

University of North Carolina at Asheville  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
Minutes, December 5, 2013 (3:15 pm)

Senate

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

Excused: L. Bond, B. Hobby.

Unexcused: K. Betsalel

Visitors: G. Ashburn, J. Brown, P. Catterfeld, J. Crave, L. Dohse, W. Kirby, E. Katz, J. Konz, K. Krumpel, P. McClellan, D. Miller, H. Parlier, D. Race, A. Shope, W. Strehl, D. Weldon.

**I. Call to Order and Celebratory News:**

Dr. Burchard called the last Faculty Senate meeting of Fall 2013 semester to order.

**II. Approval of Minutes:**

[November 7, 2013](#)

The minutes were approved without dissent.

**III. Executive Committee Report:**

Dr. Melissa Burchard

Dr. Burchard has kept her remarks brief since the Executive Committee's (EC) discussion is included in the subcommittee reports. She did mention there were some changes in the Carnegie Classifications. The classification descriptions have been "broken out" with more details. She is concerned that UNC and UNC Asheville's policies may need to be revised to bring them in line with those changes. Dr. Burchard will bring this up at Faculty Assembly.

Faculty Assembly Executive Committee.

Dr. Lothar Dohse

Dr. Dohse thanked the Faculty Senate for passing Sense of the Senate resolution [SSR0213F](#) in support of the Faculty Assembly's Resolution on System-wide Core Competencies. All sixteen university campuses passed and endorsed the resolution. He hopes faculty will have more input regarding the assessment of student outcomes which is still in negotiations. They are saying that most likely the university will work with the Educational Testing Service (ETS) to come up with a homegrown assessment plan.

There were two resolutions at the last Faculty Assembly he felt were important to bring before the Faculty Senate. One was regarding a misunderstanding of a memorandum that the General Administration had sent. Some of the campuses interpreted the memo in such a way that they redefined full-time status so that full-time faculty who were not tenure track were cut out of a course or two in order to cut benefits. The Faculty Assembly wanted to stand by their faculty and say this should not be a practice.

The second resolution is in regards to program closings. Program closings should be reviewed and allowed faculty input to determine the affects to general education. They are particularly concerned about physics and foreign languages which are programs that many times are closed due to the lack of majors in them.

Dr. Dohse also drew the senate's attention to the [Faculty Assembly flyer](#) he sent out. He will send out the final drafts of the above described resolutions when they become available.

**IV. Academic Policies Committee Report:**

Dr. Charles McKnight

**First Reading**

- [APC 6](#) Change the course number of ECE 406 to ECE 310; Change the title of ECE 455
- [APC 7](#) Delete ECE 460 and EGM 482 from the catalog
- [APC 8](#) Change prerequisites for EGM 484
- [APC 9](#) Edit the requirements for the Mechatronics concentration
- [APC 10](#) Add two new courses to the Management curriculum: MGMT 423, Seminar in Public Management and Leadership MGMT 424, Seminar in Organizational Power and Politics
- [APC 11](#) Add Study Abroad as an option for Management majors
- [APC 12](#) Add New Software Courses: MATH 242 and STAT 242
- [APC 13](#) Change the description and increase the credit hours of MATH 480; Editorial changes to requirements for the Mathematics major
- [APC 14](#) Change titles and descriptions of STAT 321 and STAT 326
- [APC 15](#) Delete MCOM 295, and replace with MCOM 293, 294 and 295; Delete MCOM 395, and replace with MCOM 393, 394 and 395; and Delete MCOM 495, and replace with MCOM 491, 495 and 496
- [APC 16](#) Delete VMP295, and replace with VMP 293, 294 and 295; Delete VMP 395, and replace with VMP 393, 394 and 395; and Delete VMP 495, and replace with VMP 491, 495 and 496
- [APC 17](#) Delete MCOM 451, renumbering to MCOM 351
- [APC 18](#) Edit major requirements for Mass Communication
- [APC 19](#) Change the descriptions and credit hours for WGSS 100, 365 and 400
- [APC 20](#) Remove the Concentration Designations from the list of WGSS Electives
- [APC 21](#) Change the Description of the Women, Gender and Sexuality; Studies Program; Delete the Concentrations in the Women, Gender and Sexuality Studies Program
- [APC 22](#) Add Directed Research courses to the MLA curriculum
- [APC 23](#) Change the name of Master of Liberal Arts to Master of Liberal Arts and Sciences
- [APC 24](#) Delete PSYC 332 and PSYC 366 from the curriculum
- [APC 25](#) Add new 3-Credit PSYC Non-lab Course, PSYC 311;  
Add new 4-Credit PSYC Lab Course, PSYC 347
- [APC 26](#) Delete PSYC 313, Psychology and Law, and replace it with PSYC 343, a 4-hour Psychology Lab Course
- [APC 27](#) Change Listing of Lab Courses for Major and Minor in Psychology;  
Change in Procedure for Declaration of Major in Psychology
- [APC 28](#) Edit the course description, title and prerequisite for MGMT 388
- [APC 29](#) Add new course: ENVR 290 Regional Field Geology
- [APC 30](#) Delete ENVR 315 from the curriculum
- [APC 31](#) Add new advanced ecology electives for ENVR students: ENVR 347, Fish Ecology, and ENVR 396, Woody Plants in Winter

For first reading, Dr. McKnight presented for the senate's "reading pleasure" APC documents 6-31. They all were unanimously passed by APC and he believes they are self-explanatory.

## Second Reading

- [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

Up for second reading, Dr. McKnight covered APC 2 – APC 5. All were passed by APC unanimously. He presented each document and called for its vote individually.

APC 2 returns MUSC 383, Music Industry and Business II, to the catalog. This course was sunsetted a couple of years ago because they did not have the faculty resources to keep it going. They now have the resources, and there is a great student demand for the course so they request its return to the catalog. There was a motion to accept APC 2 which was seconded. No discussion.

APC 2 passed without dissent and became SD1013F.

APC 3 deletes two German courses from the curriculum. He believes their rationale clearly explains why. There was a motion made to accept APC 3 which was seconded.

**Discussion:** Dr. Burchard asked for clarification of the meaning of the passage “they implemented a proficiency based communicative approach in all levels of instruction. Courses that focus on just one skill area do not fit in this sequence of instruction.”

Dr. Strehl said in order to fulfill the language requirement, you need to be able to speak, read and write a language. This course only focuses on reading and writing.

APC 3 passed without dissent and became SD1113F.

APC 4 deletes EDUC 326, which is replaced with PSY 319. Dr. Crave represents the Education Department at this meeting since Dr. Brown could not be present. There was a motion to accept APC 4 which was seconded.

**Discussion:** Dr. Crave said that the decision to eliminate EDUC 326 was based on two reasons. One, Dr. Kim Brown, who created and taught this course, is now chair of the department and thus has reduced teaching capacity. They found that the topics covered in this course were being taught in PSY 319 so this is a duplication. They found PSY 319 to be more efficient and gave students more interdisciplinary approaches within the department.

Dr. Walters asked if the Psychology Department concurred with this and can they create a section to accommodate. Dr. Crave said yes; there was an additional section created.

Dr. McKnight expressed it was his understanding that employers would find it helpful to see the PSY prefix rather than another EDUC course.

Dr. Crave concurred and said the PSY course is exploring content above and beyond assessment, which is their primary objective.

Dr. Ray asked if the Psychology Department was prepared to handle this long-term.

Dr. Crave said their understanding is yes, they can handle it long-term with the additional section.

Dr. Kormanik asked if APC saw a concurrence document from the Psychology Department, and Ms. Shope and Dr. McKnight said yes.

APC 4 passed without dissent and became SD1213F.

APC 5 is a change in co- or pre- requisites. A motion was made to accept APC 5 which was seconded. No discussion.

APC 5 passed without dissent and became SD1313F.

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

Dr. Hook said FWDC did not have any documents for first reading.

This year, one of FWDC's commitments is to look at committees and service. He had hoped to have a discussion at this meeting. However, this complex work is not ready to bring before the Faculty Senate. He did want the Senate to know that it has not "fallen off the table." FWDC is still considering the best way to solve this proliferating service demand on all faculty. They will bring the service proposal to the Faculty Senate next semester, Spring 2014.

**Second 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 brought four documents for second reading.

FWDC 7 is a Clarification of Procedures for Faculty Personnel Review. There are two parts of the document. The main idea is clarifying how the new annual peer review of teaching is incorporated into the Post Tenure Review process. Also clarifies who gathers the teaching evaluations and who delivers them.

A motion was made to accept FWDC 7 which was seconded.

**Discussion:** A dialogue began between Dr. Kormanik and Dr. Hook concerning the timing of this document's implementation. There was concern of implementing in the middle of Post Tenure Reviews (PTRs). FWDC said this document is trying to avoid issues by making it clear that the annual peer review cannot be the only review done. The annual peer review (if one exists) is to be incorporated into the PTR evaluation.

Dr. Burchard read the document, "Failure of the evaluatee to provide materials for his or her dossier in a timely fashion may result in sanctions imposed by the Provost." Dr. Burchard asked what the sanctions would be. Dr. Fernandes said she did not know what the sanctions would be since she has never been asked to do that. Dr. Burchard feels sanctions need to be specified in the Faculty Handbook.

Dr. Kaplan said an alternative is to remove the language about the sanctions from the Faculty Handbook.

Dr. Hook called the question.

FWDC 7 passed without dissent and became SD1413F.

Defining Faculty Teaching Workload (FWDC 8) is primarily a response to the added regulations following the UNC athletes' scandal several years ago. We are required to have in place policies regarding the number of independent studies that any faculty member can teach in any semester as well as discretionary reassigned time.

Motion was made to accept FWDC 8 which was seconded.

**Discussion:**

Dr. Burchard asked to step out of the chair in order to participate in this discussion. Dr. McKnight, who is the Faculty Senate's First Vice-Chair, was asked, as is the protocol, to become chair of the Faculty Senate for this item of business.

Dr. Walters has a question concerning [Section 3.1.4.1.1](#) regarding the definition of Full-time in FWDC 8:

"A full-time teaching assignment is 24 contact hours per academic year, after accounting for any reassigned time approved by Academic Affairs, in 8 or more organized course sections as defined by the Delaware Study..."

This raises questions for any department who has gone to the 4 credit hour course model. Is that definition problematic for us?

Dr. Hook agreed that it could possibly be. FWDC did have a discussion about it and deferred to Dr. Konz, author of FWDC 8, to explain the changes to this section.

The “8 organized course sections” rule is not an internal definition of faculty workload but is an external faculty workload definition. This requirement can be met with 4-hour courses, as Dr. Konz shared with his department chairs, if one-third (that is, one of the three courses) of a faculty member's offerings are divided into two OCS - Organized Course Sections like lecture/lab, lecture/recitation or some other combination. This would result in a faculty member teaching 4 organized course sections totaling 12 hours a semester (8 organized course sections a year for a total of 24 hours a year).

Dr. Burchard also had a question regarding the internal requirement of 24 hours per academic year we have set for ourselves. She wonders why continue to tie ourselves to this requirement when it is not an external requirement. She believes adjusting this requirement would provide flexibility that faculty do not currently have and need due to the changes in the faculty reassigned time policy. She is very concerned about the faculty's overall workload.

According to UNC policy and our own handbook, there are clear statements that instructional workload is much more than the credit hours and contact hours that faculty teach. Dr. Burchard called the senate's attention to [Section 3.1 of the Faculty Handbook](#) which defines instructional workload to include other activities in addition to teaching. We also have scholarship, scholarly creative activity and service, all are requirements for workload.

Overall, Dr. Burchard is suggesting, instead of tying ourselves to 24 hours per year, Faculty Senate should think about their overall workload and come up with ways that we can be more flexible in accounting for the workload.

Dr. Hook said that this document addresses a specific response that we are required to make by the UNC system. Dr Hook said that what was taken out was to be more accurate of what reassigned time might be given, not a reduction of reassigned time.

Dr. Burchard replied that this document has many things taken out that were in the previous policy. Dr. Burchard highlighted the following which has been taken out of the policy:

- Course/curriculum development
- Professional development for enhanced teaching effectiveness
- Technology training for instruction
- Participation in UNC Asheville's distinctive-emphasis programs
- Heavy load - academic advising
- Scholarship and scholarly or creative activity
- Institutionally-supported research

Dr. Konz said the list in the new policy is a list of the formally-assigned reassigned time that comes from the deans and the provost for specific purposes, often for administration and accreditation. When he drafted this document and pared down the list, it seemed misleading to have a list that we actually have never granted formally-assigned reassigned time.

Dr. Burchard asked if this document passes, does it tell us what we can use for reassigned time.

Dr. Konz said that it does list things you can ask for reassigned time.

The language of the discretionary reassigned time was referring to that which was allocated to the departments in the past. The departments had the discretion on how to allocate. Academic Affairs has the discretion to provide reassigned time upon request through the formal process. However, the existence of discretionary reassigned time at the department level is no longer a reality. Dr. Konz said he thinks it is unfortunate, but he does not want people to read in the Faculty Handbook that we normally have reassigned time when normally we don't any longer.

Dr. Walters said the last few words “any longer” are key. Dr. Walters asked whether we are formalizing a permanent change to a document that is supposed to stand for years for a temporal situation? While right now we are not receiving discretionary reassigned time, is this forever?

Dr. Konz said that he knows that Dr. Fernandes wishes we could get back to this, but that is not on the horizon. The new reality regarding reassigned time has been in place long enough for policies to not reflect an aspiration or nostalgia for that which we use to have.

Dr. Walters asked for a clear statement from the administration that we are never going back because we are being told how much we would love to go back.

Dr. Fernandes replied that she is not prepared to say ‘never.’ She does not have a crystal ball and she cannot foresee or control what happens. She will say what she knows for sure. When she started at UNC Asheville in 2008, the Board of Governors standard teaching load for UNC Asheville faculty was 4-4, exactly the same as it is now. There has been no official increase teaching load. We are experiencing an increase because we were teaching far below the 4-4 standard. She understood from conversations with General Administration officials back in 2008 that we were under the gun because we were so far below.

This happened for many reasons. One, in part, was that we were very liberal in awarding time reassigned from teaching. The work on *Delivering the Curriculum* allowed us to understand and document the many ways that faculty received time reassigned from teaching. The UNC Board of Governors has made it crystal clear we have a 4-4 teaching standard and we are expected to teach to it. President Ross has been explicitly clear we may not go below 4-4. In spite of the Provost’s conviction that this teaching load is too high, she does not see when or how it will change any time in the near future. That doesn’t mean that we cannot be creative as we are being with the undergraduate research as teaching proposal, but it does mean we will not be giving discretionary reassigned time to departments as liberally as we did prior to 2008-09. The Board of Governors is clear about what they expect from us at the current time and it is not negotiable.

Dr. Walters said that historically full-time is 24 hours with reassigned time. By limiting the reasons, are we limiting our options unnecessarily?

Dr. Burchard said she agreed with Dr. Walters. For example, the only reassigned time for research is if that research is externally funded. That seems unnecessarily restrictive. There are lots of opportunities for reassigned time for service, and she is completely behind that. It seems to her we should have clear statements about our support for teaching and research as well.

Dr. Ray said that he had an example of internally funded research that allows for reassigned time. Many know that the North Carolina Center for Health and Wellness awards three or four area focus grants each year to an interdisciplinary team of faculty. One option we give them is they can ask for a stipend or reassigned time. If they ask for reassigned time then a portion of that money is diverted over to pay for an adjunct. That is something that we have been able to do and he wonders if this document would continue to allow that. Perhaps, there are cases when having additional money to pay for an adjunct is not feasible, but it makes sense for that person to have reassigned time.

Dr. Kormanik agreed this document shouldn’t limit the opportunities for reassigned time because of the examples that have been stated as well as his personal experience. As an example of his personal experience from this semester, he saw an adjunct contract for \$56,000.00 to teach one course and he thought that amount could have supported a number of adjuncts. He gets concerned when he hears there are certain limitations that may or may not be there. Also, when he looks at the documents that show contact hours of faculty, he gets concerned when he sees one department has twice the number of contact hours of another department of similar size. There seems to be latitude in the way we count things that we all must not be aware. He would like to see all of us take best advantage of all the things we are able to do for our benefit.

Dr. Fernandes noted that the General Administration requested approval of rationales (a), (b), and (c) in FWDC 8 by September 2013. She requested an extension until December 2013 to allow time for the Senate review process to work. We need to approve the changes in response to mandated additions to the Academic Integrity policy.

Dr. Walters said that FWDC 8 includes more than what has been mandated.

Dr. Eggers suggested to amend the document by striking Item (d) and the reassigned time sections in order to pass the mandated changes today. In addition, Dr. Konz said to remove the summary, the rationale and the changes in 3.1.4.1.4. That will leave what is needed to address the changes that the UNC policy mandated, and the rest we can revisit.

Dr. Hook agreed to a later discussion on reassigned time and another separate discussion about counting overall workload in regards to the 24-hour rule of defining full-time status.

For the Faculty Senate's information, Dr. Cameron looked up the Delaware study on her laptop just now and it says you can divide by 4 if there are 4 credit hours not 3.

Dr. Fernandes said that adherence to the Delaware Study is legislated by the General Assembly and required of us by the Board of Governors. All UNC institutions are required by the Board of Governors to adhere to the Delaware study. When she started in 2008, we were required to adhere to it, but we were not doing so. Our faculty teaching load was significantly below 4-4. For whatever reason, the faculty was allowed a very liberal practice of reassigned time with it coming from a number of different sources. Early in her tenure as provost, she was told by the General Administration Vice President for Academic Affairs that we would have to comply with the Board of Governors teaching load standard. We all are aware that current circumstances have changed drastically and all UNC campuses are being held accountable for complying with the Board of Governors standard teaching load. She wants to make it clear that she does not anticipate any reduction in the expected teaching load. However, that does not mean we have to change the *Handbook* in regards to what it states about reassigned time.

Assistant Provost McClellan asked to speak in regards to the Delaware Study and the way the General Administration defines faculty workload. The General Administration has added interpretations to the understanding of what an organized course section means. She is now in the process of going back and forth to understand definitions. For example, they do not let us count internships, student teaching, research courses, or practica as organized course sections. Since 2002, when the Delaware Study started, the Board has gotten more concerned about faculty teaching load. They are tightening things up and holding us strictly accountable. The pressure from the General Administration is not letting up on the expected faculty workloads. Academic Affairs has had 53 requests from the General Administration this semester alone for additional information and data beyond the standard inquiries. One result of this is that we now need to limit independent studies taught by faculty. If you read *The News and Observer*, you know why this came to be.

The chair stated we have a motion on the floor and asked for friendly amendments to the motion.

Dr. Hook stated the friendly amendment he heard is accepted, and the motion now is to consider (a), (b), and (c) without (d), and then on the second page, strike the entire 3.1.4.1.4 faculty reassigned time section. The changed motion was made and seconded. There was a vote taken to accept the amended motion. The amendment was accepted. The question was called.

FWDC 8 passed 13-1 and became SD1513F.

Both FWDC 9 and FWDC 10 were brought to FWDC by David Weldon, the Director of Emergency Management who was present to answer questions. Dr. Hook enjoyed working with David and appreciated his responding to every request promptly.

FWDC 9 creates a committee that answers to the committee created in FWDC 10. FWDC 9 creates the Scientific Lab Committee which replaces both the Radiation Safety Committee and Lab Safety Committee. FWDC noted the large number of faculty on the committee. However, this was done in consultation with Dr. Krumpe and all departments who have labs on campus. All those associated with labs wanted representation on this committee. FWDC thought it was important that this committee didn't become a 4 member committee where a few departments were represented who would make decisions for other departments.

Dr. Hook asked for a motion to accept FWDC 9. The motion was made and seconded.

**Discussion:** Dr. Kormanik expressed an issue with the name of the committee. He would not call it "Scientific Lab Committee." Lab Safety Committee would be fine with the understanding that Lab could represent preparatory areas for drama and health and wellness as well. He thinks it is limiting to say

“Scientific Lab Committee,” given its makeup. He would hope FWDC would accept his suggestion as a friendly amendment unless there is another alternative name that they think is more descriptive.

Dr. Krumpke said the name does not matter to him.

Out of concern for faculty workload, Dr. Kormanik also sees there are 12 people on the committee and feels some of this is unnecessary like there are two members from Biology. If so, will there be two members from the Chemistry department?

Dr. Krumpke said there is one representative per department. They included both lab managers because they are involved in lab safety. All members of this committee are safety liaisons where they communicate information back to their departments and bring information from their department to the committee, ultimately through to the overarching safety committee. Dr. Krumpke said this is not creating a significant workload for people. Initially, all members will have a workload. Once the initial work is done, the workload should not be significant, and the members become a conduit for information flowing to their departments.

Mr. Weldon said this an opportunity to catch academic information and add it to our overall safety program. The number of members and the structure is intentional.

The question was called.

Dr. Hook asked if the Faculty Senate was in favor of the changes of the Lab Safety Committee.

FWDC 9 was approved with changes and became SD1613F.

In regards to FWDC 10, Mr. Weldon relayed that the Department of Health said the Safety Committee is a committee we have to have up and running on campus with a mission to look at the broad spectrum of safety issues that affect our university. They are asking for four administrative affiliates to run this committee so they can be assured it is running. Environmental Health and Safety, his department, has the responsibility to assure that committee convenes at least twice a year. This is an opportunity to get information from the academic areas and have this committee review our safety manuals to make sure we are up to date.

Dr. Hook asked for a motion to accept FWDC 10. The motion was made and seconded. No Discussion.

The question was called.

FWDC 10 passed without dissent and became SD1713F.

At the conclusion of FWDC’s business, Dr. McKnight yielded “the Chair” back to Dr. Burchard.

## **VI. Institutional Development Committee:**

Dr. Gregg Kormanik

[IDC Report](#)

[UPC Minutes](#)

### **Discussion:**

In regards to inquiries as to why we acquire more property, Dr. Kormanik said that UNC Asheville is landlocked. In order to add additional facilities and provide opportunities, we need more space. Buying property is complex for an institution because the land may not become available when you have the money or vice versa. We have to take advantage of opportunities when they arise. Properties that are acquired may lie fallow for a while until a decision is made in the Master Plan, a change in the Direction of the Institution or the funding is available.

Dr. Fernandes added if UNC Asheville doesn’t take advantage of opportunities, someone else may do something with the property that may not be advantageous to the University. We are protecting our University by acquiring and thus controlling what is done with property that is contiguous to it.

While Dr. Walters would agree that is a good reason, he finds it funny, in light of what the Faculty Senate was just talking about concerning reassigned time. In that discussion, we said we see nothing coming in the future when we would have discretionary reassigned time. He doesn’t see anything in the future that is



going to give us land either, but we seem to be acting as if it will. He is not certain why those two things have different criteria. Dr. Burchard said that was her sense of it too.

Dr. Fernandes said that in all cases of recent purchases of land, the money has been appropriated to us for that purpose. It is not as if we have the money sitting there and we decide to buy land rather than doing something else. If we don't buy the land for which the money was appropriated, we will lose the money. It is not available to support reassigned time or other benefits.

Dr. Burchard asked if UNC Asheville asks for the money.

"Yes, in some cases, to protect the University, we ask for the money," Dr. Fernandes replied, "and in some cases, we get asked."

Dr. Kormanik concludes his report.

## **VII. Administration/Academic Affairs:**

Dr. Jane Fernandes

### **Counting Undergraduate Research as Teaching.**

Dr. Fernandes reported that President Ross and the General Administration approved our proposal to count undergraduate research as teaching. Our UNC Asheville Board of Trustees will learn about this development at a meeting tomorrow. The Provost expressed deep appreciation to our Board for taking an active role in endorsing our proposal and advocating for its approval. She also thanked Chancellor Ponder for her help and support in getting the proposal developed and approved. Thanks to their efforts, we will begin counting students in the UGR 499 course this spring. If/when the MLA 599 is developed, we will be able to count that as well. She sees this as a small win, but she sees it as one that will develop into a bigger win over time.

#### **Questions:**

Dr. Ray asked if the seven students that a faculty member must mentor have to happen over a particular period or not. His understanding is it doesn't have to be in one semester or a set period of time. When they have mentored 7 students, they get one reassigned time.

The Provost confirmed that Dr. Ray's understanding is correct. There is no time limit placed on when a faculty member reaches seven undergraduate research students. The Provost elaborated that she and the Deans will develop a system where they will be constantly in the process of counting faculty who have individual students being mentored in undergraduate research. When seven are reached in 499, that will be equal to one course of time reassigned from teaching. The University reserves the right to determine when faculty their take reassigned time.

Mr. Bowen asked the Provost if this is effective now and is it retroactive to last semester. At what point does the count start?

Dr. Fernandes said the effective date is spring semester 2014 since it was just approved this month by the General Administration.

Dr. Cameron received a question from a member of her department. Students can sign up for a three-hour experience and others can sign up for one-hour experience. If she has two students where one is at one-hour and the other at three-hours, do they count equally for her, the faculty mentor?

Dr. Fernandes said the proposal counts students in UGR 499 irrespective of credit hours. No mention is made in the current proposal about credit hours. It focuses on the number of students being mentored in a project. In regards to the MLA 599 course proposal, five students being mentored will equal one course reassigned time.

### **AVID for Higher Education.**

By great chance, we had an opportunity to participate in AVID for Higher Education which is a program that encourages universities to be intentional about assisting first generation college students in completing a degree. Another university dropped out, at the last minute, of a large grant in support of AVID for Higher Education institutions. We were asked with a very short timeline if we were willing to replace the institution that withdrew. The Provost agreed to participate because she knew we already had a lot of groundwork underway. We have a group of dedicated faculty and staff who are themselves first generation college students and who want to serve as role models for others like themselves. We are in the process of developing a scholarship specifically geared toward AVID high school students. We were already working on a grant to the Sisters of Mercy Foundation for our

own AVID in Higher Education program. And for all these reasons, we are now officially going to be an AVID for Higher Education campus. We have a team of faculty and staff going for training in December on how to support first generation college students. Almost 142 currently enrolled students will qualify under the AVID for Higher Education grant to receive structured, academic and co-curricular support and programming. There will be grant components in tutoring, freshmen seminar and faculty development, cohort management, programs outside of the classroom, research, administrative coordination, and team leadership.

#### **LAC Implementation/Transition**

**Assistant Provost Pat McClellan**

Assistant Provost McClellan talked about the implementation of the Liberal Arts Core. After the Senate approved the [Liberal Arts Core Implementation Proposal \(LAC\)](#), she talked with APC about how they wanted to phase it in. She referenced the unusual situation where they are going from more requirements to fewer, less complex requirements. It occurred to her that they may have students, who couldn't graduate in May under the current ILS because they have not completed a cluster, but who could graduate under the new LAC which does not require clusters. If these students are forced to wait for the new system to be effective in the fall before graduating, they would be without financial aid since they will have completed the requirements for graduation by the time they enroll in the fall when the new LAC is in place.

In trying to avoid that scenario, she worked with APC to develop a transitional map. The transitional map, available on DegPar, honors the courses a student may have selected as part of going through ILS while allowing them to use those courses to complete the LAC. The Registrar and her staff, Ms. Race and Ms. Shope, are just wonderful and worked very hard to get DegPar, and a quick review of LAC, out to the students.

The Assistant Provost thinks there are some committees getting together now, as designated in the LAC document to come up with the courses that will count for scientific perspectives and social sciences. We can't leave the students hanging while we wrestle through the details. Her worst nightmare would be to send an unintentional message to students to stop for a year and come back when LAC is all worked out.

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

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

##### **Proposed Official Email Policy.**

Dr. Walters asked for the discussion of the proposed official email list to be put on the agenda today because he believes "there are serious ramifications for our ability to freely exchange thoughts and ideas. The proposed policy seeks to create a more narrowly defined use of the listserv and create a structure of governing offices that will determine what is appropriate to be shared on campus." He wanted to express a certain amount of alarm about that.

Dr. Walters said "If you go back to the history of the email list, it goes back to March of 2000 when the head of ITS, Kern Parker, established those listservs. When he created the two official listservs --- faculty\_official ([faculty\\_official@unca.edu](mailto:faculty_official@unca.edu)) and staff\_official ([staff\\_official@unca.edu](mailto:staff_official@unca.edu)), he said, 'As their names imply, faculty\_official and staff\_official are to be used for UNC business and activities. Membership in these two are mandatory.' That was the complete definition of what the lists were for. They were not moderated and were for UNC business and activities. "

Dr. Walters then compared that to the proposed policy:

"University "Official" email lists... are limited to communication of official university academic, administrative, business, personnel, and safety information... These lists are not intended for discussions, but are limited to dissemination of University information to specific campus constituencies."

Dr. Walters rhetorically inquired who makes the determination of what should be allowed to be distributed. Each list has "a governing office," according to the policy, "... which determines the appropriate uses of the list, moderates messages sent to the list, and determines the appropriate constituency of the list."

The faculty\_official list is governed by Academic Affairs.

Dr. Walters thinks the ramifications are clear. A top down distribution of information is created rather than horizontal faculty-to-faculty communication. And it explicitly eliminates discussion. Dr. Walters would argue this is beneath a public university for we are trying to teach our students to be engaged citizens while at the same time making it more difficult to engage ourselves. “We are trying to teach our students to consider things with which they disagree while at the same time trying to protect ourselves from things with which we disagree.”

Dr. Walters believes civil discourse is important, but civility is not a synonym for dispassionate. If you define verbal abuse in a way that eliminates any sort of edge to what is said, Dr. Walters would say it is beneath the office of being a professor or being part of an academic institution. We are a community. One aspect of being part of a community is that you are forced to deal with things that you don’t necessarily agree with or want to hear. He believes this listserv allows that. If you eliminate the ability of faculty to communicate with each other and discuss issues that he would consider to be UNC business (UNC business being anything that impacts us or our students) then that limits the ability to freely exchange ideas.

Dr. Walters is not certain what he is asking the Faculty Senate to do. There does not seem to be an outlet for communication to this particular group except through our members. He believes Dr. Kormanik sits on that policy’s committee. He simply wanted to bring to this body his alarm at what seems to him to be a move that really undermines what it is to be a university and an academic institution.

Dr. Walters yields the floor.

When things are coming from faculty\_official, Dr. Cameron believes the email to be something she is expected to address regarding her job. UNC Asheville has provided a forum where the entire university community can be engaged in discussions where there is the freedom to express but also the freedom not to express nor be concerned about what others are expressing. Right now, the current policy causes issues where filters are not perfect and you can accidentally eliminate information that is essential to what is going on campus, safety alerts and weather conditions.

She does not have a problem with two different listservs. She believes her students need to be assured she is neutral to their ideas in terms of her evaluating their work. The same with her colleagues. She wants her colleagues to really understand that we are all human. She may disagree with your political ideas or social commentary, but she will be fair to your perspective. She understands the purpose of this policy.

Dr. Kormanik said part of the issue is we don’t know where this is going and what the implications are. For example, would he be able to announce a town hall meeting for folks to talk about graduate programs sponsored by IDC – maybe yes, maybe no. Would he be able to say his student group is going to be making a presentation? That doesn’t affect everyone and not everyone is interested. Would he be able to say his singing group is going to be down at the local pub?

Dr. Diefenbach said he would like to see faculty\_official broadly defined as being information relevant to our professional practice. He doesn’t want to see discussion moved to the forum which is just classified ads as far as he can see.

Dr. Stratton thanked Dr. Walters for what he said. Dr. Stratton wanted to make two points about the policy. One, in regards to Dr. Walters’ point about freedom of speech, in organizations there is no such thing as freedom of speech. We are governed by federal statutes about what is protected and what is not protected. When there are insults thrown offensively, we are governed by various laws so we should be concerned about certain things that are indeed communicated out.

The other point Dr. Stratton wanted to make was that he was happy to see that the faculty\_official list consists only of all current university faculty members. He finds it highly problematic that former employees of the university have access to our lists for a variety of reasons that we have seen over the last year. He finds it disruptive and disrespectful. We do not know the reasons why they are former faculty members. To him, it is odd and problematic for an organization to allow former employees to communicate on a shared list.

Dr. Walters disagreed with Dr. Stratton for he considers retired faculty members to still be part of our academic community. While sometimes retired faculty members, or any faculty member, can do things that are annoying, he still thinks that retired faculty (which is different from people who have been fired) should

remain part of our community as contributing members. There is a lot of wisdom there. Being annoyed by them does not seem to be sufficient reason to shut that down.

Dr. Stratton asked from an organization's perspective, how does the organization protect the individuals that are actually employed in the organization? This is a unique scenario in his mind. To Dr. Walters' point, Dr. Stratton recognized there are benefits associated with allowing former employees to be part of the community and be able to share wisdom.

Dr. Walters also argued that the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has taken a position on this that very much favors official business as not being the only criteria for the use of listservs.

Dr. Roig said the reason for the need of a solution is because you can't opt out of the official lists and there are risks with filtering where you might miss an important email. All this policy is doing is limiting the official list to official business. It doesn't say there aren't other venues where discussion can happen.

Dr. Walters inquired what would that venue be.

Dr. Roig said right now there is the UNC Asheville forum.

To satisfy his curiosity, Dr. Kormanik asked how many have opted out of the UNC Asheville forum list. He noted more than four has opted out. Dr. Kormanik said this shows if something goes to that forum, only 67% of the UNC Asheville community would receive it, if the Faculty Senate's participation is representative of the UNC Asheville Community.

Dr. Konz said the official policy allows Academic Affairs to establish another forum for discussion. They have drafted a proposal which includes the creation of a listserv called Academic Forum for the conversations that Dr. Walters is talking about. It is an opt out list for discussions, if you wish to do so. We all agree that forums for conversations and discussions are an important part of our academic community. They have shared with FWDC and they will share with the senate the proposal of the other listserv, if the current proposed policy becomes official.

The Faculty Senate also had concerns about giving up rights and privileges, censorship, and moderation of the lists.

Dr. Kaplan asked Mr. Brown to explain what was the catalyst for generating the policy in the first place.

Mr. Brown said the catalyst was the feedback from faculty members who voiced concerns similar to what you have heard here today. He thought a group should work on the policy instead of him determining what the policy would be. This policy is a result of the group reviewing not only our policy but other policies and practices of other institutions and UNC schools. This is very much in line with other institutions' practices.

Dr. Stratton asked Mr. Brown how are the listservs currently moderated.

Mr. Brown said the faculty\_official is not moderated.

Dr. Stratton asked if the moderation would change with this proposed policy.

Mr. Brown said it was beyond ITS scope to determine. It is the discretion of the provost.

Dr. Walters said that is part of the issue is that this proposed policy does not really say other than Academic Affairs is to decide.

If the big picture, university-level policy is approved, Dr. Fernandes believes FWDC will have a major role in developing the divisional policy. Therefore, the Faculty Senate would have a role in approving whatever that policy might be. Under this process, you can be assured that your views will be heard and understood.

Dr. Ray asked Dr. Konz what an opt-out listserv look like. Will everyone still have access to all forms and discussions?

When you become a member of the faculty, you are put on the list that you have the option to opt in and out, back and forth from at any time. Dr. Konz said the policy says that faculty\_official and staff\_official remain unmoderated lists, but the academic forum is opt out policy. Although FWDC is not developing a document that he is aware of, they were consulted about the proposal. He said there are standards of behavior and usage guidelines. Standards of Behavior are already dictated by the university. The rule says repeated violations could have someone removed at the discretion of the provost.

Dr. Konz said the formal policy could be approved by the Faculty Senate and put in the Faculty Handbook. It could be the official policy review committee stipulates that ownership and rules are determined by Academic Affairs in consultation with the Faculty Senate. The way the policy reads now Academic Affairs owns it. Academic Affairs thought it was important to consult with FWDC.

Dr. Hook wanted to say that there was a lot of discussion at FWDC and there was some uneasiness. When they saw the original policy, they didn't see just this policy, they saw the possibility of the creation of an academic forum. They were not looking at the proposed policy in isolation but were talking about other forms of open discussion. When the policy change first came out, Dr. Hook was a bit surprised that this was all until Dr. Roig reminded him it was the first step that had been discussed to establish ownership of the official list before the creation of opt-in or opt-out listservs.

Dr. Walters read what the proposed email list policy says. It defines what is going on with official email lists and team email lists where people are working on a common theme. Then it says, "Opt-in email lists are created for groups of individuals to facilitate communications around a particular topic or theme. Membership in an opt-in list is completely elective, Members may unsubscribe from the list at any time. An example of an opt-In email list is the UNC Asheville Forum." He said there isn't anything in the proposal about an opt-out list.

Dr. Burchard asked if there was a reason this policy needs to be approved in pieces rather than pass them through together where they can be seen together, which might solve some problems.

Dr. Kormanik said this has a lot of tentacles sticking out. If we were to have assurance that listservs would be established to permit discussion on academic issues among the faculty, that the rules and guidelines would be passed through FWDC, and the moderation rules and guidelines of the official list would go through FWDC, as he believes the provost said, then that would allay some of their concerns.

Dr. Konz said, with Dr. Fernandes' approval, he would be happy to send the proposed policy, as it stands right now, to members of the Faculty Senate. There are two pieces – one that establishes the listservs and their ownership, and the other is the maintenance which is the piece that could go into the Faculty Handbook and would require senate's approval.

Dr. Burchard asked that Dr. Konz shares all the pieces with the Faculty Senate. This will be placed on the January Faculty Senate meeting's agenda for a continued discussion. It was decided it would come first to the Faculty Senate and then a charge would be given to FWDC.

Dr. Kormanik said the Faculty Senate could make a Sense of Senate Resolution to delay the policy.

Mr. Bowen made a motion for a Sense of the Senate resolution to ask that the policy be delayed regarding the implementation of the email server policy until after the Faculty Senate meets again. The motion was made and seconded.

The Sense of the Senate Motion passed without dissent and became SSR0413F.

[New Director of the Humanities Program: Dr. Brian Hook](#)

The Faculty Senate congratulated their colleague Dr. Brian Hook on his selection as Humanities Director.

## **X. Adjourn**

Dr. Burchard adjourned the meeting at 5:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by: Lisa Sellers  
Executive Committee