

University of North Carolina at Asheville
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Minutes, November 7, 2013 (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, R. Roig, M. Stratton, S. Walters, J. Wingert; J. Fernandes.

Visitors: G. Ashburn, K. Brown, P. Catterfeld, L. Dohse, B. Judge, K. Krumpke, L. Mathews, P. McClellan, D. Race, A. Shope, W. Strehl.

I. Call to Order and Celebratory News:

Dr. Burchard called the meeting to order.

By way of celebratory news, Dr. Burchard highlighted the excellent turnout to hear Dr. Cornel West speak at the Kimmel Arena on November 6. She said it is hard to imagine anything more wonderful than 2,600 people coming to a gym on a college campus to listen to a Philosopher!

Dr. Burchard also welcomed our new senator, Dr. Blake Hobby. She thanked him for his willingness to serve with his colleagues in the Faculty Senate.

II. Approval of Minutes:

[October 3, 2013](#)

The minutes were approved without dissent.

**III. Executive Committee Report:
Student Government Report.**

Dr. Melissa Burchard
Mr. Benjamin Judge

Mr. Judge is filling in for Ms. Whittaker. The Student Government is working to create a student-run Diversity Action Group known as ARRAY.

Mr. Judge said he asked to give the Student Government report today since the Faculty Senate was voting on the ILS Curriculum changes. He has been working with faculty members on this for two years, and he has done his best to represent students' view. He knows students who have had to stay extra semesters due to their clusters and intensives, and he believes this framework streamlines the process. He urges the Faculty Senate to pass the legislation.

General Education Council (GEC) Report.

Dr. Kim Brown

The General Education Council (GEC) was appointed by President Ross in consultation with each institution's provost. Dr. Brown is UNC Asheville's representative on the council. The council is split up into several working committees. These working committees are directly addressing what the UNC strategic plan requires. There are five requirements in the strategic plan and there are five corresponding subcommittees. Dr. Brown serves on two of these subcommittees: the CLA subcommittee and the Communications subcommittee.

The CLA subcommittee had to develop an assessment tool that will be used by all UNC universities. UNC Asheville already uses the chosen assessment tool: the revised College Learning Assessment (CLA). Dr. Brown's understanding is the tool would only be used for the identified common core competencies: critical thinking and written communication.

The identification of these two common core competencies came about from the work of the General Education Council. GEC put together an assessment tool/survey that many faculty responded where they were asked to offer what they thought were important competencies. They took that information and reported on the two most prevalent from the data.

There is no intent on the part of GEC to replace anything that universities are doing currently in terms of assessment. Assessment of these two common competencies will be across institutions because the council was mandated to do so. However, all institutions have the latitude to do whatever else they want with other competencies as well as determining their assessment methodologies.

The other work going on at GA is the development of a new revised articulation agreement. The strategic plan mandated that courses seamlessly transfer between universities and from community colleges including early college programs. In essence, a student could attend early college and have all their general education requirements completed before they attend a community college or a university. A series of people have been called to Chapel Hill to work on these courses.

This is work that is separate from the GEC. Dr. Brown doesn't agree that we need common competencies across universities at all. However, the strategic plan mandates this. Although Dr. Brown does not endorse common competencies across universities, she does believe, as a unified front, we should endorse the Faculty Assembly resolution.

Questions:

In relation to the seamless transfer work, Dr. Ray asked how does this work differ from the 44-credit hour core. Was that supposed to be a seamless transfer model?

Dr. Brown said he was correct and they want to expand. Dr. Brown has a great concern about the direction we might take with the curriculum review. Her position has been if we take away some of the more distinct pieces of our curriculum like the intensives and the cluster requirements, we are providing more opportunities for seamless transfer courses and eventually allow courses from anywhere to anywhere.

Associate Provost McClellan said there are some meetings taking place about the community college 30-hour core and 60-hour core. All of the 30-hour core courses must be applicable to the General Education; however, the universities may still have other courses to require as part of their General Education beyond what is core. We have already applied all our 44-hour core rules to students who come to us from early college.

Next week, Associate Provost McClellan will be talking to APC to get their feedback on this 30-hour core. She has been involved with the 30-hour core from the beginning. In regards to the 60-hour core, she has met with some of the department chairs regarding the second 30 hours. They took the eleven most popular majors and asked the faculty to advise these students who may want to go ahead and earn the 60-hour Associate's Degree. They looked at these majors to see if there are general requirements within the major. There is a very important vote taking place today that affects how we do this. She has Plan A and Plan B to address these issues.

Dr. Brown elaborated that since the GEC and the subcommittee regarding seamless transfer credit operate separately, an environment of fear has been created. People feel if we don't do this then someone will impose their version of general education on all universities. All the work has been under very tight deadlines which makes everyone suspicious of what is exactly being done and how it is implemented.

Dr. Hook concurred and further added he didn't know which authority set up all of this nor how these groups are connected.

Dr. Dohse said that the General Administration (GA) set up the GEC. Dr. Dohse is under Faculty Assembly. Faculty Assembly is the UNC system version of our Faculty Senate. Dr. Dohse is our representative who serves. Dr. Brown is on the General Education Council which is very much under the guidance of General Administration. The umbrella from which this work comes under is the 5 year plan that was passed last year. The GEC and Faculty Assembly are two different bodies. GEC comes under GA and is not a subcommittee under the Faculty Assembly. However, since the members of both bodies are faculty, there are connections and communications between these two bodies. GA is the body directing the work of the 5 year plan.

Dr. Ray asked Associate Provost McClellan the percentage of transfer students at UNC Asheville.

Associate Provost McClellan said the percentage of transfer students was within the range of 45-50 percent.

Dr. Ray asked, regarding these 30-hour and 60-hour credit models, is there concern that for the transfer students this work would make us look less distinctive.

Associate Provost McClellan said we have been doing this for years. When the associate provost looks at the 44-hour core and the proposed 30-hour core, these are not very different for our transfer students. UNC Asheville has been taking a “philosophical hold” where the cluster is waived since the transfer student has already taken a natural science, social science and math course. The waiver equates to 30-33 hours of the 44 core hours.

The waiver system was due to a visit back in 2005 from the Vice President of GA. He came to tell them they have received many complaints due to transfers not getting credit for courses taken at the community college. He told UNC Asheville to give transfers more credit due to complaints they had received instead of embedding them in a cluster.

Dr. Ray concluded that we have been doing this all along and there isn’t much change between the 44-hour and the 30-hour model. The Associate Provost nor the Associate Registrar anticipates many changes from the adoption of the 30-hour model.

Dr. Brown relayed again that the GEC members’ fear is not about general education transfer hours. The fear on the part of the General Education Council is the transfer student will come with entry level courses for a major to apply that do not have the foundational information an institution is trying to provide in their entry level courses to a major. This breaks down the foundations departments are trying to provide in each major.

Dr. Cameron also sees many transfers come in with a lot of their general education requirements met that force them to take an unusual number of high level courses in their major before they have foundations leading to failure and burn out. In other majors like computer science, the curriculum builds on the courses that come before, sometimes you can’t take a course until another course is met. As a result, the student takes over four years to complete their degree.

Dr. Betsalel does not see the conflict for we are called universities for knowledge is universal and ease of transfer credit could be an opportunity for students.

Dr. Hook said that there is a loss of community and continuity when moving from one university to another. He agrees with Dr. Cameron regarding majors expecting a progressive expertise, and notes that a transfer student wanting to major in languages might face the same challenge of graduating in four years. Course offerings will also matter for some departments. A transfer student who enters with most general education requirements met still cannot take 3 or 4 Latin/Greek courses per semester, for example, because we do not offer so many. This practice would inevitably delay graduation in many disciplines. He understands how we feel about our distinctiveness, and he assumes that other institutions would feel the same about their curriculum.

Dr. Ray pointed out that it is ironic that we are judged on our ability to retain students, and at the same time, we are trying to make it easier for students to go anywhere.

Dr. Walters asked Dr. Dohse if GA creates this single assessment tool for everyone, essentially is that “No College Child Left Behind,” is that the situation we are left at?

Dr. Dohse said that he does not know where things are going. Dr. Dohse brought it to Suzanne Ortega’s attention that students will be assessed twice which is a waste of time and money. That observation on Dr. Dohse’s part may be a basis for the argument that “one assessment fit all” might not be appropriate.

Dr. Walters is concerned, like “No Child Left Behind,” that these tools could be used to reward or punish colleges.

Dr. Dohse said that is the major concern heard in Faculty Assembly. He does not know at this time if this is a realistic concern or fear-based concern.

Dr. Brown concluded her report relaying CLA's discussion of badges. She has asked how to "badge" a student who graduates from UNC Asheville but a substantial amount of their work was done at another institution. She asked how does a student get "badged" within this "seamless transfer of courses" environment.

Faculty Assembly Executive Committee.

Dr. Til Dohse

This past month the Faculty Assembly has spent their time discussing the new core common learning outcomes. He says it is "pretty much a done deal" that the two core learning outcomes will be writing/communication and critical thinking. Dr. Dohse said that it is important to remember that last year the new five year strategic plan was passed. This strategic plan is very different from years' past due to the very short timelines and the pace is much more rapid than the faculty has had opportunities to digest. However, they have managed to get faculty input in this process which was originally not in the plan. With the faculty input, the two learning outcomes emerged.

The main topic of discussion now is assessment of these two outcomes. Because of the importance of proper implementation, assessment and use of the results, the Faculty Assembly put together a resolution especially to protect the autonomy of the universities, especially the smaller universities. Faculty Assembly is asking for an endorsement or a sense of the senate to approve their resolution.

Basically, the resolution states there are two core learning outcomes – critical thinking and written communication – but the campuses are in charge of the assessment or have a strong input in order that the assessment reflects their campus' mission. Without this resolution, the smaller campuses expressed fear that when we will get the common assessment tool, the Board of Governors will look at it as a grade of the university and shut down the smaller institutions. Dr. Dohse does not believe that will happen to UNC Asheville, but there are some campuses that are very, very concerned. The smaller institutions believe we need to stand up now as one voice of the faculty and step forward to say we would like to keep our autonomy for we are responsible for our curriculum and we need to choose our assessment tools. In order to preempt this outcome, the Faculty Assembly would like all senates to endorse their resolution that they will bring to the General Administration (GA) on December 2 so that GA can bring it before the Board of Governors in early January.

Although the Faculty Assembly resolution was not on the agenda, there is an opportunity to vote on it today.

Dr. Burchard said that the resolution was sent to all Faculty Senate members and this would be included in the discussion of the Faculty Senate's Sense of the Senate Resolution EC 1.

Questions: None

EC 1 Sense of the Senate Resolution on System-wide Core Competencies

Dr. Burchard first presented the Executive Committee's discussion. She brought the Faculty Assembly resolution to the Executive Committee for their consideration. The Faculty Senate received the resolution in emails from Dr. Dohse as well as from Dr. Burchard. [The resolution of the Faculty Assembly](#) is fairly thorough. The resolution states that the Faculty Assembly believes all campuses need to take a strong position in attempting to maintain control over the implementation and the assessment of the core competencies. The reasoning of Faculty Assembly was strongly based on the fact that no one wants this situation. Given we have been mandated these core competencies and assessment of them, the best we could do is provide a united front with regard to maintaining control over the implementation and the assessment of those competencies. Thinking in those terms, the Faculty Assembly drew up a resolution and voted to accept it, and then has asked all campuses to please endorse it through their Faculty Senates.

The Executive Committee studied and discussed the Faculty Assembly resolution. The discussion was whether this resolution was best for UNC Asheville to endorse or a stronger statement/resolution expressing our sense of ownership over our own student learning outcomes, our competencies, and our assessment tools and procedures. The Executive Committee drafted an alternate resolution which they believe expressed a stronger sense of ownership over our own procedures, outcomes, competencies and tools.

The Executive Committee brings both resolutions to the Faculty Senate with a number of options:

- The senate could decide to endorse the resolution from the Faculty Assembly,
- Or instead pass our own sense of the senate resolution,
- Or pass neither of the resolutions,
- Or pass both resolutions.

Dr. Burchard asked for a motion to accept EC 1, the Sense of the Senate Resolution on System-wide Core Competencies so the discussion could be opened on the resolutions. The motion was made by Dr. Roig and it was seconded.

Discussion:

Dr. Fernandes wanted to ask Dr. Brown a question for clarification. Dr. Fernandes was not clear on what the GEC was asked to do and how that relates to the Faculty Assembly resolution. Her understanding is Faculty Assembly wrote this resolution to make a strong statement that campuses are responsible for their own assessment. However, Dr. Brown has said that the GEC will select assessment tools for all the campuses to use. In Dr. Fernandes' mind, that means the campuses are not going to retain any responsibility for assessing written communication and critical thinking. It is going to be dictated by whatever GEC decides. She asked if she is correct in her understanding.

Dr. Brown said yes, that most likely using the CLA but only because that is what the strategic plan says they must do.

What Dr. Fernandes is trying to clearly understand and communicate is we have the Inquiry Arc that is focused on critical thinking. Dr. Russell and several teams of faculty are working quite hard on these assessment plans for critical thinking. The provost doesn't understand how that fits with the GEC's assessment plan. Will we do two assessments, and if so, how will they be aligned?

Dr. Dohse said that was the point he made to Suzanne Ortega that we would be assessing the same learning outcome twice. At the end of their discussion, Dr. Dohse had a glimmer of hope that they won't be quite as strict.

Dr. Kaplan wanted to agree with Dr. Walters that the worst outcome is to have a uniform assessment for all campuses that can be used against individual campuses in the same way he has seen end of course and end of grade assessments used in schools to essentially punish schools that are not "leading." Anything we can do with either resolution, perhaps supporting both of them to support the Faculty Assembly's efforts to prevent that from happening. However, Dr. Kaplan gets the feeling, upon hearing that this is "a done deal," that it doesn't matter what we or the Faculty Assembly or GEC says, we might as well give up?

Dr. Brown doesn't see it that way. Basically, President Ross said we are going to define a couple of core competencies and we are going to assess them with a common assessment. He wanted the committee to figure out what those core competencies are and what the assessments are going to be. GEC has done the job they were given to do, and they passed their results on to the Faculty Assembly. Faculty Assembly endorsed that if we have to pick, these are the core competencies. Now, they are asking the individual campuses to say the same thing. She feels the faculty is saying we do not love this, but we are being forced to do this. If forced, then these two core competencies are okay with us.

Dr. Stratton said the competencies may not be the issue. The assessment can be.

Dr. Ray asked Dr. Brown if a number of campuses offered pushback on the whole thing, is President Ross going to listen? Is GEC going to listen?

Dr. Brown said she alerted the provost of the issue last week that the UNC system community of faculty were reacting to UNC Asheville's "counter resolution." Dr. Brown cautioned Faculty Senate to be careful that we are not fighting amongst ourselves and the importance of a unified front. Since they haven't seen it, Faculty from across the UNC system don't understand what the counter resolution is, and they acknowledge that.

On the other hand, these faculty members wonder why someone would not go ahead and accept Faculty Assembly's resolution with these two competencies when it was a required task and we need to

show that faculty from all campuses agree with these two outcomes. Dr. Brown became concerned of their concern over our “counter” resolution on the table, only because it made us look like we were going against what everyone else had agreed to although that may be the right thing to do. The tone of the emails was such that she did not respond. The only thing that Dr. Brown said was that our Faculty Senate will be addressing this issue at their meeting today and that is all she said.

Dr. Cameron asked if all the other institutions have signed on?

Dr. Dohse said that six have approved. However, most of the senates have not met yet.

Dr. Kaplan asked if any campus rejected it yet?

Dr. Brown and Dr. Dohse said that none of the campuses have rejected the resolution.

Dr. Kaplan asked if any campus offered a counter resolution? No.

Dr. Eggers said what she liked about ours is we don’t disagree. Ours says that we already do this. We already assess learning outcomes, and we reserve the right to determine what our outcomes are and to develop assessment tools. She believes the other campuses might be interested in this language.

Dr. Kormanik said one of his disagreements he has with the Faculty Assembly resolution is in the very last sentence, “Be It Further Resolved That the faculty at the constituent institutions must have primary responsibility for the development and administration of assessment instruments..” Yet, we are being told that we are going to have assessment instruments foisted on us. That is a bit incongruous.

Dr. Hobby asked how many have read the “Our Time, Our Future” document. This document clearly specifies the state will develop enhanced assessments of student learning across campuses. He has read this document many times. His point is it seems clear we are worried about something that we are powerless about in that we will have an assessment. We have some choice over what will be assessed. Perhaps, we will have some input on how it will be assessed. He agrees with Dr. Kormanik where we have a conflict with this last item where we say we want to have control, but we know we are not going to. He is disturbed that we would come up with another document that would not be in solidarity with the other members in the system. That really disturbs him for he believes it is important that the institutions and the faculty to speak with a united voice.

Dr. Burchard asked to respond to Dr. Hobby’s comments. With regard to the strategic plan document itself, “Our Time, Our Future” was passed by the Board of Governors with very little input from faculty from any of the campuses. The Faculty Assembly worked very hard to put together their response incredibly quickly and forwarded it in time to the Board of Governors for their consideration. However, the fact of the matter is they gave it very little consideration. Given the document has been passed, the response in Faculty Assembly has been we still may be able to control a lot of things through implementation. She understands that is the spirit of the Faculty Assembly resolution here.

Dr. Hobby said his fear is if we stand out then we set ourselves up to stand alone. Considering the political climate in which we exist, he thinks it is important to recognize a point of compromise might be helpful to convey our willingness to a reasoned resolution and work with the group.

Dr. Diefenbach offered that if the campuses are allowed to come up with their own assessment tools then GA is less able to compare the campuses. If the institutions are using the same assessment instrument and ratings, then that gives them the ability to compare institutions.

Dr. Burchard concurred and pointed out that both resolutions say that each campus needs to be able to design and implement their own assessment tools. There is complete agreement about that.

Dr. Walters believes that as a starting point in considering any of these resolutions that the Faculty Senate should put aside, at least initially, the consideration of whether or not we have power. We should look at these resolutions to see if we agree with them. If we don’t agree with them, then we should pass a resolution that expresses our defiance in using that. We should be true to our beliefs and not to the idea of the power we have.

Yes, that does make us stand out in defiance. At some point, Dr. Walters believes we will have to stand up and say, “No, that is not acceptable.” We are not McDonalds where you can go through the drive-

thru and order the same food. To him, this is as good a place as any – general education seems to be a place that we all have differing approaches. He would argue that we should put a stake in the ground.

Dr. Hook added “and for other campuses to do the same.” That might be the united front that we prefer. Dr. Hobby said he does not disagree with Dr. Walters at all that there may be a time. He wonders if this is the time. Do we really want to fight over critical thinking and writing skills? He doubts that anyone on this campus would argue that those are really important. Personally, Dr. Hobby, as the Director of Freshman Writing, would be delighted to see our students be tested in any way to see what the writing skills are like at this school. That would be valuable information to him. He would love to make changes in the curriculum based upon what they would learn. He likes our students compared with other schools. He does not have a problem with that. If however, we were told to lose the humanities and go to a general education core that is like every other college in the system, then it would be time to say no. He wonders if this is the right moment.

Dr. Roig said that waiting for that point would be going too far to be able to put the stake in at the later date. Dr. Roig said the key point is that the assessment is our choice as an institution and faculty. Not only the assessment but the competency itself should be determined by this institution. All our resolution is saying is we agree, and in fact, we are already doing this. That is our right as an institution, and we should retain that right. He doesn't think we are being disunited from the rest of the universities. We are just making a stronger statement.

Dr. Bestalel does not find GA's work something to be feared, and perhaps, faculty are overreacting. If we are already a campus of assessment, then we also have to see ourselves as part of a chain of assessment that ultimately goes through to the state and nationally. He believes these are relatively modest instruments. When the tools are not modest or their goals are unrealistic, then that would be the time to push back.

Dr. Cameron expressed concern, as a member of the Inquiry ARC who enjoys that work, that we will be doing the assessments twice which brings added problems when dealing with faculty workload issues. She also is concerned about how this could slowly erode faculty's ownership of the curriculum. She believes this is a legitimate concern and not unrealistic fear. She is supporting both resolutions for she agrees regarding the politics of the matter. She doesn't see the Executive Committee's resolution contradicting the Faculty Assembly one. She believes it strengthens the Faculty Assembly's resolution. Perhaps, the other institutions will agree to do the same.

Stratton is mostly concerned where this all ends. He doesn't have a problem with assessments. That culture has emerged here. His concern has to do with the use of the data. The hope in assessing data and learning outcomes is about making a better curriculum and improving our students learning. However, is it going to be used that way by politicians and the General Administration for whom the Board of Governors are political appointees? That is the concern he has. This is not paranoia but the trend of higher education. In Kansas or Iowa, their assessments are extreme where every single course is assessed for the legislature agreed on common course assessment, which is crazy. If it is simply assessment, he prefers us to have the autonomy to determine how these two core competencies are assessed.

Dr. Fernandes' concern is the integrity of the process. Her viewpoint is our campus has a mission, and we went through a process where we derived learning outcomes that stem directly from that mission. The faculty, departments and teams plan assessments of learning outcomes based on our campus mission because we teach students here who hopefully learn what we say they learn. We use the assessments to demonstrate to ourselves and the North Carolina public that they are learning.

Dr. Fernandes elaborated that the General Administration doesn't have students; they don't have faculty; and they don't have a mission about teaching and learning. So she is uneasy that the General Administration is setting outcomes and assessments. She would feel more comfortable if the General Administration had said the faculty voted on two outcomes: critical thinking and written expression and then asked how many campuses already have identified these as outcomes for your students based on your mission.

Dr. Fernandes said the General Administration should have asked those institutions that do not have these outcomes to consider a process to establish them instead of directing that all campuses will adopt them. Further, they should have asked campuses who have adopted these learning outcomes how they are currently assessing them to see if, in fact, we already conducting adequate assessment and what we can learn from what is already happening. If they wanted to maintain our integrity of our process, they could have designed an inclusive process that would have asserted our responsibility for student learning. She is worried about where this is going, but she acknowledges it may be out of our control. She believes that Dr. Hobby's point is well-articulated that this may not be the place to put the stake in the ground, as Dr. Walters has said. However, she believes this process lacks integrity.

Dr. McKnight thinks the language at the end of the Faculty Assembly's resolution is useful because it says, "the faculty at the constituent institutions must have primary responsibility..." To him, it leaves the door open for some other participation whether it is from the Board of Governors or the General Assembly or whoever can do their own assessment as long as we have primary responsibility for how we assess things. He believes the political point is quite important here. If Dr. Dohse is on the Executive Committee in the Faculty Assembly and they come up with something and he goes back to say we didn't go along with it, Dr. McKnight thinks that is a dangerous message. There is strength in numbers. If we have 100% of the campuses endorsing that our faculties must have primary responsibility, he believes that is a very strong message, and one that we should make.

Dr. Burchard said it seems clear to her that there are good arguments on all sides of this matter and it would be good to make a decision about this. <She is about to call the question.>

Dr. Kormanik asks for and is granted the floor by the chair. Since the chair was about to call for the vote, he had one more comment before she calls the question. A lot of information has been relayed just now that we have not thought about or considered when first looking at the Faculty Assembly resolution and then contrast that with the Executive Committee resolution. An alternative action now is to say we are unable to vote at this time and table the documents until the next senate meeting so we have more time to think.

Dr. Eggers said she agrees with Dr. Cameron in that she supports both documents. She wonders whether we can express our support for both of these documents.

Dr. Galloway and Dr. Roig are not sure you can vote for both. They believe the senate should support one resolution. Dr. Galloway said she believes the documents say different things.

Dr. Eggers disagreed. She said it was more like having a motion to not eat things that are cruelly raised to eat and then have a motion that further supports eating organic vegetables. She feels that EC 1 says we support the Faculty Assembly resolution but go even further. She believes you can vote for both.

The question is called on EC 1.

A Sense of the Senate Resolution EC 1 passes 10-6 and becomes [SSR0113F](#).

Dr. Cameron moves that the Faculty Senate endorse the resolution on [\[2013-11\] Resolution on System-wide Core Competencies Approved by the UNC Faculty Assembly](#) on October 25, 2013. The motion was seconded.

Discussion:

Dr. Kaplan said this gives Dr. Dohse the opportunity to say we have campus support and there is an asterisk that we further believe we are doing that already and this whole thing is ridiculous.

Dr. Dohse was asked if he felt comfortable doing that.

Dr. Dohse said he feels comfortable doing that and he would also like to note that EC 1 goes to the Board of Trustees and the document from the Faculty Assembly goes to the Board of Governors which are two very different groups.

Dr. Galloway asked if this puts a bigger target on us if we say no.

Dr. Dohse said that it creates strange dynamics by standing out in that forum for it would be before President Ross' eye first before it goes to the Board of Governors.

Dr. Burchard said that the Sense of the Senate Resolution is an internal document basically. The question is called.

A Sense of the Senate endorsing the Resolution on System-wide Core Competencies Approved by the UNC Faculty Assembly on October 25, 2013 passes 14-2 and becomes [SSR0213F](#).

[Faculty Assembly Resolution on Faculty Senate Communication with Board of Trustees](#)

Dr. Burchard said there are campuses in the UNC system whose senates do not have any mechanism of communication with their Boards of Trustees. This resolution states that all faculty senates should be able to make a report, either orally or in written form, to their Board of Trustees at their Board of Trustees' meetings.

A motion was made and seconded to accept the resolution.

Discussion:

Dr. McKnight said it was a darn good idea. The response of the other senators indicated to the chair that this resolution was uncontroversial, that Dr. McKnight accurately summed up the majority opinion and the question was called.

A Sense of the Senate accepting the Faculty Assembly Resolution on Faculty Senate Communication with Board of Trustees passed without dissent and becomes [SSR0313F](#).

IV. Academic Policies Committee Report:

Dr. Charles McKnight

First Reading

*[APC 1](#) Liberal Arts Core Implementation Proposal

The Senate intends to waive the Comer Rule to discuss as well as **vote on this document.*

[APC 2](#) Return MUSC 383 to Catalog with Change of Description

[APC 3](#) Delete GERM 115 and 125 from the curriculum

[APC 4](#) Delete EDUC 326 from the curriculum;

Replace EDUC 326 with PSYC 319 in the Elementary School (K-6) licensure area

[APC 5](#) Change MATH 192 to a pre- or corequisite in ATMS 305, Atmospheric Thermodynamics and Statics; Change course description and add ATMS 305 as a pre- or corequisite to ATMS 320, Meteorological Instruments

Dr. McKnight first covered APC 2 – APC 5 are up for first reading. These are mostly minor changes in catalog copy which were unanimously accepted by APC. He urged the senators to read and study them at their leisure.

Dr. McKnight then moved to bring APC 1 off the table and requested to once again to waive the Comer Rule so that the Faculty Senate may discuss and vote on APC 1 today. The motion was seconded.

No discussion on the motion.

The motion to bring APC off the table and waive the Comer Rule in order to discuss and vote on the document passed without dissent.

Discussion:

Dr. McKnight began the discussion by saying that APC 1 was also a darn good idea.

Since the laughter indicated the senate would discuss this document, Dr. McKnight drew the senators' attention to the grid that begins on page 8. He said that nothing much has changed since last month. They have refined the language some. Everything that precedes the grid is introductory in nature to tell us how we got to this and why it is important. Also he has talked with many people around campus and received written communication from a department. Since all urge the senate to pass this as soon as possible, the time has come to say yes this is what we want to do.

Dr. Burchard agreed with Dr. McKnight in that whatever the senate decides to do with the document,

the senate should make the decision today to vote the document up or down, one way or the other. We shouldn't say we need to tinker with it more. We need to make a decision.

Dr. McKnight concurred with Dr. Burchard. Not to say this document is ideal or fully complete, there are other things to address like the major hour limit, which APC and the senate will take up as a separate issue. In the past weeks, APC has had talks about how HWP (Health and Wellness) fits and they may address HWP in future documents. There is plenty of work to do. APC 1 provides a general framework.

Dr. Ray concurred that this is a general framework. Dr. Ray, as chair of the Health and Wellness Department, wanted to publicly thank Dr. Hobby, Dr. Bond, Dr. McKnight and APC for taking the time to integrate HWP at this level. He also restated Dr. McKnight's comments concerning this is not the definitive list. We do intend to lead in the Health and Wellness area. We do intend to take this framework and do some creative things that no other institution is doing. He is asking for the faculty's support as we move forward in those conversations.

Dr. McKnight concurred that we will do some seriously creative things in regards to Health and Wellness incorporation.

Dr. Cameron does support the document. However, she wants it as a matter of record that the Faculty Senate acknowledges there is a shift of work onto the department chairs and the deans. She is not putting that out there to vote against APC 1. She contends that we are giving up a degree of ownership by giving up some oversight. She wants this on the record that we understood, discussed and acknowledged this shift so when somebody asks why are the deans in control over this or what happened to faculty ownership of this, the record will show this shift of ownership was intentional.

Dr. Roig generally agrees with the document. However, he does have one question. If we are in fact moving the information literacy and the writing intensives to the department, do we really need separate coordinators? And more importantly, do we want to give those coordinators approval rights? Dr. Roig has been serving on the Information Literacy subcommittee for a while, and the approval process is a long and difficult process. He is not sure that is a burden for one person to bear. It puts them in a difficult position. He can see the need for a coordinator from a consulting standpoint to help departments, but he is concerned about the approval process. If they approve the framework with these words, will the senate be locking themselves in that framework?

Dr. McKnight understands the basic idea is the coordinators will not necessarily be working alone, may call for help from colleagues, and there would be more eyes than just two. Another concern is when SACS comes along and says okay you have this – how is it assessed, how are the criteria controlled and how is the quality across the campus insured, at least to some extent?

Dr. Roig feels on one hand we are saying this is now the department's responsibility, and on the other hand, we are saying no its not.

Dr. McKnight believes we are saying on the one hand this will be the department's responsibility, and on the other hand, here are some guidelines to help you.

Dr. Roig said UNC Asheville has been doing this for a long time. As we have the guidelines, he wonders whether we need to continue the faculty oversight.

Dr. Cameron and Dr. McKnight believe the coordinator can see what is going on across the departments and across the university.

Dr. Bond hears there isn't enough work for the coordinators, and on the other hand, there is too much work for one person. She wonders perhaps the coordinators are the answer to help in this transition. The coordinator may be a temporary position during this transition to the new curriculum. Later, we assess whether the departments can do this themselves and whether these positions are necessary.

Dr. Roig's point is the approval process is a time consuming process. He doesn't have a problem having the coordinators as consultants, and feels that is a good idea. As approvers, that is where his concern is.

Dr. Hobby wonders perhaps this is an area where more work will need to be done as APC documents are created. He asked where would the recording of these jobs and the approval process go for he does

believe this needs to be worked out. He agrees with Dr. Roig where he likes collaboration and does not like the position of overseers.

Dr. Kormanik also agrees with Dr. Roig and suggests to remove the word “approves” in those instances. As a friendly amendment, Dr. Kormanik moved to remove the word “approves” from the coordinators’ descriptions which are found on the numbered items 1, 2, 3, and 4 on page 10 of the proposal.

Dr. McKnight said the friendly amendment is accepted.

Dr. McKnight advised to have the description match the grid which does not mention approval, it only mentions helping out.

Dr. Walters asked what happens if a department develops a diversity intensive that was pretty lame.

Dr. McKnight says we have guidelines to prevent that.

Dr. Burchard says we do have a Liberal Arts Core Oversight Committee that could be bumped up if there are objections.

Dr. Mathews wanted to ask a question about the scientific perspectives block on page 9 of the grid. It is not clear to Dr. Mathews if these courses would have to be coming from the natural sciences. It says various disciplines, but it doesn’t specify natural or social science.

Dr. McKnight said it could be lots of things. Three or four weeks ago, APC did have a specific list of prefixes that might be appropriate. In our discussions, we decided that the list would be too limiting so the list was removed.

Dr. Mathews asked a follow-up question regarding the oversight of the scientific perspectives. It says in the grid that “The Natural and Social Science Department Chairs and the Deans of Natural and Social Sciences will determine the list of courses collaboratively and approve...” This doesn’t map nicely with the oversight table that is on page 12. This gets back to faculty workload. If she understands it correctly, one of the motivations for moving to the new curriculum is reducing faculty workload, especially on the oversight level to get rid of the Intensive Oversight Committees that many have been involved. As she understands page 12, we have the current ILS Oversight on the lefthand column and then the Liberal Arts Core Oversight on the right. However, the inclusion of those chair positions does not appear on the right hand side column of the table on page 12. Thus, the stated reduction in faculty oversight from 61 positions to 16 does not seem to be accurate. Can someone speak to that?

Dr. Krumpe said much of the conversation about that particular issue on APC differentiated approval of courses versus oversight where oversight is ongoing. There will be upfront work to come up with that list and periodically there might be additional courses that a department from anywhere on campus may want to propose. They would go through the two deans who would convene the chairs to review the list. It doesn’t map nicely for oversight isn’t like the clusters were in terms of ongoing. Historically, once a course has been added to the list, it stays there until the department wants to get rid of it. We don’t renew them so they do not need continued oversight.

Dr. Mathews wanted to express her concern, which was Dr. Cameron’s earlier point, about this shift in oversight responsibility from the faculty, which we all acknowledge is a burden in terms of time and energy. However, it seems to Dr. Mathews there is a significant shift in control over what counts and doesn’t to the department chairs and to the deans. If we are ok with that, so be it. Personally, Dr. Mathews is not comfortable with that idea. She likes distributive oversight. As a faculty member, she likes having a voice over what is happening to our curriculum on campus.

To speak to Dr. Mathews’ point, Dr. Walters asked to speak. When he came to UNC Asheville fifteen years ago, he was hired as chair. He had several mentors assigned to him during the first year. They had a discussion about whether chairs were administrators or faculty members. They were pretty adamant that we were faculty members first with an administrative assignment. He doesn’t think regarding chairs as administrators is scary since they are teaching three classes each semester. To him, the deans are the primary contacts who call the meetings, but there is enough faculty in the room who have served as chairs to prevent losing control of the curriculum.

The question is called.

Dr. Kormanik called a point of order reminding the prior meeting's motion for a ballot vote.

Ballots were distributed. The chair instructed the senators to vote either "Aye" or "Nay."

The Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant counted the ballots and reported the result to the chair.

The chair announced that APC 1 passed without dissent and became [SD0713F](#).

Dr. Burchard took a moment to thank APC, and Dr. Bond and Dr. Hobby especially, for their work to make the proposal something that everyone could agree. This is wonderful work. She also thanked everyone on the senate for taking this seriously and making sure that it is a document "we could live with."

V. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee:

Dr. Brian Hook

First Reading

- [FWDC 7](#) Clarification to Procedures for Faculty Personnel Review (Faculty Handbook sections [3.3](#), [3.5](#), [3.7](#))
- [FWDC 8](#) Defining Faculty Teaching Workload (Faculty Handbook [Section 3.1](#), [SD2799S](#))
- [FWDC 9](#) Replacement of Radiation Safety Committee and Lab Safety Committee with Scientific Lab Committee (Faculty Handbook Section [10.4.32](#))
- [FWDC 10](#) Restructure and Renaming of Campus Safety and Health Committee to Environmental Health and Safety Committee (Faculty Handbook Section [10.4.13](#))

FWDC is bringing four documents for first reading. The Clarification to Procedures for Faculty Personnel Review (FWDC 7) is clarifying how the new annual peer review of teaching is incorporated into the Post Tenure Review process.

Defining Faculty Teaching Workload (FWDC 8) is primarily a response to UNC policy manual requirements to define faculty teaching workload. You might remember the scandal at UNC about academic credit being given to athletes. From that emerged certain requirements to respond to that.

The last two FWDC documents (FWDC 9 and FWDC 10) essentially create a scientific lab committee as well as restructuring and renaming the campus Safety and Health Committee. These documents are again in response to Federal regulations. We have to have an Environmental Health and Safety Committee. We had something like that but it wasn't functional. We have to have one that is functional because when there are reviews we have to provide minutes and documents of meetings, etc. Those could have been a single document and need to be read together. However, since they were made by two separate committees, we made two documents. Now the committee reports to the new Environmental Health and Safety Committee.

Second Reading

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

The document up for second reading is the revision to procedures for faculty grievance. This document changes grievance mediation from being mandatory to optional. The reason mediation was made mandatory initially was due to a misreading of the initial UNC policy. [The UNC Policy](#) states "the faculty grievance committee shall refer the matter for mediation in accordance with the policies of the constituent institution." We had read that as it *has* to be referred to mediation. However, the next paragraph says, "Each constituent institution will have a policy either that requires.." mediation or not, basically. FWDC 6 corrects that misreading to make mediation optional rather than mandatory.

A motion to accept was made and seconded.

Discussion:

Dr. Galloway asked if there was a time limit specified in the policies and whether this document addresses that. On the last grievance committee she served, there was an issue carried over for more than two semesters. Mediation was called for the first semester. Mediation did not happen due to numerous scheduling issues. Three semesters later, outside legal counsel got involved and they never did the mediation. She was wanting to have a friendly amendment considered.

Dr. Hook said this document does not address anything in regards to when mediation is chosen.

Dr. Hook and Dr. Kaplan said that FWDC would be happy for Dr. Galloway to come to an FWDC meeting to look at this and propose a future document rather than to try to address this concern in this document.

The question was called.

FWDC passed without dissent and became [SD0813F](#).

VI. Institutional Development Committee:

Dr. Gregg Kormanik

[IDC Report](#)

VII. Administration/Academic Affairs:

Dr. Jane Fernandes

Nothing to report.

VIII. Old Business.**IX. New Business.****X. Adjourn**

Dr. Burchard adjourned the meeting at 5:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by: Lisa Sellers
Executive Committee