

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

Senate

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

Excused Absence: R. Bowen

Visitors: G. Ashburn, P. Catterfeld, L. Cornett, L. Dohse, O. Erdur, J. Gage, D. Gillette, B. Hobby, E. Katz, J. Konz, K. Krumpe, A. Lanou, L. Mathews, P. McClellan, H. Parlier, D. Race, A. Shope.

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

Dr. Burchard called the meeting to order and introductions were made.

II. Approval of Minutes:

[September 12, 2013](#)

The minutes were approved without dissent.

III. Executive Committee Report:

Dr. Melissa Burchard

Faculty Senate Social Event. The Faculty Senate Social Event has been set for October 30 from 4:30 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. in the Red Oak Conference Room of Ramsey Library. Dr. Burchard thanked the Provost, Dr. Fernandes, for contributing beverages for the event.

Section Size Committee. This committee was formed at the UNC system level in response to the Strategic Plan Initiative. The Section Size Committee is looking at how big classes should be ideally. This is one of the efficiencies from the General Assembly and Board of Governors. This group worked over the summer gathering information on different kinds of courses. There is a fair amount of literature on optimum sizes of classes which differs enormously in program areas depending on many variables. They are working on putting together a report for Dr. Ortega on what they have found.

Student Government Report. Jeremy Gage reported that the Director of External Affairs is forming a Pro-Voting Task Force with SGA senators and other student leaders to address student voter engagement in the upcoming municipal election. They are also crafting literature explaining voter requirements and dates of elections. There will also be events organized to promote voter registration for the polls at both the Early Voting location (downtown) and the Election Day location (as of now, the North Asheville library).

SGA is also working with OLLI (Osher Lifelong Learning Institute) to coordinate a City Council Candidate Forum to take place on October 10 at 6 p.m.

UNC Asheville was well represented this past weekend at the monthly UNC ASG (Association of Student Government) conference held at NCCU. The main topic of interest was voter engagement for both this election as well as the next election, specifically planning efforts to address solutions for the new voting requirements and voting districts.

They also discussed the Board of Governor's policy regarding "gender non-specific housing."

Additionally in ASG, there are plans for student representatives (including UNC Asheville) to go to Washington, D.C. Their trip is planned for November. They will meet with the U.S. Board of Education to discuss student loan interest rates (undergraduate and graduate) as well as other topics that pertain to college students.

SGA now has a weekly report in the Blue Banner.

Faculty Assembly Executive Committee. Dr. Dohse reported on the Faculty Assembly's first meeting where they prepared for the coming year. President Ross reported being more optimistic because the Board of Governors understands the needs of the UNC system more. As a result, he is experiencing more support for the universities.

There was a survey distributed concerning the student learning outcomes for the entire university system. They discussed the survey results where critical thinking and written communication are the top two highest rated desired outcomes. There were no decisions made at this time; however, the results of the survey align with UNC Asheville's mission and boosts support for our distinctiveness.

Regarding the new concealed weapon legislation, after hearing the Faculty Assembly's discussion, Dr. Dohse is not as concerned as he was when this new legislation passed. He said the new rules do not ever allow the person to take the gun out of the car and the gun has to be locked up. In light of that rule, Dr. Dohse does not understand the advantage of the new gun law.

There was a discussion on the new health care plans and there is concern that the 80/20 option could be lost if members are not attentive.

A subgroup talked about online classes, and Dr. Dohse does not know how that will affect UNC Asheville. Other campuses have problems that have to be sorted out. One of the issues is there are examples of some faculty in the system who have taught online classes and not received credit for them because the class does not meet in a physical classroom.

Questions:

Dr. Cameron asked what percentage of the faculty responded to the survey concerning the General Education Requirements. Dr. Dohse does not know offhand, but the numbers were in the thousands. He does not know what that means in terms of a percentage. He will let her know at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

Regarding the handgun legislation, Dr. Cameron asked if there was any campus or UNC system policy regarding people who have a concealed weapon. In regards to our security, do they have to disclose? Dr. Dohse said that the group spent most of their time talking about sexual harassment and assault. From what Dr. Dohse could glean from their discussion, the concealed weapon cannot ever leave their car. Dr. Burchard said she believes the law states they have to have a concealed weapon license permit.

Dr. Cameron said that her point is that our campus security does not know who has concealed weapons and she wondered if UNC Asheville could have a policy where they have to reveal they have a concealed weapon.

Dr. Burchard said her understanding is there isn't a requirement that they report to our security system. She said that Eric Boyce did put out an email, [Handgun Legislation Q&A](#), which has some basic information.

Heather Parlier, Associate General Counsel for UNC Asheville, said that she had researched this. She found under North Carolina General Statute (N.C.G.S.) § 14-415.23 dictates that *"...no political subdivisions, boards, or agencies of the State nor any county, city, municipality, municipal corporation, town, township, village, nor any department or agency thereof, may enact ordinances, rules, or regulations concerning legally carrying a concealed handgun."* She said we can't make any separate rule or law.

Dr. Cameron asked whether we can have a policy regarding disclosure.

Ms. Parlier said we can't make any rules about concealed carry weapons.

Dr. Burchard said, if the Faculty Senate wishes, they could have Chief Boyce come and report at a Faculty Senate meeting.

IV. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee:

Dr. Brian Hook

First Reading

[FWDC 6](#): Revision to Procedures for Faculty Grievance

This document changes grievance mediation from a requirement to a recommendation. Mediation will be a voluntary effort to arrive at reconciliation before a formal inquiry by the Grievance Committee. The coding as a requirement is the result of a “bad reading” of UNC Policy where it states that formal grievance procedures must permit parties to seek mediation but does not state mediation is mandatory. Dr. Hook believes UNC Asheville is the only campus in the system that had required mediation.

Second Reading

[FWDC 1](#): Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee and Animal Subjects Policy

There are five updates to the Animal Care Committee policy. The first three are due to federal regulation. The fourth, regarding changing the appointment of a chair, has to do with a timeliness issue. The fifth brings this committee’s work and plan in line with hierarchy requirements. There was a motion to accept FWDC 1 which was seconded.

Discussion:

Dr. Kormanik asked to make a friendly amendment to change the name to “Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee.” The rationale is the “Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee” is universally used by funding and granting agencies and almost universally used by other institutions. When people refer to an IACUC procedure or approval, everyone knows what that is.

Dr. Hook and Dr. Gillette, the current Animal Care Committee Chair, accepted the friendly amendment.

Dr. Kormanik really appreciates all the work and consideration that Dr. Gillette and the committee has done to establish this policy. However, Dr. Kormanik believes this issue is complicated having ethical, moral and practical considerations in how it is implemented. Personally, he would prefer the document to say that “IACUC will review the use of any live vertebrate in teaching, testing and research.”

Federal policy, for example, may exclude things like fish and amphibians, but NSF requires those approvals. If the research is going to be published in a journal, you have to get approval before doing the experiments, even if the research is not being funded.

Although he appreciates all the work, he is sorry to say he can’t vote for FWDC 1 in its present form.

Dr. Hook is deeply grateful for Dr. Kormanik’s points. Although, this is out of Dr. Hook’s expertise, Dr. Hook brought the document forward with Dr. Gillette’s help and asks Dr. Gillette to correct where he may misspeak.

Dr. Hook’s understanding is that it is a matter of funding agencies. UNC Asheville follows the guidelines that were set up by its funding agencies: the USDA and the Public Health Service. These are, in a sense, lower requirements, as in they do not require all vertebrates. The National Institute of Health and the National Science Foundation (NSF) have more stringent restrictions.

Dr. Hook decided to bring the document forward for three reasons:

- 1) There is little current research being done and this committee is not terribly active. If we expand the scope of the committee, it will substantially change the amount of work;
- 2) This policy is beyond what UNC Asheville is currently required by law to have; and
- 3) The current committee will review all the protocols from researchers whose research organisms fall outside the lower definitions provided by the USDA and the Public Health Service.

To push the definition beyond what we are legally required to do would push the number of queries to the committee into the hundreds.

Dr. Gillette said that what they are doing now is beyond what is required by law and the committee designed the document to consider the workloads of the committee and all faculty who teach these courses. He agrees with what Dr. Kormanik is saying about the ethical issue here, but they are meeting all federal requirements. If granting agencies, those who are submitting to research journals, or investigators come to the committee with requests, they will submit that work for review.

Dr. Burchard clarified that Dr. Gillette was saying that as the policy is currently stated in this document does not preclude anybody from asking for the higher level of review. He confirmed that they are beyond what the law requires.

Dr. Betsalel asked what type of animals.

Dr. Gillette said that vertebrates include mammals but not amphibians, birds, and fish.

Dr. Kormanik said that his issue is philosophical in nature of where to draw the line in animal care use. He can envision a situation where students would extend some observations in class to get an undergraduate research project none of which has been IACUC approved. Then they want to publish it and go to a journal. When the journal asks for their IACUC approval, the student won't have it. They can't get IACUC approval post hoc; they have to get it approved and have it in hand ahead of time. That is a practical aspect of where to set the line.

As an investigator with IACUC, Dr. Kormanik has had situations with NSF where he had to have vertebrate approval for using fish.

Dr. Hook said that is his concern. Who decides this philosophical question? FWDC? The Animal Care Committee? This committee (which is a 3 member body) brought the document to FWDC for approval.

Dr. Betsalel offered then the committee would be the ones to change the policy if the Faculty Senate votes this document down.

Dr. Kormanik said he respects the Animal Care Committee's deliberations and their findings are perfectly acceptable. However, Dr. Kormanik still needs to vote as he feels based on the guidelines he has to meet.

Dr. Hook agreed saying that all faculty will do what they have to do according the guidelines they need for their research. The committee as it currently exists will help them do that and will lead them through the approval process. Dr. Hook also offered that undergraduate research projects would have a faculty member involved from the beginning.

Dr. Galloway asked what happens if the Faculty Senate is in agreement with Dr. Kormanik's opinion where they prefer the policy to be written more in his direction and include all vertebrates and classroom experiments.

Dr. Hook said then the Faculty Senate would have to persuade the committee to do it because this is not a FWDC decision. The Faculty Senate can recommend, but the Faculty Senate can't make the committee operate that way. The policy is before the Faculty Senate because it is part of the Faculty Handbook. The committee does not report to FWDC. The committee reports to the Provost.

Dr. Betsalel said, due to his high regard for Dr. Kormanik's opinion, he can't vote against Dr. Kormanik's judgment. Dr. Galloway agreed that she is more comfortable raising the bar on the distinction of the animals due to her respect of Dr. Kormanik.

The question is called.

FWDC 1 failed 7-8 in dissent.

[FWDC 2:](#) Endowed Professorships

FWDC 2 adds new endowed professorships to the Faculty Handbook as well as the practice of endowed professors not serving as department chairs and program directors at the same time. A motion to accept was made and seconded.

Discussion:

Dr. Bond noticed that the Howerton Professorship does not show the reassigned time. The other professorships show the reassigned time. Is that an editorial issue? Dr. Konz, who wrote the document, is not sure there is formal reassigned time for this professorship. He will check. The Faculty Senate agreed needed editorial changes could be added after the document's passage.

Dr. Walters asked for clarification regarding the practice of department chairs and program directors not serving in professorships. He wondered does this work against small departments being able to have an endowed professorship.

Dr. Hook said this was a practice and not a rule. As stated in the rationale, exceptions can be made. FWDC 2 does not make this practice a rule but a recommendation.

Dr. Burchard noticed that the first two professorships do not have any specified term (the Belk and Carson Professorships). She wondered if these could be changed, and Dr. Hook replied these cannot be changed for these changes replace the agreements.

The question is called.

FWDC 2 passed without dissent and becomes SD0313F.

[FWDC 3:](#) Updating Sexual Harassment and Workplace Violence Policies

These changes bring the Faculty Handbook policies in alignment with the University's policy updates. A motion to accept was made and seconded. No discussion.

FWDC 3 passed without dissent and becomes SD0413F.

[FWDC 4:](#) Use of Department and Program Values Documents

FWDC 4 provides the use of departmental and program values documents. It expands the stated sharing of them to include not only the senior faculty but also the Post Tenured Committee, the Deans and the Provost.

A motion was made to accept which was seconded. No discussion.

FWDC 4 passed without dissent and becomes SD0513F.

[FWDC 5:](#) Faculty Approval of Candidates for Graduation

Currently, the Faculty Handbook does not have a provision for faculty approval of Candidates for Graduation and for Honors outside of a faculty meeting. Faculty meetings, especially over the summer, have been sparsely attended which necessitated the need for other opportunities although the preference is a faculty meeting. The policy is written that "if approval is not sought at a faculty meeting, the provost will report to the faculty the results of the vote." A motion to accept is made and seconded.

Discussion:

Dr. Galloway asked why the specific means like email was named in the rationale but not put in the policy change. Dr. Hook said that FWDC intentionally left the policy vague as to the means of voting and reporting to avoid revisiting the document due to future practices.

Dr. Walters asked whether the policy was necessary at all for he cannot recall when the faculty would vote against someone.

Dr. Hook does remember occasions for discussion regarding Latin honors. The communal aspect of talking about this is good. He does not know from where the practice comes. He does not remember ever voting a candidate down who has met all the qualifications for graduation.

Dr. Stratton says that all of his degrees say on them that he has the approval of the faculty.

The question is called.

FWDC 5 passed without dissent and becomes SD0613F.

Faculty Senate Election to fill a vacant Faculty Senate seat. Dr. Roig reported that the election is ongoing. As of noon Thursday (October 3), there were 115 faculty who had voted. This represents a fairly active participation. Dr. Roig will send out another reminder tomorrow morning. FWDC hopes to seat the new senator by the next senate meeting. Dr. Roig does not know what happens in case of a tie; however, FWDC will figure the procedure out if that scenario occurs.

VI. Institutional Development Committee:

Dr. Gregg Kormanik

[IDC Report](#)

[UPC September 26, 2013 Minutes](#)

VII. Academic Policies Committee Report:

Dr. Charles McKnight

Status Report regarding the APC/CRTF group's work

- *[APC 1](#) APC Executive Summary:
Interdisciplinary Learning Perspectives Implementation Proposal
- **The Senate intends to waive the Comer Rule and discuss the document.*

Dr. McKnight brings APC 1 for first reading. The senate adheres to what is known as the Comer Rule when processing documents before the Faculty Senate. The Comer Rule does not allow discussion nor voting on a document up for the first of two required readings.

Dr. McKnight made a motion to suspend the Comer Rule to allow the Faculty Senate to discuss APC 1 this afternoon. His motion was seconded.

The motion passed without dissent.

Discussion:

Dr. McKnight asked the Faculty Senate to focus their discussion on the grid (begins on page 8) which is the actual architecture of the proposal. APC 1 is the result of APC seeking to flesh the CRTF proposal out into items that the Faculty Senate could enact with APC documents.

The two co-editors of this final document are Dr. Laura Bond and Dr. Blake Hobby.

Dr. Burchard explained to allow visitors to formally speak in these discussions takes a vote of the Faculty Senate. There was a motion to allow visitors to participate which was seconded.

The motion passed without dissent and visitors were allowed to participate in the discussion.

The floor was then officially opened for discussion.

Dr. Roig said one of his ongoing issues was dropping the Health and Wellness requirement. APC 1 speaks to resource issues that led the taskforce to drop that requirement. UNC Asheville has a center for Health and Wellness which was granted due to the efforts of the legislature and our community to promote health and wellness in the State of North Carolina. Dr. Roig believes to eliminate the Health and Wellness requirement is a poor move politically and UNC Asheville should find the resources, given the following:

- This university was provided this center along with its funding,
- UNC Tomorrow specifically says UNC should lead in improving the health and wellness of all people and communities in our state, and
- A community of our students, if educated properly on health and wellness, could lead in improving the health and wellness of the state as well as our country.

Dr. Ray, the Chair and Associate Professor of the Health and Wellness Department, stated the department is currently able to meet the demand for the Health and Wellness requirement as well as enable Health and Wellness students to complete their program in a timely manner.

Dr. Ray further elaborated that Americans spend more than 2 trillion dollars on healthcare a year. Seventy-five cents out of every healthcare dollar is spent on a preventable condition. Yet, more than half of all Americans

suffer from one or more chronic diseases. Dr. Ray asked, “Isn’t it the role of North Carolina’s public liberal arts institution to lead the way in providing a valuable health and wellness component in their liberal arts education?”

All CRTF members agreed on that role. At the same time, the taskforce members were interested in compromising and working with the whole group to find models that were more sustainable.

Dr. Ray said the compromise point that the department reached was they were willing to let the health and wellness requirement go away, but only if the taskforce was in full support of looking for more creative ways to embed health and wellness in everything we do. Additional conversations to figure out this strategy are necessary, and the rewording of APC 1 is necessary to accurately reflect the compromise regarding Health and Wellness.

Dr. Lanou wanted to add the department was under the assumption that they had to deliver the ILS requirement with only their tenured track faculty. They have several fulltime lecturers. If their assumption was a misunderstanding, they could provide the requirement with fulltime lecturers.

Dr. Walters asked the Faculty Senate if they were considering this document as a whole for an up and down vote or in pieces where they are able to make changes to the document. Dr. Walters’ impression is the proposal is a whole document for an up and down vote.

Dr. McKnight responded that when the Faculty Senate was given the proposal, the taskforce emphasized over and over again that the proposal was a whole.

Dr. Roig pointed out that APC 1 isn’t a whole relative to CRTF because it doesn’t include the 100 hour restriction.

Dr. Hobby’s understanding was the 100 hour restriction would be addressed in a separate departmental document so the restriction is in the proposal. APC 1 addresses the concerns related to the general curriculum architecture as a whole. If the Faculty Senate wishes, the restriction could be easily added to APC 1 also.

Actually, Dr. Roig has been clear from the beginning that if the 100 hour restriction was in this document, he would vote the document down. He actually prefers the 100 hours restriction to be separate from this document.

Dr. Kormanik believes any document that comes before the Faculty Senate is amendable. However, if you push here, then you have to pull from someplace else. If you add here, then you have to take out a bit. The question is how many absolute electives do we want the students to have. The Faculty Senate may feel it is more important to add a health and wellness component and cut the absolute free electives by an hour or two.

Dr. Ray was asked to relate the department’s current resources to meet their curriculum.

Dr. Ray said they have three fulltime lecturers. With that level of resources, the department is able to deliver both the ILS and the major curriculums. If they have less resources, they would either have to hire additional adjuncts or discontinue the ILS requirement.

Dr. Kaplan asked Dr. Fernandes if she, as the Provost, could speak to future resources. Is it unreasonable to imagine keeping three fulltime lecturers?

At the moment, the Provost could not confirm due to many unknowns. She believes that any curriculum built on the assumption of lecturers is probably on shaky ground.

Dr. Kaplan asked if PAC were considering any expansion positions?

Dr. Fernandes said that there are no expansion positions under consideration by PAC. The University will be fortunate to get through the year holding onto current faculty lines, but may lose some positions depending on various factors that may come into play.

Dr. Walters says that he is puzzled regarding the proposal on the money savings. He feels like the central piece is money, lectureship and lines, but no one is willing to take a position on whether those lectureships will continue to exist or not.

Dr. Walters agreed with Dr. Ray that the section on the second page regarding the rationale of the Health and Wellness requirement needs to be reworded to explain the compromise that Health and Wellness made for the whole curriculum.

Dr. Ray agreed that the section does need rewording. Dr. Ray further elaborated that as the process moved forward, CRTF members found it trying to figure out how sustainable was the curriculum that the taskforce came to an agreement. How do we define sustainability? Defined qualitatively or quantitatively?

Dr. Eggers thanked Dr. Bond and Dr. Hobby for all their work they put into APC 1. She wondered why the Foreign Language was not 8 hours for her students usually take 2 semesters of a foreign language.

Dr. Hook said that all N.C. high school students are now required to have 2 years of a foreign language to graduate. We assume that students should place into the second semester of a foreign language. The completion of the Second Language Perspective is the completion of that second year.

Although Dr. Cameron as a member of APC did vote to bring APC 1 to the Faculty Senate, she wanted to bring her concern before the full senate that she takes issue with the Quantitative Intensive being reduced to one course. Social media recently brought the issue to light when someone posted the following problem:

$$6 \div 2 (1+2)$$

Adhering to the proper order of operations, the correct answer is nine (9). It is heartbreaking the number of people who insist the answer is one (1) because they do not understand something as simple as the order of operations. We should be especially concerned with reports coming out saying that by 2030, jobs will require some type of quantitative reasoning. New jobs in the technology field require knowledge gained from one of these courses. She believes it is a disservice to students to weaken the quantitative requirement, and it is not enough to obtain more quantitative learning through the other science perspectives. She understands that she is in the minority regarding this issue. From attending the listening sessions, there was much more concern over reducing the number of hours for the humanities program than the reduction of the quantitative intensive.

Dr. Walters read from the proposal the following sentence from the Quantitative Perspective box on page 8:

“Although initially fulfilled by taking MATH or STAT, the quantitative perspective is practiced and applied throughout the ILP in the sciences and social sciences and humanities and in arts-related disciplines like music reliant upon quantitative knowledge, content, and methods.”

He says this statement represents a “fuzzing” that he sees throughout the document. Although he is not interested in academic silos, Dr. Walters gets concerned when we define things so broadly that they can live anywhere. He further stated that interdisciplinary experience has to have rigor or it means nothing.

Dr. Cameron said that interdisciplinary learning is across the curriculum and doesn’t have to be defined. Students can make the connections themselves and should be encouraged. This is the type of knowledge gained from going abroad.

Dr. Hobby agrees that the quantitative perspective needs rewording to clarify that taking MATH or STAT courses fulfill the requirement. The rest of the paragraph means there are other ways that quantitative learning would continue across the curriculum.

Dr. Bond said that APC decided to add that statement after Dr. Cameron had brought her concerns to APC. The statement is to acknowledge where quantitative skills are being utilized across the entire curriculum.

Dr. Roig notes the use of the word Interdisciplinary may be overused to sell the curriculum in a way that is not necessary.

Dr. Burchard agreed she also has heard many comments from faculty in the senate-sponsored forums. Dr. Burchard said they need to think about the definition of interdisciplinary. Regarding Dr. Hobby’s definition of interdisciplinary, they need to consider whether everyone is prepared to teach in the interdisciplinary way that he is. She imagines not everyone is. That is another aspect that has to be guaranteed in order to say students will get that experience in all the different classes from these different departments.

Dr. Betsalel believes a lot of compromising went into the document; however, he does not believe it is a compromised document. He had strong reservations against the CRTF proposal and wondered whether this was really general education with a humanities core. He was persuaded in the APC discussions about the nature of what holds us together as a community which is the interdisciplinary nature, not of the disciplines, but of knowledge itself. There isn’t a question that can’t be addressed, and indeed, it has to be addressed from the interdisciplinary

perspective. We do this in all disciplines: empirical science, economics, statistics, foreign language, history, and philosophy, as examples. The proposal really reflects the structure of knowledge that drives him to accept this understanding. This structure is truly manageable.

Also, Dr. Betsalel is voting for APC 1 because he is honoring what came before. It took an act of great courage and insight for the faculty to collectively move to this ILS cluster program. Though the ILS program was a brilliant plan, it didn't work for we didn't have the time, the commitment, nor the resources to make it work. This proposal acknowledges how we got here and there is nothing in APC 1 that says we can't work collaboratively together.

The chair recognized Dr. Mathews. Dr. Mathews thanks the committee for their hard work over the past two years. She empathizes with all the work that was done and the interest that the Faculty Senate has in making sure something happens fairly quickly. She has worked on instruments that would take 3 years to design and then nothing came of the work immediately where it would be two more years before she saw changes. Thus, she indeed empathizes with those who have worked and spent a lot of time on this proposal.

However, she does not think moving quickly is always the best strategy. One of her concerns with this document and the conversations she has heard is she has not heard anything about student learning. We are talking about constraints, lightening the load for faculty and providing more choice. These are important things, but where is the learning. If we think that clusters are great but the implementation is not good, why not tweak our existing architecture to see if we can get the clusters to work?

*Those of us on the Food for Thought Cluster have been assessing student outcomes in our cluster. The great news is you don't have to have class at Asheville Brewing Company to have successful learning outcomes, although it is great fun.*¹ You don't have to have grandiose events to enjoy the benefits of the learning outcomes in your students. They have documented evidence that illustrates you do not have to have intricate cross-course projects in order to get student learning gains in interdisciplinary thinking. That is the good news.

Dr. Mathews suggests patiently holding off on this proposal and think about tweaking the existing ILS program. Why not think about changing some things before throwing away the ILS architecture especially given there will be changes forced upon us in terms of a core general education program? Why not try to retain our distinctiveness? We want to be distinctive in the UNC system; we want to be known as distinctive. Why are we trying to make ourselves less distinctive by changing our general education right now when we could be learning more about other general education programs?

One last point Dr. Mathews wanted to make is in regards to the Writing Intensive element of the current ILS. She understands in this interdisciplinary writing perspective document is an accommodation in placing the writing competency in the major. However, that is disciplinary-based writing. What we know from all the studies published recently is we need more integration. We need to be able to communicate across disciplines. By placing the writing intensive in the department, we may be disadvantaging our students' ability to learn more about how to communicate across disciplines.

Dr. Betsalel moves to waive the Comer Rule also for the purposes of voting on APC 1 today. He felt that the Faculty Senate could approve the architecture and then move on to the departmental requirements. Some of the senators felt the Senate had already done that when they waived the Comer rule. Dr. Roig countered that the motion to waive the Comer Rule was specifically worded to waive only in order to discuss the proposal. The chair concurred with Dr. Roig. The motion was seconded.

Discussion:

Dr. Hook appreciates what Dr. Besalel said and shares the passion in which he said it. He felt similarly until he attended two faculty meetings on Tuesday. The nine faculty in these two meetings all wanted the Faculty Senate

¹ **Secretarial Note: After the minutes were approved, the secretary received a request for a correction of this statement to reflect more closely to what the speaker said in order not to be taken out of context: "It doesn't take regular meetings at Asheville Pizza to have successful learning outcomes."*

not to vote on this document. It was contrary to what he expected. Five of the nine had been on the taskforce who looked at the document and found items that they need clarification to understand the differences from the actual CRTF proposal. They would like a document that lays out the differences between these two proposals. The decision of 100 hours was a difference and they want to know of other differences. Also, there is the perception that interdisciplinary learning is lessened. Plus the wording of the document sounds too apologetic.

Thus, Dr. Hook is neither ready nor interested in voting on the document today because the curriculum is so important and these concerns were expressed by all nine highly regarded colleagues. However, he does not want to leave here today without giving APC guidance on what to do.

Dr. Stratton has concerns about postponing a vote until there is widespread support for the proposal. Before the senate is a document that all members have the option to vote no, yes or abstain from voting. If it is voted down, the document returns to APC to make changes.

Dr. Betsalel said the vote is simple to him. This curriculum is reaffirmation of the humanities core, first and foremost. That seems to be the single clearest message. The second is to simplify the curriculum so that students can mitigate in a sustainable way. This proposal answers both of those questions. He is ready to vote on this and he understands we are running out of time due to a crisis that has been described to him. He may be mistaken, but we can check with Dr. Fernandes on whether there is a crisis or not.

Dr. Fernandes said she is not aware of a student crisis.

Dr. Betsalel said it is in the document and they were told that there is. If we are saying now there isn't a crisis, then let's take the document back to APC and look at it.

Dr. Stratton said his concern is that we are rushing this through. He said the reason he seconded this motion is he feels APC 1 should be voted down and return to APC so they can spend more time on this. The impression APC has given is this proposal needs to happen now since it has been discussed for 2.5 years. However, Dr. Stratton counters that this body has not had that amount of time nor sufficient time to discuss the document.

Dr. Fernandes said she did not have any role in writing the current document and asked if Dr. Hobby and Dr. Bond could describe what they meant when they wrote it.

Dr. Bond explained the taskforce was told two years ago when they started their work that there was a crisis.

Dr. Hobby asked if there were any numbers in terms of how we are impacted regarding faculty workloads and how students are moving through the curriculum in a timely fashion. Do we have any numbers?

Assistant Provost McClellan asked to speak to the history of the taskforce. Two and a half years ago, UNC Asheville was still feeling the effects of the serious budget cuts where they lost 10 faculty positions. We need a curriculum that is sustainable with the reduced faculty numbers. That was the crisis. Students do complain about getting through in a timely fashion. In its early meetings, CRTF researched to determine the lowest hours to get through a major. The taskforce was surprised to learn that many majors have grown into larger numbers than were approved in earlier APC documents.

Ms. Catterfeld said in the last few years the state or the General Administration has also been investigating the funding model. To determine the faculty FTE, they are adding in factors like retention and graduation rate. Based on these numbers, they will either increase or decrease the institution's budget.

Dr. Walters asked whether this has already been implemented. Both Catterfeld and McClellan answered in the affirmative.

Dr. Bond wondered if it was possible to vote on the structure that is proposed here, but not necessarily the words that represent the structure so that the words are not getting in the way.

The Chair called the question.

The motion failed 7-8 in dissent.

Dr. Hobby said that what happened is exactly what he hoped would happen. He wanted to present a structure and get input before drawing out an entire curriculum with APC documents that could have been voted down and then they would have had to start again. He thanked everyone for their valuable feedback.

Dr. Diefenbach said he would like to be behind this proposal. He said that he would like to see a list of the major concessions to be sure what we thought was coming is actually in this document.

From the discussion on the word interdisciplinary, the chair stated that there are misunderstandings and a need to clarify meaning.

Dr. Bonds asked how does that work? Can this document be changed?

The chair said the document can be changed by APC, but it will come back as a first reading again. However, the Faculty Senate can waive the Comer Rule again.

There was a question as to who changes the document. Dr. Fernandes confirmed that CRTF will not convene again. The senators and the Chair concurred that this is the Faculty Senate's document (see standing rules and the charge to APC from May 2013 meeting).

Dr. Fernandes added that she believes that the crisis is more related to faculty than to students. The curriculum, as it is currently structured, is not sustainable with the current faculty resources that UNC Asheville has. With our current patterns, we are stable but we are not generating more faculty positions. We have no way to grow the university. In addition to the ten faculty positions that we lost 2011, last year we lost four more, and next year we may lose one or two more. She asked that we reconsider what sustainability means in our curriculum so as to avoid a crisis for our students. Before too long, without any change, the faculty will have to teach a 5-5 load.

Yes, we are in a crisis but not what Dr. Betsalel asked about. The students are not in crisis as of yet because the faculty are delivering the curriculum as it is structured. But the workload for faculty is not sustainable and it is not good for student learning because the faculty is exhausted, in her view. She requests that the faculty develop a curriculum that we can deliver.

She thinks the CRTF work was positive in that direction. It was not perfect, and she personally disagrees with many things in the final proposal, but that is the nature of consensus. We are all giving for the sake of the whole. She supports the CRTF proposal since we are heading for a crisis if we don't create a curriculum that is sustainable.

Dr. Galloway never understood this to be a student crisis. She understood from the first couple CRTF meetings that CRTF was formed initially with the idea of sustainability across the board. She believes that the Faculty Senate was elected to be leaders and get things done. Now that she understands this document is owned by the Faculty Senate, she believes that APC and the Faculty Senate could make changes. She recognizes that CRTF and APC have done a lot of work. She would be very disappointed if the Faculty Senate does not have this settled a month for there needs to be a vote next month. She believes that Health and Wellness is important and needs to be part of the required curriculum for the students, for all connects to wellness. It is the most interdisciplinary thing she can bring to mind.

Dr. Hobby said that perhaps the crisis should be described as a potential problem for our students where they may not be afforded the kind of education than previous generations of students attending UNC Asheville.

Dr. McKnight believes APC, Dr. Bond, and Dr. Hobby have what they need to make the changes to the document and it can return for its second reading.

Dr. Roig believes our top priority is discerning what we believe is the right curriculum and the right student learning outcome that we wish to achieve, and then balance that against the resources we have. From the beginning, his concern with this CRTF is it focused on resources and sustainability over a review of the curriculum.

Dr. Cameron moved for a ballot vote on document APC 1 when it comes to a vote. The motion was seconded. Roberts' Rules of Order says that a motion for a ballot vote is undebatable (Article VIII: Vote, Section 46: Voting, Paragraph: *Voting by Ballot*).

The motion passed 8-7.

Dr. Walters does not believe the document should be altered. The document should be voted on as written. If it is altered, he believes the document comes back for a first reading.

Dr. Kaplan moved to reconsider the motion to vote today. The motion was seconded. No discussion.

The motion did not pass 4-10 in dissent.

Dr. Roig moved to table the document APC 1. The motion was seconded.

Discussion:

Dr. Roig moved to table the document to insure it does come back as a first reading and not a second reading. He believes there are enough changes that the document will need to be a first reading. If the senate wishes at that time to waive the Comer Rule again, it may.

The motion passed 10-3.

VIII. Administration/Academic Affairs:

Dr. Jane Fernandes

Undergraduate Research and Reassigned Time. There is a [proposal to offer undergraduate research](#) as a course which allows faculty to receive reassigned time after reaching a certain number of students. She provided the members of the Faculty Senate with the proposal which focuses on two ways undergraduate research is offered, either the currently offered UR 499: Undergraduate Research or a new course that faculty can recommend for advanced students, MLA 599: Directed Research. When a faculty member reaches 7 undergraduate research students, the faculty member is eligible for one course time reassigned from teaching.

The basis of the proposal came as a result of Chancellor Ponder's recent evaluation. During the evaluation, faculty made clear that they want a way to quantify their contributions in undergraduate research. Dr. Fernandes is working with Chancellor Ponder to process the proposal. The UNC Asheville Board of Trustees at their last meeting voted to approve the proposal which now has to be approved by President Ross.

Discussion:

Dr. Cameron asked if a student takes two semesters of undergraduate research, is that counted as one or two students for the purposes of reassigned time.

Dr. Fernandes said that would count as two students.

Emerging Technology. The university has received a ["Dear Colleague" letter](#) making it clear that our classroom technology is required to be accessible by all students. We can't use technology that is inaccessible to some students. A university-wide committee, led by Assistant Provost McClellan, will develop a plan for UNC Asheville to comply with the requirements. Information will be shared as it becomes available.

Discussion:

Dr. Eggers asked what is a "Dear Colleague" letter?

Dr. Fernandes said a "Dear Colleague" letter coming from the Department of Justice indicates in a friendly way that the issue addressed in the letter is essential and the recipient is advised to have a plan to be in compliance as soon as possible. In this case, the issue is emerging technology as it is used for instruction. There is a community college in the southeast that had a million dollar fine for inaccessibility of their instructional technology.

[Summary of Board of Governors Policy Regulations for 2013-14.](#) Assistant Provost McClellan prepared a summary of new regulations from the Board of Governors which Dr. Fernandes distributed. Some students are experiencing adverse impacts of these new policies. Dr. Fernandes asked that faculty consider policies that could help students mitigate adverse impacts. She suggested a more liberal PASS/FAIL philosophy would be helpful to counteract the new limited number of course withdrawals. She encourages Assistant Provost McClellan and APC to have conversations about this and other possibilities.

IX. Old Business.

X. New Business.

XI. Adjourn

Dr. Burchard adjourned the meeting at 6:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by: Lisa Sellers
Executive Committee