight began his report saying that since APC brought to the Senate around 100 documents last year, this meeting probably will be the only time this year that APC does not have documents to present for readings.

Dr. McKnight reported the APC/CRTF work is progressing. There is an editing group of two people, Dr. Hobby from CRTF and Dr. Bond from APC and CRTF. They are writing up actionable documents that will be presented to APC next Thursday. They said they will have their editing done and APC will bring the document to the Faculty Senate for first reading in October.

The summer group did review the issues the faculty noted in the survey last spring. After considering the issues, the group decided not to make any changes to the CRTF proposal.

The Discussion branched out to exploring the possibilities of how the document proceeds through the Faculty Senate, understanding the process thus far (new senate members getting up to speed), the meaning of a faculty as a whole vote, the challenges for students in the transition and the need for guidance to faculty when advising students in the interim.

The Chair called the discussion to a conclusion and asked how the Senate wished to move forward from here.

Dr. McKnight suggested that resending the current structure of the proposal is redundant for that is what Faculty Senate did in the spring. It would be better to send out a detailed, more concrete proposal to show what the curriculum will look like. He believes the document needs to come to the Senate before going to the faculty for a vote.

Dr. Betsalel asked what happens if the proposal is voted down and what precedent does a faculty as a whole vote set.

Dr. Roig said that since the Faculty Senate are the elected representatives to deal with these issues, that the proposal should proceed as it normally would through APC and then come to the Faculty Senate for a vote. Under the Constitution, the faculty has veto rights of the Faculty Senate action. He believes that is the clearer way forward for the senators are well aware of what the faculty has said to this point. The Faculty Senate can have a healthy debate about what the APC documents state and come to the conclusion that we are satisfied or not satisfied that we have a curriculum.

Dr. Bowen concurs for faculty can override any decision that the Faculty Senate makes. Also if APC submits a document as a document to the Faculty Senate then it is done.

Dr. Burchard said that is her concern.

Dr. Kormanik moved since no changes were made to the CRTF proposal architecture over the summer that the Faculty Senate forgo the faculty as a whole vote and have APC move ahead to produce final documents to bring for consideration to the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Galloway seconded.

**Discussion:**

Dr. Burchard is concerned since the faculty has been told the proposal would be brought to the faculty for a vote. Last spring was a survey and not a vote, and the senate was quite clear about that. If we do not bring it to them for a vote, then the senate would not be doing as we said we would do. Certainly the Faculty Senate could choose to do that. However, in the very least, Dr. Burchard would want the Faculty Senate to put out an explanation of why we are not bringing it to them for a vote.

Dr. Stratton asked for what purpose is the senate calling for a faculty vote in the middle of the process.

Dr. Cameron strongly advocated that their colleagues have the opportunity to voice their agreement or disagreement. The curriculum is too important a matter to forgo their voice. The vote will say what the faculty wants. We represent the faculty and we need to hear hear them as well as the faculty needs to be vested in the curriculum. If the proposal is good for our students, then our colleagues will support it. If not, then it won't. Dr. Cameron wants their voice to be heard.

Dr. Hook has concerns where we are dealing with the "tyranny" of the urgent. His first concern is we still to this date do not have a document to put to a vote. Second, as Dr. Hobby pointed out last year, the CRTF has already voted for the proposal, and as Dr. McKnight has pointed out, the survey results had 60% approval from 92 faculty out of the eligible number of faculty (around 190).

Dr. Roig corrected that the number who approved was 42 faculty. However, all faculty had the opportunity to respond or to choose not to respond.

Dr. Kaplan corrected that it wasn't a vote but just feedback. The survey asked whether they read the CRTF proposal, whether they read the justification, and then they were asked to give feedback regarding what changes would they make. The summer group decided not to make changes based on that feedback, which is great. Now what we are talking about is an up and down vote either on the same architecture or a proposal document. The Faculty Senate said we were going to do it, and he thinks it is irresponsible not to do as we said. We should honor it.

Dr. Eggers asked a question regarding when ILS passed how did it come through the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Konz relayed that only the Faculty Senate voted on ILS. There were two documents and two votes. First the architecture came through and was passed and then the APC catalog documents came through the Faculty Senate. Dr. Konz said that he and Dr. Krumpke were part of the group that worked on the documents.

Dr. Betsalel said he believes we need the faculty vote for legitimacy and integrity of the process. He agrees with Dr. Kaplan that once this body said that it would take it to the faculty that the Faculty Senate should honor that. The other reason is to make sure if there are substantive opposition to the changes then we need to know it. He suggests a simple up or down vote without any comments.

Dr. Galloway was part of the CRTF when it started two years ago where a large portion of the faculty had opportunities to contribute. All last year, the Faculty Senate talked about the delays from CRTF, and the Faculty Senate has spent time listening to the faculty in sessions as well as the survey. She thought the survey was a vote and a means to give feedback. Too many well-meaning and veteran faculty have worked on this. Part of that group told the Faculty Senate that they were beginning to feel disrespected and their work devalued. Out of respect for the work they have done and all the faculty input that the senate has heard, Dr. Galloway agrees with Dr. Roig that the Faculty Senate is elected by the faculty to do this really hard work. The Faculty Senate should be able to move forward with APC's report at the next Faculty Senate meeting. We do not table concerns but continue the discussion through email until the next senate meeting.

Ms. Shope said that Dr. Hobby and Dr. Bond are only working on the curriculum core and that is not including all the needed changes. She believes the vote needs to go forward on the structure and then let APC work on the catalog documents. If the faculty votes the proposal down, we are starting all over again. APC needs to know that before going forward.

The Chair asked Dr. Kormanik to repeat his motion.

The motion is repeated as stated above.

The Chair calls the question.

Dr. Stratton relayed that he still wants to know what the influence of the vote would relay. Is it to get reassurance that the faculty are aware? He wants it to be on record what power the faculty have or do not have. If we are aware that the faculty as a whole vote is more powerful than good will, Dr. Stratton needs to know whether the faculty vote will be replicated by the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Walters expressed he needs to know that also. Dr. Walters wonders by sending the proposal to the faculty for a vote puts the Faculty Senate in the situation where it must replicate that vote. If the faculty votes no, do we see a situation where the Faculty Senate would override that? If that is the case, we are doing a referendum and not an advisory vote. Dr. Walters' understanding is Dr. Kormanik is moving that the Faculty Senate forgoes an advisory vote.

Dr. Kormanik explained the purpose of his motion was to get the Faculty Senate to move to a resolution of this issue. If APC did not see any reason to modify the CRTF document, then the senate can go ahead and proceed rather than having a vote on the same document.

Dr. Cameron, an APC member, said she was not part of the summer group. Her understanding is that although the summer group did not see any reason to modify the architecture in light of the survey concerns, modifications were needed for there are parts of the proposal that are unclear.

Dr. Kormanik apologized for misinterpreting.

Dr. Eggers agreed that for the integrity of the Faculty Senate that we do need to have a vote for we said we would do that.

Dr. Burchard added that what has made this process difficult for the faculty is they have not felt things were completely transparent. She feels it would be a mistake not to do what the senate said they would do at this point.

Dr. Kormanik withdrew his motion.

Dr. Eggers wondered if the Faculty Senate could agree this evening which document will go to the faculty for a vote.

Dr. Kaplan concurred with Dr. Eggers. This will ensure that the correct document will be on hand at the October meeting.

Dr. Roig suggested that the faculty vote on architecture and not the specific language. It is the role of APC and the Faculty Senate to implement the architecture.

Dr. Kaplan made a motion that the Faculty Senate empowers FWDC to conduct a faculty as a whole vote of the general architecture before the next Faculty Senate meeting.

Dr. Eggers seconded the motion.

The Faculty Senate decided to make other motions to determine the details of a vote.

The motion passed by a vote of 13 to 3.

The Chair asked APC to give their approved wording of the preamble to FWDC by Monday and FWDC will finalize the details for conducting the vote at their next meeting, Thursday, September 19.

The Chair said the next matter of business is to decide whether a quorum will be required.

Dr. Cameron moved to establish a virtual quorum of 50% faculty +1 of eligible faculty and voting choices be up/down and no preference.

Dr. Kaplan seconded.

Dr. Bowen offered that the last vote of the faculty almost did not make quorum.

Dr. Eggers offered a friendly amendment that voting preferences are to vote the proposal up, down and no preference.

Dr. Cameron accepted the friendly amendment.

Dr. Hook is concerned about how the voting results are interpreted. He wondered whether Dr. Kormanik's motion should stand for the Faculty Senate needs to do what it has been elected to do. He felt that it would terrible

if quorum is not met or the proposal is voted down. He does not understand what is gained from a faculty as a whole vote.

Dr. Eggers believes people have a right not to vote or participate, for whatever privacy reasons they may have. She believes the vote should be carried out and give the faculty 4 or 5 days to vote.

Dr. Roig reminded the senate that this would mean the faculty would have two elections in a 3 week timeframe.

Dr. Stratton called the question.

The motion failed by a vote of 7 to 9.

Dr. Eggers moved to have a sense of the faculty vote where the voting preferences would be to vote the proposal up, down or no preference.

Her motion was seconded.

Dr. Kormanik moved to add a friendly amendment that the vote is a sense of faculty, and therefore, is not binding. Otherwise, the Faculty Senate's hands are tied, and if the vote fails, we are dead in the water and a lot of good, hard work by a lot of people over a very long period of time will be thrown under the bus.

Dr. Stratton asked if the language of the survey said there would be a vote by the faculty.

Dr. Roig does not recall the language of the survey saying there would be a vote. The only place is in the minutes. He does not understand what is gained from a vote that is only a sense of the faculty. He also would like to return to Dr. Kormanik's motion.

Dr. Eggers withdrew her motion.

Dr. Kaplan said the survey was informational. Having the vote, keeps the faculty in the loop. And we said we would do it.

Dr. Galloway agreed that a heads up is fair to all parties and it says that we are not operating in the dark nor trying to be mysterious about this.

Dr. Walters said he does not understand the gain in the vote just capture 8 percentage points.

Although nothing changed, Dr. Wingert considers the vote is a different question from the survey.

Dr. Galloway added that a vote says that the proposal has gone to the Senate now and we are doing our jobs.

Dr. Cameron added that she also hopes that the Faculty Senate's message is that we care about what our colleagues think and we are not doing anything behind closed doors.

Dr. Walters said that we are a representative body. If we are going to govern by referendum, then govern by referendum. If we send it out, then make it binding.

Dr. Cameron thinks that a curriculum change that affects all of us is important enough to have the faculty vote. If that is a referendum, then fine. When she took the survey last year, she understood that the Faculty Senate was looking for feedback. She did not understand it as a vote due to the survey's wording. Upon reading the faculty vote in the minutes, she would be waiting for that opportunity. If the proposal passed through the senate without the faculty vote, then she would have wondered where is her opportunity to have her voice heard.

Dr. Roig and Dr. Kaplan added that the survey asked the person for their vote and feedback to support it. The survey asked for more than feedback. It asked if you support the proposal as a whole.

Dr. Cameron recalls having concerns and relating those concerns in the survey. The survey's implication would be that the concerns would be addressed and she would get to see how they were addressed.

Dr. Eggers moved the Faculty Senate asks the faculty for an up/down/no preference vote on the general architecture of the curriculum. Dr. Cameron seconded the motion.

The vote failed by a vote of 7 to 8.

The Chair announced that since the Faculty Senate cannot pass a motion to carry the vote to the faculty then the next course of action is to call for the APC documents to be written. The Chair also suggests that the Executive Committee writes a notice to the faculty explaining the current status as well as outlining the steps that



have to be completed by the end of the fall semester. The notice's intent is to reassure the faculty that the curriculum review work is moving forward and the faculty will not be left in the dark.

Dr. Roig suggested that the Faculty Senate calls a special session to vote on the architecture and set it up to accommodate a larger gathering and invite all faculty to attend and be heard at that time.

Dr. Burchard said that the forum would allow faculty to have a voice; however, they still would not have a vote.

Dr. Walters moved that after the Senate votes on the APC documents that are submitted and if it is a positive vote, that the documents go to the faculty as a binding referendum in an up/down vote.

Dr. Hook second.

**Discussion:**

Dr. Konz reminded that the Constitution has this veto built into it. It requires 2/3 of the faculty override of a 50%+1 quorum to overturn a Faculty Senate action.

Dr. Kaplan said in order for any of this to happen, we would need to meet every week and none of these motions address that.

Dr. Stratton suggested that foregoing the vote would expedite the process.

Dr. McKnight reminded that the senate vote last spring gave APC until the November meeting to submit documents.

Dr. Statton wondered if the motion is necessary if the veto is built into the Constitution.

Dr. Roig said that the Constitution says the faculty calls the meeting to override. This motion says we would call the meeting to override.

Dr. Roig's problem with this motion is a lot of work went into the CRTF proposal and there is more work to come. Under this motion, in the end, all the work could be trashed. He does not want to support the motion especially when the faculty entered into this review in order to lighten their workload.

Dr. Stratton said he is not sure that the senate could pass the CRTF proposal for the current framework has many unanswered questions.

Dr. Walters knows how much work went into the proposal. However, he added that regardless of the amount of work does not mean that what was created was the right thing to be created. The proposal still has to go through our usual process for deciding on curriculum. That process goes through the senate. We don't take a vote on the amount of work that was done nor the time spent. We take a vote on the quality of the document.

Since the faculty already has the right to veto provided by the Constitution, Dr. Walters withdrew his motion.

Dr. Roig moved that the Executive Committee informs the faculty of the process this summer where the joint group of members from APC and CRTF reviewed the comments from the survey. They made the decision that there were no changes to be made to the architecture. Therefore, inform the faculty that the proposal moves forward through the normal curriculum process through APC and then the Faculty Senate. As a reminder, inform the faculty that they always have the right to be involved in the process by attending the senate meetings and contacting their senators before it comes to a senate vote.

The motioned is seconded by Dr. Hook.

The Chair, hearing no discussion, calls the question.

The motion passed by a vote of 10 to 3.

The Chair declared that the passage of this motion rescinds all prior passages of a faculty as a whole vote.

**VIII. Administration/Academic Affairs:**

Dr. Jane Fernandes

Undergraduate Research and Reassigned Time  
Emerging Technology  
Summary of Board of Governors Policy Regulations for 2013-14

Due to the lateness of the hour and the senators' need to leave for other commitments, Dr. Fernandes deferred her report and will present her report to the Faculty Senate at a later time or communicate about these agenda items through other venues.

**IX. Old Business.**

A question was brought up about the STAMATS report on graduate programs that is to go out to everyone before the meetings with STAMATS. Dr. Fernandes has received an update from Ms. Warren. Dr. Katz is working on the report and will send it to all groups before the September 30<sup>th</sup> meeting. They intend to have it out more than a week before the meeting.

**X. New Business.****XI. Adjourn**

Dr. Burchard adjourned the meeting at 6:22 pm.

Respectfully submitted by: Lisa Sellers  
Executive Committee