

University of North Carolina at Asheville  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
Minutes for April 30, 2015 (3:15 pm)

Senate

Members: D. Eggers, L. Bond, M. Galloway, S. Kaplan, C. Bell, K. Betsalel, M. Cameron, D. Clarke, D. Diefenbach, C. McKnight, M. Neelon, S. Patch, J. Perkins, K. Ray, M. Sidelnick, M. Stratton, G. Trautmann, S. Walters, J. Urgo.

Alternates: W. Strehl.

Visitors: G. Ashburn, B. Butler, P. Catterfeld, L. Dohse, J. Dunsmore, W. Haggard, L. Hewitt, L. Holland, A. Jesse, E. Katz, J. Konz, K. Krumpe, A. Lanou, B. Larson, L. Mathews, P. McClellan, H. Parlier, J. Preston, A. Shope, R. Tatum.

- I. Call to Order, Introductions and Announcements: Dr. Dee Eggers**  
Dr. Dee Eggers called the Faculty Senate meeting to order.
- II. Approval of Minutes:**
- [April 9, 2015 \(3:15 p.m.\)](#)  
Moved, second, no discussion and passed without dissent.
- III. Executive Committee Reports: Dr. Dee Eggers**  
Creation of Task Forces. After reviewing the Survey of Interest the Faculty Senate filled out at their previous meeting, Dr. Eggers wanted to propose the creation of four task forces. Upon reviewing the research on how task forces and ad hoc committees are created, Dr. Eggers found there are many ways to launch a task force. Dr. Eggers asked the Faculty Senate to consider creating some task forces at this meeting by a majority vote.  
The four task forces that Dr. Eggers proposed were the top items of interest on the survey:
- 1) Task Force to Study Faculty Salary and Equity
  - 2) Task Force on Faculty Workload
  - 3) Task Force to Revise Student Rating of Instruction
  - 4) Task Force on Graduate Programs

In regards to the Task Force to Study Faculty Salary and Equity, an equity study is the best means to correct faculty salary issues. This was done by the previous Task Force on Salary and Equity in 2004-05. They recommended it occur every five years. This is a good time to conduct an equity study since there will be money for raises from the tuition increases.

The Task Force on Faculty Workload will summarize the Faculty Workload Survey Responses and make recommendations based off their findings.

The Task Force to Revise Student Rating of Instruction has been a request for some time, and many faculty members would like to participate in this task force.

For some time, there has been a need for a campus-wide discussion on Graduate Programs. Dr. Eggers said that Ms. Sellers collected excellent research from the Faculty Senate archives. The research showed that graduate programs have been a long, on-going conversation that dates back to before this institution became the University of North Carolina at Asheville.

Dr. Eggers passed around [a document that described each of the four proposed task forces](#). The Task Force to Study Faculty Salary and Equity is the only task force that Dr. Eggers is proposing to launch immediately. A subset of this task force will meet over the summer to capture the analysis that was done by

the previous task force before Dr. Gravely and Dr. Larson retire. Then the entire task force will convene in the fall to begin their work. Provost Urgo proposed a friendly amendment to add Pat Catterfeld in place of John Pierce on the committee. The friendly amendment was accepted by the Executive Committee.

Dr. Galloway proposed a friendly amendment to add a member from IDC to the Task Force on Graduate Programs. The friendly amendment was accepted by the Executive Committee.

Dr. Eggers noted that members of task forces can be from the faculty at large as well as from the Faculty Senate. Other than the task force addressing salary, which must begin work immediately, an invitation will go out via FWDC in the fall to faculty to write a statement of interest and then FWDC will select the membership for the Senate to approve.

Dr. Bond proposed there be representation from the three divisions as well. This friendly amendment was accepted by the Executive Committee as well.

Dr. Cameron also added that the position of Lecturer should be acknowledged by being among the membership if the task force membership decrees a representative from each rank is to be represented.

Dr. Neelon confirmed there are 44 lecturers and almost all except two have an FTE of 1.0. The friendly amendment was accepted to add Lecturers back to the list of rank for a task force membership.

Dr. Walters offered a friendly amendment to make the number of faculty on the Task Force to Study Faculty Salary and Equity to be an odd number. The Executive Committee agreed to have five faculty total with Dr. Eggers and four others to be appointed. The friendly amendment was accepted.

A motion was made to approve launching the four proposed task forces as outlined in the Executive Committee description document as amended, which was seconded.

**Discussion:**

No discussion on the motion.

The motion passed as amended without dissent and all four task forces were created.

Student Government. Ms. Jennifer Preston and Ms. Ashleigh Hillen were present to take questions from the Faculty Senate regarding SGA's [Resolution for Divestment of Fossil Fuel Companies in UNC Asheville's Endowment](#) and the [Report on Options for Incorporating Sustainability into Investment Practices](#).

Dr. Eggers thanked the SGA students for bringing this important issue to the attention of the Faculty Senate. However in researching Senate's possible actions, Sonia Marcus let Dr. Eggers know that UNC Asheville does not have a value statement regarding our investments. The Executive Committee decided that IDC needs to formulate a value statement on investments to bring before the Faculty Senate for approval. Dr. Eggers asked Dr. Galloway to read the charge to IDC that the Executive Committee drafted for Senate approval:

"Reflecting on the Student Government's resolution on Divestment of Fossil Fuels, members of the Senate realized there is not a statement of values regarding our investment activities. Such a statement is needed to guide the formation of policies as we move forward. Many other universities have one or more socially responsible investment funds that provide donors with greater options to give. Indeed, by having no such investment vehicle, and considering the progressive nature of both our graduates and the region, we may be forgoing opportunities for people to give us sizable donations.

Our investment decisions affect the quality of our students' lives at UNCA and beyond. Our investments should support an abundant, just, and healthy future. To do otherwise is inconsistent with both our core values and what we teach our students about being responsible global citizens.

We charge IDC with investigating investment-related values statements appropriate to liberal arts institutions. This investigation should include a review of relevant values statements of other institutions as well as input from the campus community.

After completing the above, IDC should prepare a statement addressing, at minimum, the following:

- a. what we value as reflected in our Mission;
- b. how that should be reflected in our investment activities including things we should not invest in; and
- c. standards for levels of transparency of our investments.

IDC shall submit a final report, including recommendations, in time for the April 2016 Faculty Senate meeting.”

After Dr. Galloway read the proposed charge to IDC, Dr. Eggers asked for a vote from the Faculty Senate to accept this charge to be made to IDC to research and bring a value statement to the Faculty Senate to be discussed and approved.

Dr. Galloway and Dr. Eggers both thanked the students for bringing this issue to the Faculty Senate’s attention, and the Faculty Senate applauded their work.

Hearing no other discussion, Dr. Eggers called for a vote.

The Faculty Senate approved the charge to IDC as read without dissent.

The Faculty Senate Secretary recorded this work for IDC, and Dr. Galloway encouraged next year’s IDC to also include student representation as they do their work.

Continuity on the Faculty Senate. Dr. Eggers called for a vote to have FWDC investigate opportunities and make recommendations to improve continuity on the Faculty Senate.

The Faculty Senate approved the charge to FWDC as read without dissent (two abstentions).

The Faculty Senate Secretary recorded this work for FWDC.

Faculty Assembly. Faculty Assembly elected its officers for 2015-16. Dr. Dohse was elected again to the Faculty Assembly Executive Committee. The Faculty Senate congratulated Dr. Dohse on both his reelections

Dr. Eggers added that Faculty Assembly did pass one resolution regarding continuity on Faculty Assembly. They decided over the summer that the outgoing executive and incoming executive committees would meet together to transition the work to the new Faculty Assembly Officers. Since three of the four officers of the current Faculty Senate are rotating off, Dr. Eggers and the Executive Committee suggests there should be meetings between the outgoing and incoming Executive Committees over the summer to provide a similar smooth transition.

### **Second Reading**

[EC 1](#) Academic Assessment Revision Proposal

(includes an explanation for revisions to [SD0713F](#) and [SD10214S](#))

[EC 2](#) Revision of SD0713F: Liberal Arts Core Implementation Proposal Introduction

[EC 3](#) Revision of SD10214S: Replace the Integrative Liberal Studies Program with The Liberal Arts Core

EC 1 has a friendly amendment to bring consistent language usage to EC 1 and IDC 1. In EC 1, instead of stating University Student Learning Outcomes (USLO), the outcomes should be called Liberal Arts Curriculum Outcomes since that is what the USLOs were changed to after the approval of the Liberal Arts Curriculum.

Dr. Eggers read the changes into the minutes:

The old wording in EC 1:

“The SACS principles of accreditation do not require schools to evaluate every component of their General Education Curriculum, only their University Student Learning Outcomes. Our University’s Student Learning Outcomes are meant to capture the fundamental values embedded in our General Education Curriculum, the Liberal Arts Core. We now have four University Student Learning Outcomes and the minimum number required by SACS is three.”

The friendly amendment proposed wording:

“The SACSCOC principles of accreditation do not require schools to have an individual assessment plan for each component of the General Education Curriculum only an assessment plan for their General Education Outcomes. Our new Liberal Arts Core Outcomes replace our former University Student Learning Outcomes in all documents. They are intended to capture the fundamental values embodied in our General Education Curriculum, the Liberal Arts Curriculum (LAC). We now have four LAC outcomes and the minimum number required by SACSCOC is three.”

Dr. Eggers asked for a motion to accept the friendly amendment as read. The motion was made and seconded. No further discussion. Dr. Eggers called the question and asked for a vote.

EC 1 passed as amended and became SD7215S.

There were no changes made to EC 2 and EC 3. There was an inquiry from the Writing Assessment Group stating some concern about dropping assessment requirements. Dr. Eggers clarified that the purpose of all of this is to reduce the burden of our external reporting requirements. This by no means indicates that we won’t assess writing, but we will assess in ways that are most logical and useful for us.

A motion was made to pass EC 2 which was seconded. No discussion.

EC 2 passed without dissent and became SD7315S.

A motion was made to pass EC 3 which was seconded. No discussion.

EC 3 passed without dissent and became SD7415S.

#### **IV. Academic Policies Committee Report:**

**Professor Laura Bond**

[APC Year End Report](#)

##### **Second Reading**

[APC 57](#) Change prerequisites and/or timing for  
ACCT 216, 301, 302, 317, 321, 322, 340, 341, 411, 417, 418

[APC 58](#) Change to Accounting Narrative and Major Requirements  
(Micheal Stratton)

<a href="#">APC 59</a>	Change course description and grade mode of SPAN 110
<a href="#">APC 63</a>	Change the name of the Department of Foreign Languages to the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures (Greta Trautmann, Wiebke Strehl)

Professor Bond first notified the Faculty Senate that the Education documents were withdrawn from Second Reading. After a number of discussions and exchanges of information, APC decided to withdraw the Education Department documents until the Fall Semester so APC and the Education Department could work out details.

Hearing no questions regarding the withdrawn documents, Professor Bond moved to the Second Reading documents before the Faculty Senate. She bundled APC 57, APC 58 and APC 59 together and then presented APC 63 separately.

She asked to accept APC 57, APC 58 and APC 59. A motion was made to accept these documents which was seconded. No discussion.

APC 57, APC 58 and APC 59 passed without dissent with two abstentions and became SD7515S, SD7615S and SD7715S.

APC 63 is the proposal to change the Foreign Language Department's name to the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures.

A motion was made to accept APC 63 which was seconded.

Dr. Sidelnick thought this change had already been approved. Dr. Trautmann replied that they may have proposed the change but there has not been follow through in the past 16 years until now. Dr. Bond confirmed that the Curriculum Review Task Force did extensively discuss this; however, the change was not proposed through Faculty Senate.

Dr. Kaplan asked since the name is very similar to "the Department of Literature and Languages," he wondered if that department has indicated they are fine with this new name. Professor Bond said that one of the stipulations APC made was clarification from the Department of Literature and Languages. That department as well as Dean Ashburn were involved in the discussion. Reports came back that the Department of Literature and Languages nor Dean Ashburn had a problem with the new name and they were in support of the change.

Professor Bond called the question for a vote.

APC 63 passed without dissent with one abstention and became SD7815S.

#### **V. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee Report: Dr. Sam Kaplan**

Dr. Kaplan started his report by thanking the 2014-15 FWDC members: Jason Wingert (who stepped off at end of Fall Semester), Michael Neelon, Mark Sidelnick, Steve Patch, Scott Walters, and Jeff Konz. It has been a great pleasure to work with them.

They met 18 times throughout the academic school year and had a productive year. They discussed issues ranging from faculty workload to child care to faculty salary which still have outstanding issues. They did make changes to the Faculty Handbook to align with state policies. Those changes involved:

- 1) Outlining the requirements for a course syllabus
- 2) Extended the terms for some important committees from two to three years in an effort to improve the quality of the work of those committees
- 3) Created a new Sustainability Committee
- 4) Made Peer Review more flexible than it has been in the past
- 5) Approved Administrative changes to the PDL policy
- 6) Changed how to gather faculty preferences for Standing Committee Service utilizing a Google Form/spreadsheet created by Lisa Sellers

FWDC also worked with the Administration to establish a task force to address policies regarding UNC Asheville's retired faculty. The language is not yet finalized and will be coming in the Fall Semester. Additional work to be done in the 2015-16 academic year by FWDC:

- 1) Review Workload Distribution looking to combine or disband some Standing Committees
- 2) Talk with Vice Chancellor Haggard about pulling faculty representatives from Student Affairs' committees into a bullpen to assign as needed to minimize and evenly distribute faculty work

### **Second Reading**

[FWDC 16](#) Revisions to Hearings Committee Procedures

FWDC 16 brings our Hearings Committee's Procedures back in alignment with NC state code. FWDC 16 clarifies when to bring issues to the Hearings Committee as well as clarifies faculty rights during the hearing.

Dr. Kaplan asked for a motion to accept FWDC 16. A motion was made and seconded to accept FWDC 16. No discussion. Dr. Kaplan called the question.

FWDC passed without dissent and became SD7915S.

### **First Reading**

[FWDC 17](#)\* Remove Aesthetics Advisory Committee from the list of Standing Committees

*\*FWDC intends to make a motion to waive the Comer Rule to discuss as well as **vote** on this document.*

FWDC 17 removes the Aesthetics Advisory Committee from the list of Standing Committees in the Faculty Handbook. Dr. Kaplan thanked Ms. Sellers for bringing a vacant appointment to FWDC's attention. As a result, the Chancellor and FWDC realized this committee only met once or twice in the past seven years. Upon reflection, they decided this committee may be disbanded since the Chancellor can put together an ad hoc committee as needed to the same end rather than staff a committee that may not meet in a given year.

Dr. Kaplan moved to waive the Comer Rule so Faculty Senate may discuss and vote on FWDC 17. The motion was seconded. No discussion. Hearing no discussion, Dr. Kaplan called the question.

The motion to waive the Comer Rule in order to discuss and vote on FWDC 17 passed without dissent.

Having waived the Comer Rule, Dr. Kaplan asked for a motion to bring FWDC 17 before the Faculty Senate. The motion was made to accept FWDC 17 which was seconded. No questions nor discussion came from the floor. Dr. Kaplan called the question.

FWDC 17 passed without dissent and became SD8015S.

Dr. Kaplan thanked all members of FWDC and the Faculty Senate for a fantastic year.

## **VI. Institutional Development Committee/UPC Reports:**

**Dr. Melodie Galloway**

IDC elected to withdraw IDC 2 and IDC 3 (regarding Provisional Minors and a proposed provisional minor for Food, Food Systems and Culture) from Second Reading. Their decision was based on the discussions the Faculty Senate had at their last meeting as well as the subsequent IDC meetings. The decision is based on the Food Studies Group not wanting to create an 18 hour minor course of study.

The Food, Food Systems and Culture faculty has decided to return in the fall with a new proposal.

Dr. Galloway was very grateful for the discussion and asked continuing senators to think about undergraduate certificates. None of the senators had questions nor comments regarding the withdrawal of the Provisional Minor and the proposal for a provisional minor in Food, Food Systems and Culture.

**First Reading**[IDC 4 / APC 64](#)

Revisions to the Duties of IDC and APC Proposed for the Standing Rules and Rules of Order (2015-16)

Dr. Galloway introduced document IDC 4/APC 64 which are proposed Standing Rules revisions to the duties of IDC and APC. The Standing Rules and Rules of Order changes can only be approved in the opening Faculty Senate meeting in the fall (although there are historical precedents for extending that time until October 15 in order to give the subcommittees time to review and propose changes).

The intention of IDC 4/APC 64 is to give greater clarification between APC and IDC's roles. The clarification will help the Senate to determine more effectively when curricular proposals need to go to IDC before going to APC for approval. Dr. Galloway invited Senators to read and consider this document.

The clarification is that IDC first evaluates when there are new implications that need to be reviewed to ensure they are in line with the mission of the university as well as changes requiring new resources. After IDC reviews the proposal, then the proposal is forwarded to APC. APC deals with existing degree programs and minors that **do not require new resources** as in new faculty lines, new buildings, and new equipment. Dr. Galloway said that Dr. Cameron's and Ms. Sellers' SenateSubmit work will be very important in guiding the Executive Committee and the APC Chair (the frontline person who first sees a curricular proposal) to determine when a proposal needs to go to IDC.

When we go to the new online submission system, all of us will be able to see the proposals rather than a proposal going to one person via email. Professor Bond said this will make the process more efficient and promote better communications between the Faculty Senate committees as well as the Registrar's office.

[IDC Memorandum](#). Dr. Galloway presented the memorandum, a draft document of procedures for IDC (which is similar to the APC procedures document which is revised annually). The document gives clarity of purpose for the University Planning Council (UPC) as well as IDC. The Chancellor and IDC will have changes to this document in the fall when it will come before the Faculty Senate for approval.

[Year End Report](#). Over the past year, IDC respectfully shepherd the interim and new chancellors. It was wonderful working with Doug Orr and welcoming Chancellor Grant. They had an important advisory role to the Chancellors and the Interim Provost.

They reviewed graduate programs and certificates considering their implications and evaluating whether they line up with our university's mission. Dr. Galloway believes IDC's work next year with the newly created graduate program taskforce is important. Irregardless of the outcome, we will know by the end what is in line with our mission.

Also, important work for next year is restructuring and redefining IDC's role.

Dr. Galloway closed by saying it has been a pleasure to work with Keith Ray (who is retiring), Don Diefenbach, David Clarke, Greta Trautmann, James Perkins, Dean Gwen Ashburn, and Director Jessica Dunsmore. She also thanked her fellow senators and members of the Executive Committee. She enjoyed working with Dee, Sam and Laura who are incredibly hard-working people.

**VII. Administrative Reports:****Provost Joseph Urgo**

The Faculty Senate congratulated Provost Urgo for being officially appointed Provost by the Chancellor and confirmed by the Board of Governors. Provost Urgo thanked the faculty for supporting his appointment.

As Provost Urgo begins thinking about his role going forward, he would like to meet with all the departments throughout the next academic year. He also asks faculty to schedule a time to meet with him for 15-20 minutes so he can know everyone on campus. Chancellor Grant is starting in the fall to have a coffee hour to meet with members of the campus community and she intends to invite the Senators up to her house this summer for a picnic at some point. They wish to build more informal social interactions between the faculty and the administration.

Provost Urgo feels strongly that through conflict we progress. He is not afraid of conflict for he believes conflict is very important – important to discover where conflict is and what drives it. Otherwise, when issues are buried, an institution stagnates and the members begin to see things as unchangeable.

Provost Urgo invites anyone who wants to be a Facebook friend to befriend him now he has been confirmed as provost.

**Updates:**

Dr. Junius Gonzales, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs for the UNC system, asked recently what faculty do with reassigned time. Although the issue of the workload bill is gone, it is apparently evident this topic is not understood by the public. Citizens need to understand what reassigned time is and means. To the average person, reassigned time sounds like vacation time. In response, the Office of the Provost has put together around five examples of practical use of reassigned time by faculty who received grants or worked with students on research projects. They explained the benefits from reassigned time that would not come otherwise.

Provost Urgo has worked very closely with many tenured faculty through the Position Allocation Committee (PAC) this year. He praised these hardworking colleagues who serve on PAC. After considering 21 requests, PAC recommended 12 allocations for the coming year. When their report is final, Provost Urgo will respond to their report. Both their report and his response will be made public. They were successful in 19 faculty searches and there will be quite a few new colleagues in the fall.

**VIII. Old Business**

No old business.

**IX. New Business**

Dr. Eggers drew the last 2014-15 Faculty Senate meeting to a close by summarizing her work in Faculty Senate:

- I. Faculty Workload Survey
- II. Significantly reducing externally required assessment
- III. Establishing task forces in four major areas
- IV. Keeping the campus informed
- V. Creating a welcoming and smooth transition of the administration

In light of a year ago when we did not know who our Chancellor nor Provost would be, Dr. Eggers said her primary motivation as Faculty Senate Chair was to establish a cooperative and collaborative relationship with the in-coming administration. She said that due to Provost Urgo's and Chancellor Grant's natures, that has turned out to be relatively easy. She strived for a relationship that was characterized by transparency and mutual trust. She is so glad we can do this because she thinks the work that we do with our students at UNC Asheville is some of the most important work done anywhere by anyone.

In closing, Dr. Eggers wanted everyone to know what an honor it has been to work with them and she thanked all the Senators for their hard work.

The Senate responded with applause for their Senate Chair. They exchanged tokens of appreciation. They also gave a card of congratulations to our newly confirmed Provost.

**X. Adjourn**

Dr. Eggers adjourned the meeting at 5:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by: Lisa Sellers  
The Executive Committee