

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT ASHEVILLE

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

February 8, 2018; 3:15 pm

Red Oak Conference Room

Members Present: M. Stratton, M. Cameron, B. Butler, L. Hewitt, J. Beck, K. Betsalel, L. Bond, K. Boyle, P. Haschke, L. Holland, M. McClure, K. Moorhead, C. Oakley, M. Richmond, A. Rote, N. Ruppert, M. Smith, S. Traboulsi, K. Peterson.

Visitors: T. Adcock, E. Adell, A. Adelson, C. Bambara, S. Broberg, J. Brown, R. Bruce, M. Cebria, R. Criser, L. Dohse, D. Erb, M. Gass, H. Holt, T. Hussey, A. Jessee, J. Konz, K. Krumpke, D. Luke, M. McLain, J. Moffitt, J. Pierce, A. Peitzman, M. Reyhanoglu, A. Rucker, J. Sanchez Martinez, A. Shope, W. Strehl, D. Traywick, C. Williams.

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes: December 7, 2017 3:15 p.m.
Passed without dissent.

III. Executive Committee Report: Dr. Micheal Stratton
Dr. Stratton welcomed Kevin Moorhead (APC), Christopher Oakley (FWDC) and Ken Betsalel (IDC) to Faculty Senate to replace Senators who resigned last semester: Agya Boakye-Boaten, Regina Criser, and Amanda Wray.

Chancellor Search Update. Dr. Stratton gave an update of dates and process:

- The Leadership Statement was posted and the exploration of candidates has started.
- February 23 – The Chancellor Search Committee meets to solidify plans for the spring airport interviews and on-campus interviews for select candidates.
- Late March – The Chancellor Search Committee travels to Charlotte for airport interviews.
- Early to mid-April – The candidates visit the campus.
- April 20 – The Board of Trustees will vote on the candidates and an unranked list will go to President Spellings and the Board of Governors on April 23.
- July 1 – The New Chancellor begins work at UNC Asheville.

Reason for Faculty Senate meeting cancellation on February 1. Faculty Senate did not meet last week due to quorum issues per the Faculty Senate Chair's email he sent to the campus:

Dear Colleagues,

After discussing with our Executive Committee and Lisa Sellers, Assistant to the Senate, there's a strong likelihood that we will not have sufficient quorum to hold our meeting today (due to numerous illnesses, conference travel, and other obligations requiring our Senators to be away). We wanted to inform you now instead of waiting until we all arrived to Senate only to realize we could not actually call to order. Therefore, we will postpone until February 8, 2018. Please plan accordingly.

I recognize this may be challenging to the work of our committees and the faculty/staff/students on the docket to present. We appreciate your anticipated understanding. Do not hesitate to reach out to me, Marietta, Lyndi, or Brian if you have further questions.

Lisa will be in touch regarding any updates to the agenda and will inform the invited guests to Senate about the change.

Sincerely,
~Micheal

The Statement on campus climate from the Senate Executive Committee. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee sent a statement regarding campus climate out to the Faculty Senate, the Department Chairs, the Program Directors and a number of administrators. Dr. Stratton said he has directed the Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant to include the statement in the minutes for this meeting:

Statement on Campus Climate

Faculty Senate Executive Committee
February 1, 2018

With strong resolve, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee urges that serious attention be given to the current climate at UNC Asheville, particularly for more vulnerable members of our community. Sexual harassment, bullying, and abuses of power remain far too common in academia, and UNC Asheville is no exception. The #MeToo movement has illuminated anew the prevalence of painful stories, as well as the systems that have enabled their concealment for so long. As such, it has never been more important to clearly communicate our values and embody them in our practices.

We believe it is our responsibility as faculty leaders to state publicly and boldly where we stand, and to demonstrate our commitments through our work. In order to be effective in promoting a culture of respect, fairness, and transparency, we must also have the support and cooperation of the university's highest levels of leadership.

Specifically, we call upon Interim Chancellor Urgo, Acting Provost Peterson, and all current and future senior leadership to:

1. Reaffirm unequivocally that workplace bullying, sexual violence, sexual harassment, and abuses of power are unacceptable and will not be condoned, concealed, or tolerated;
2. Work collaboratively with Faculty Senate, Human Resources, the Office of the General Counsel, and the Title IX Office to review existing policies and practices, and make necessary revisions to ensure that best practices are followed and enforced;
3. Take just and appropriate action in response to violations of university policies regardless of a faculty member's record of achievement in scholarly activity, service, or teaching;
4. Protect rather than shame those who report violations of university policies;
5. Support the Title IX Office in the performance of key functions, including investigating reports of alleged policy violations and ensuring that proper remedies are applied when evidence demonstrates that violations have occurred;
6. Promote the development of efficient and fair protocols that invoke adequate record keeping and record sharing among Academic Affairs, Title IX, and Human Resources in an effort to identify misconduct that is severe, pervasive, or exposes a pattern requiring robust and immediate intervention;
7. Uphold a firm commitment to the basic tenets of professional courtesy, classroom civility, collegiality, and human dignity to reflect the values of the University and advance the creation of a socially just environment that is free from hostility, harassment, intimidation, and threats for all who engage in the process of learning.

In the coming weeks, FWDC will host a series of listening sessions during which campus climate, among other issues, will be discussed. It is our hope that faculty will use this opportunity to share their experiences and suggestions, and that the administration will support us toward translating them into meaningful, positive change.

We look forward to working together to create and sustain a healthy, safe, respectful campus environment for students, faculty, staff, administrators, and all who visit our community.

Sincerely,

Micheal Stratton, Faculty Senate Chair
Brian Butler, IDC Chair
Marietta Cameron, APC Chair
Lyndi Hewitt, FWDC Chair

Dr. Samer Traboulsi asked Dr. Stratton if the Faculty Senate was going to discuss this statement.

Dr. Stratton replied that Dr. Traboulsi was welcomed to ask questions of the Senate Executive Committee at this time.

Dr. Traboulsi said he has a statement that he preferred to read. He also preferred the camera to be outside the room. [Aaron Adelson, WLOS reporter was in the room]. Dr. Hewitt said this is an open meeting and we cannot ask people to leave.

Dr. Stratton asked Clifton Williams, the University's General Counsel, to comment. Mr. Williams clarified that "the Faculty Senate is not a formal public body like the Board of Trustees so the Senate, through its normal rules, can invite or disinvite anyone they want to the meetings."

Dr. Traboulsi made a motion that the camera leaves the room for five to ten minutes. The motion was seconded.

Discussion:

As a cautionary, since Dr. Traboulsi is asking for privacy, Professor Bond expressed support for her colleague. Although he was not commenting on any specific circumstances, Dr. Traboulsi said that he felt this was an internal matter. The question was called.

The motion failed 6-9-2.

Dr. Samer Traboulsi's statement:

Obviously, you have read the public statement sent by the Senate Executive Committee. I appreciate their concern on the issue and fully support the issue they are raising. My personal opinion about sexual harassment was stated clearly in my email response to your statement. I want to make it clear that I agree with the essence of your statement, and I unequivocally stand against sexual harassment.

To make things clear, my criticism of the statement is based on the legal and procedural repercussions of the list of demands included in your statement. I replied in email to the original recipients because your statement was a public statement and because we were not consulted or informed about your intention to write and release a statement.

I will focus on two of the demands since we do not have time to discuss the entire statement:

6. Promote the development of efficient and fair protocols that invoke adequate record keeping and record sharing among Academic Affairs, Title IX, and Human Resources in an effort to identify misconduct that is severe, pervasive, or exposes a pattern requiring robust and immediate intervention

In other words, you are asking the administration not to clear the record of a person accused of sexual harassment or any of the other accusations. This is closely tied to the third demand:

3. Take just and appropriate action in response to violations of university policies regardless of a faculty member's record of achievement in scholarly activity, service, or teaching

Since you are demanding that this be done suggests that you know or have heard of a case where the administration wanted to keep a case under the radar to avoid damaging the university's reputation or even worse to protect the defendant.

This is our right and we expect our administration to protect us from faculty or staff involved with a history of misconduct with their colleagues. This demand seems fair. Right?

Actually, I think it is not. It shows your unfamiliarity with the legal framework that binds the administration. The investigation is done behind closed doors and confidentiality prevents the administration from discussing the matter with anyone, even the Executive Committee, otherwise they risk being sued by the defendant. Actually, when it comes to the big cases, such as bullying, sexual violence and harassment, most of the time, the chancellor and provost have no control over what goes into the record and what does not.

Example:

A, the plaintiff, accuses B, the defendant of sexual harassment. The administration is obliged to investigate the case. There are two possible outcomes:

1. Defendant B was found guilty because there is enough evidence to support the case against him/her. If the Provost decides to clear the record of the defendant, then he risks being sued by the plaintiff for obstruction of justice and tampering with evidence. These are criminal charges and the sentence varies between 1 to 20 years in prison.
2. Plaintiff A's claim was dismissed due to lack of evidence or because it is a "my word against your word" case. A judge won't even consider such a case for lack of evidence and/or witnesses. This is sad if the aggression did happen, but the legal principal is clear: a defendant is innocent until proven guilty.

It is a no brainer that the defendant will seek the help of a lawyer. In the case of no evidence and the defendant is innocent, his/her lawyer would threaten to sue the university on behalf of his client for slander, libel, defamation, psychological and emotional distress. This is when both parties reach a settlement where the provost is forced to sign an agreement to clear the record and not take punitive actions against his/her client now or in the future. This signed agreement remains with the lawyer and the defendant. The university cannot even keep a copy of this agreement in the defendant's record since they was cleared of the case.

Now you can meet the Provost and the Chancellor to accuse them of the "imagined" cover up. Unfortunately, the Provost and the Chancellor cannot defend themselves because the document they signed is binding. They end up being the bad guys who do not care about their faculty's safety and welfare for do not listen to faculty nor follow our "uninformed" advice. All of this because they are professional, and they follow the rules and laws as they should.

The outcome is the erosion of trust between the faculty and administration, tension rises, and rumors start circulating through hallway meetings, as this is happening now. If you have heard of a case, please let me know.

All of this because you do not have a grasp of how administrations function, and when ill-informed public statements are made, they aggravate the campus climate instead of calming it. I'm not questioning your sincere feelings and concerns for this institution, its faculty, staff, and students, but you need to have more trust in the administration.

Please, if you had discussed your statement with us first behind closed doors, we would have addressed these issues, the statement would have come from the Senate, and a statement from the Faculty Senate would have been more effective.

By the way, in regards to the email from Marcia where she speaks about some specific case of misconduct under investigation, if there is some specific case of misconduct, your email statement sent last week is actually damaging the alleged case. We are binding/limiting the administration in what they can do. Marcia's email is written evidence of the case. When the rumors circulate on campus that may identify the people involved, you have a nice case of slander and libel. A lawyer can subpoena some faculty on campus. Under oath, they could be asked if they have heard rumors. The hands of the administration are now tied, and with a good lawyer, the whole case would fall apart.

This is a game way bigger than the faculty. It requires experience to set clear, detailed, well-defined policy to protect victims of harassment and bullying. You also need to define what is meant by bullying, sexual harassment, and what an unsafe space of work is. This is how to make strong cases, and how we stop sexual harassment and bullying on campus.

Most probably, sexual harassment are the worst issues that an administration would want to deal with. There is nothing as legally tricky as such cases. Public statements do not help with this. You can have as many trainings as you want, but if there is nothing to support these trainings, it doesn't matter legally. A lawyer can get everything thrown out and dismiss the whole case, and we are back to square one.

What is my point? Instead of talking, let's have a committee bring in experienced lawyers from outside the campus to write a clear policy and deal with intervention. Thank you.

End of Dr. Traboulsi's statement.

Discussion:

Dr. Butler asked to say two things. One, Marcia's email said that Dr. Traboulsi must be bringing up something of an individual case. She did not bring up anything about an individual. Dr. Traboulsi imputed that. Two, our Executive Committee's statement wasn't just about legal. There is a legal baseline, but there are also best practices. We don't want to continually rest upon the legal baseline. That would be a real sad state for our campus climate. We made the statement in hopes for a better climate, which is an ongoing project.

Dr. Stratton clarified that the statement was a statement of the Senate Executive Committee. It was not a statement by the whole Senate. The Executive Committee was not speaking on the behalf of this body but speaking on the behalf of the Senate Executive Committee. This is very important to understand.

Dr. Traboulsi said it was clear the statement came from the Senate Executive Committee. His point was if the statement had come from the Senate, it would have been a

much stronger, effective statement, and the opinions of more people would have been heard before publishing the statement.

Dr. Hewitt said that she supports Dr. Traboulsi's right to share his perspective, and she is thankful that he shared it. She also wanted to go on record saying that she believes Dr. Traboulsi's statement contains some factual errors and pretty heavy assumptions for which he does not have any evidence. He has completely misread the tone and the motivation behind the statement that the Executive Committee wrote. Dr. Hewitt wanted to be clear to everyone who is listening that she does not agree with the vast majority of what Dr. Traboulsi shared.

Dr. Cameron thanked Dr. Hewitt for her response. To her colleague Dr. Traboulsi, she agrees he has the right to read his statement into the minutes and he has. However, she also agrees with her colleague that Dr. Traboulsi made assumptions in his statement. When he said trust the administration, he forgets that around this table there is a combined experience of many years of different experiences. From her experience, Dr. Cameron knows what blind trust brings faculty. That is why in terms of asking for policies and clarifications, everyone in this room has the right to ask for those. We do not presume to be lawyers. The statement that the Executive Committee made had nothing to do with any legal issues. It had everything to do with climate, and Dr. Traboulsi's response is a great, wonderful example of what the Executive Committee is talking about regarding our climate where we push buttons on each other with the presumption of knowing what is right while regarding the other as inferior in intelligence. Part of the Executive Committee statement was to address that and start a conversation.

Dr. Cameron asked Dr. Traboulsi to please remember that Faculty Senate was supposed to have met last week. If that meeting had taken place, the statement would have been read into the minutes and there would have been a discussion. The meeting was cancelled because some people were sick, some people had other things happen to them and still others were away. The meeting was cancelled for that reason and no other.

Dr. Cameron believes the Executive Committee made a mistake in sending the statement out before Senate met, and they probably should have waited until this meeting to actually read it. Dr. Cameron does trust that the administrators and her colleagues are all doing what is in the best interest of this institution. We are going to disagree, and we are going to disagree passionately. The trust that Dr. Cameron is asking for is not that you are going to do the right thing in terms of what she perceives as the right thing to do for we all have different ideas of that, but she trusts that our intentions are pure in terms of what is best.

Dr. Traboulsi second Dr. Cameron's sentiment in regards to trusting intentions, but his point was in regards to legal procedure.

Dr. Jill Moffitt, Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Title IX Administrator, was invited to speak. Dr. Moffitt began by sharing that she is the expert in Title IX protocol and procedures. Title IX is not a legal issue in the sense that Clifton Williams as General Counsel makes sure those procedures and protocols are fair and unbiased. Dr. Moffitt sees the Executive Committee's statement as a call to faculty to say, "We are not going to have a climate that is at the bottom minimum level. We are going to have a climate that exceeds that." That is what Dr. Moffitt considers her job.

When the Executive Committee's statement came out, Dr. Moffitt was thrilled to think she could sit around the table with faculty to create policies, definitions and protocols that make sense for our campus and our climate. Dr. Moffitt appreciates the statement for addressing Title IX work for climate issues are not easy. Dr. Moffitt takes issue with a lot of what Dr. Traboulsi said in terms of the genderism that speaks to our climate issues. There is a lot of assumptions as Dr. Hewitt said that are not based on fact. In most institutions of higher education, Title IX have their own set of rules that do not have anything to do with legal proceedings, although attorneys are welcome to join our process.

Dr. Mark McClure thanked the Executive Committee for their statement and asked that Senate move on to the next item of business. Due to technical difficulty, Dr. Stratton passed the floor to Dr. Cameron, Faculty Senate First Vice Chair, to conduct the business since he was having difficulty hearing what was being said.

Engineering Fee Update.

[Statement by Dr. Marietta Cameron regarding the Engineering Fee](#)

Supporting Documents:

[Student Petition Regarding Engineering Fee](#)

[Part two of the Petition](#)

[Student Andre Rucker's Questions from February 1 meeting](#)

[Dr. Krute's Response to Engineering Fee](#)

[Statement from Dr. Rebecca Bruce](#)

[Resolution 1217-1- Approve Tuition General Student Fees for 2018-2019](#)

[Board of Governors Special Fees Slide 1/25/2018](#)

[Fall 2017 Schedule Analysis](#)

[Spring 2018 Schedule Analysis](#)

After reading the statement, but before making a motion, Dr. Cameron yielded the floor to student Andre Rucker to present his petition and statement.

Andre Rucker began by stating he is representing the UNC Asheville Mechatronics Students. Mr. Rucker sent out a survey earlier today to these students. The survey asked students what they would do if this fee was approved. He has received 62 responses so far:

77% stated they would stay (52)

36% were second-year students

31% were third-year students

13% stated they would transfer to another school (6)

5% stated they would change to the 2+2 program (2)

5% stated they would change majors (2)

Mr. Rucker drew attention to the trend that the further along the student was in the program the more likely they would stay whereas the first-year students were most likely to opt out of the program.

He has received over 90 signatures for the petition asking for the fee to be rescinded. This is a big concern of the engineering students and their faculty. He ended his presentation by thanking the Faculty Senate for their time.

Dr. Cameron apologized for bringing this before the Faculty Senate on such short notice, but this matter only came to the Executive Committee's attention within the last seven days. Our Board of Trustees will meet on February 23, 2018. It is our understanding that the Board of Governors will address this matter on March 23, 2018. Dr. Brian Butler made the motion for Dr. Cameron on the behalf of the Executive Committee since Dr. Cameron was running the meeting:

We move that the UNC Asheville Faculty Senate request the following:

1. That the UNC Asheville Board of Trustees rescind their approval of the fees amounting to \$500 per semester to be levied against the UNC Asheville Engineering Students
2. That the UNC Board of Governors vote against any proposal that levies fees against UNC Asheville students.

The motion was seconded.

Discussion:

Dr. Rebecca Bruce relayed that she had contacted Dr. Linda Krute, Director of Distance Education in the Engineering College at NC State University. Dr. Krute knew her response would be sent to the UNC Asheville's Faculty Senate. Not that she would definitely reduce our funding, she is very concerned for she did not have prior knowledge.

Acting Provost Karin Peterson said that this is a joint program with NC State. As part of that program, their students have been paying this fee since Fall 2016, and our students have not. She apologized for the insufficient advanced consultation with engineering students and faculty. She offered that apology as someone who was not here last semester, but she accept this as her responsibility. The fee is intended to meet the goals of maintaining facilities, adding new equipment, and enhancing engineering students' experiences including undergraduate research and travel. She looks forward to working with Dr. Reyhanoglu and Dean Holt so that engineering students benefit and this program at UNC Asheville remains competitive with other programs of excellence in the nation.

Dr. Holland asked for a point of clarification: The NC State Engineering students are paying a \$500.00 per semester? Dr. Peterson corrected that now it is \$1,500.00 a year.

Mr. Erb pointed out that there is a radical difference in facilities available to NC State students unavailable to UNC Asheville students. There is an entire separate engineering campus in Raleigh for the NC State students.

Professor Bond was curious why the motion is not open to any fee at all.

Dr. Cameron said at this time the only fees that have been proposed is the engineering fee and is the only fee she is aware coming before the Board of Governors on March 23. However, the motion is to protect all UNC Asheville students.

Professor Bond wanted clarification that Faculty Senate is being asked to rescind the fee now so that a conversation can occur to take this fee away.

Dr. Cameron agreed this is to give room for the discussions to take place that should have happened.

Dr. Betsalel asked if this the normal process to have increases without consultation with the groups that were mentioned? Have we increased fees this way? Second question, have fees ever been targeted to a specific group of the student body?

Vice Chancellor John Pierce apologized for us being where we are today. At no point in time was there ever any intent to exclude faculty or to exclude students in the process. Vice Chancellor Pierce gave context for why we are where we are:

In September, the Board of Governors passed a resolution recommending there would not be any tuition and fee increases.

Normally, we get instructions from the UNC system in September. Based on those instructions, we normally form the Tuition and Fee Committee which includes students, faculty, and staff and we discuss these things. This year we did not receive our UNC system instructions until we went through our Board of Trustee meeting at the end of October. By then, we were two-thirds of the way through the time we normally would have to process. Our general thinking was that we would not have any increase on tuition and fees. Given that dynamic where we were not increasing tuition and fees as well as have not received instructions from downstate, it didn't make sense to have a Tuition and Fees Committee. This was discussed with the Senior Staff all the way through. About that time, the topic of the engineering fee came up. The engineering fee applies to the students in the Engineering Department, but not to all students, only 220 students as compared to 3,500.

The mistake that was made in this process was the communication of that to the engineering faculty and the students. For that, Vice Chancellor Pierce apologizes. It was a different process from the normal process. As a result, that proposal went through the senior staff at the end of November to the Board of Trustees at the beginning of December and then to the Board of Governors for their consideration. This package was sent in the beginning of January to be voted on by the Board of Governors on the 23rd of March. Vice Chancellor Pierce explained that we normally follow a process, but we were in a compressed time frame.

Dr. Betsalel asked it to be clear that this group of students were excluded from the process. Vice Chancellor Pierce acknowledged that an error was made.

Dr. Reyhanoglu wanted to clarify all hours for this program are credited to NC State not UNC Asheville. UNC Asheville gets the tuition and fees. That is the current MOU that we have.

Dr. McClure asked what Faculty Senate's authority here was. He wondered what this vote expresses. If we pass this Sense of the Senate, is anyone bound by this?

Dr. Cameron said that no one is bound; however, we are making a request. She hopes that everyone is operating in good faith. She is hoping that the Board of Trustees will take our request seriously and go back to reconsider. She especially hopes they will consider what this is doing in terms of our engineering programs and our UNC Asheville students. Dr. Cameron's understanding is that the Mechatronics program is completely here and is UNC Asheville's program. Mr. Erb said the Mechatronics program is unique in that our students graduate from NC State and UNC Asheville simultaneously upon graduation.

Dr. Betsalel also added that as a deliberative body that our duty is to our constituency - both the students, the student body, the people of WNC - it is our responsibility to take up

these issues to give voice and bring to light issues of importance. It is not anger that is being expressed. It is about our responsibilities. Dr. McClure asked whether we would end up the same place after going through a different process.

Speaking for herself and not on the behalf of the Executive Committee, Dr. Cameron hopes that whoever is looking at the matter of increasing fees on our students that they would first of all show a budget, where the costs are, show how these costs are different from the average student, show what the allocation would be. She would also hope there would be some consideration of our principles of keeping a quality education accessible for all. In the Board of Governors slides, there is a definition of what a special fee is and the justification of it. One of them involves what amounts to “we are going to charge extra on those students that are going into fields that give them a competitive edge,” which Dr. Cameron interprets as “we want to charge students that are going to be able to get a job that pays more than other disciplines.” This puts the students at a disadvantage.

Dr. Cameron has heard the justification that NC State has asked for this. Are they also asking AB-Tech, who also has a program with NC State, to also pay a \$1,000.00 fee? Dr. Cameron also understands that students who come here for the 2+2 program are not paying this fee while at UNC Asheville. But when they go to NC State where they are in residence at NC State, they are paying the fee. We need to have discussions regarding why a subset of students are paying this fee while at UNC Asheville.

Dr. Beck asked, if we do not get the FTE, are we losing a substantial amount of state funding?

Dr. Reyhanoglu said they discussed this today at their meeting for he brought up this issue as well. We are operating on an old 2004 agreement. We need to renegotiate the MOU so when UNC Asheville faculty teach engineering classes here, the student hours should count for UNC Asheville. This is an issue that needs to be worked out.

Dr. Hewitt said what she sees as the purpose of this motion, whether the request ends up being granted or not, is to promote greater transparency and shared governance in the future.

Dr. Cameron said that we should demonstrate to students how to speak out. So as we are before them, we should demonstrate the model we teach. She would not as part of the Executive Committee insisted on this if she didn't believe that speaking out makes a difference. If there is a decision to continue on with this fee, at least they have heard someone say this is not fair and this is not right.

Andre Rucker stated that as an engineering student the biggest problem they had was they didn't understand why they weren't consulted or told in advance. They had no prior knowledge of the fee. It would have nice to have had a voice or to have somebody speak on their behalf.

Dr. Rebecca Bruce said this is a fee levied against students in a program where the faculty and students were not consulted. Think about the normal process of a student fee where the allocation of the fee has been outlined in detail. She cannot buy or request an instructor PC because it is not a student activity. This fee was proposed and put through an approval process without consulting the students or the faculty of the program for which it is supposed to be supporting. We have no plans that address how this fee is going to be used other than it goes to the Steam Studio, which is a common facility for all UNC Asheville

students. Also, some amount goes to the administration in ways that are not defined. And finally, some of the fee goes to the department that is fully supported by NC State, which does not have need for additional equipment. The purpose of the fee has not been disclosed in detail.

Dr. Stratton wanted to echo some of what he has heard. This is an opportunity for faculty and students, to voice issues, which this opportunity was not given to a Tuition and Fee Committee nor the SGA. Some may see this as just a symbolic vote; however, this is an opportunity to have that voice and to ensure that we are having a seat at the table. He will be at the February Board of Trustees meeting. When he gives the report of the Senate, he will be sharing this with them. The Faculty Senate is a deliberative body and a space for people to voice as we have heard throughout this hour of debate on a variety of issues.

Dr. Cameron pointed out for the students who are affected by this – this vote is not symbolic. When she was a student, she definitely would not appreciate thinking that all my efforts are just simply symbolic. She hopes the effort she is making and the reason that she goes through this is for people to actually reconsider. She also would like to point out that today this affects the engineering students; tomorrow it could very well be our own students. Dr. Cameron has seen the Board of Governors slide to know this is a true possibility. We have been down this road before where special fees were taken away and now they are returning. If we are not diligent about speaking out, then it is to our disadvantage.

Dr. Peterson wanted the Faculty Senate to understand the context of declining state budgets and state appropriations to universities. This is part of why NC State started a fee was to sustain the quality of effort they have in their program, and we cannot count on more appropriations from them. If we do not have this fee, at some point, it is going to dig in somewhere.

Dr. Butler asked to respond to Dr. Peterson. He thinks it would have been nice to have that in the committee to discuss what the issues were. He appreciates the description of the way it happened and the admission that there would have been better procedures. It is not symbolic to ask when possible to use procedures. It is important to know the rationale on both sides.

Dean Holt said he is not sure what the plan is moving forward. Our mover/shaker Chancellor Mullen came up with this program with NC State, which is when this original MOU came out. NC State gets all the student credit hours. Getting the student credit hours back to us would be very helpful to us. As a campus that has 6 FTE to hire people this year, the additional credit hours to generate more FTEs is important. Dr. Reyhanoglu and Dean Holt are going to work together with Provost Peterson to make sure this MOU is examined and perhaps redone in such a way that allows UNC Asheville to benefit more from the engineering program.

Dean Holt went on to acknowledge there is concern from Dr. Bruce and Mr. Erb for they are emotional regarding what is happening to their students. They don't want the students to be assessed these fees. He understands why they are emotional about this. The students are emotional about this as well. Referring back, February 1 was the first time Dean Holt heard from the students about this fee. They were trying to provide answers to them and trying to provide the context of the fees. The students were appreciative of the opportunity to speak and it is unfortunate they did not have the opportunity before February 1. Apparently,

based on administration, there was an opportunity to pursue this fee to be consistent with what NC State does. Our facilities are not as good as NC State's, but maybe, with this fee, the facilities can be reexamined and improved. So that is where we are. The Engineering Department is going to work within first and then Dean Holt is going to work with the Engineering Department to make sure their curriculum can handle additional facilities and instrumentation as well as other improvement to enhance the student's experience.

Dr. Bruce emphasized that the bottom line is the operating budget for this program comes from NC State, as agreed upon by our MOU with them. Administratively, if UNC Asheville wants a bigger piece of the pie, the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) should be changed, not double charge and put the burden of that on the student. If fees are charged, they should be distributed to support the engineering program.

Mr. Erb does not perceive this as faculty not making their needs known. When Doug Orr was Interim Chancellor, he talked with Mr. Erb for an hour regarding renegotiating that MOU because of the need for it. He had that conversation with Cheryl Alderman and he had that conversation with Joe Urgo for two hours. It still hasn't happened yet.

Dr. Holland wanted to state for the record that she honestly resents the implication of the word "emotional." She thinks it is fine to be emotional and her perception was that use of that term was to make a negative comment. She appreciates the fact that the engineering faculty do care so much about their students and that both faculty and students care about their program.

The question was called.

The motion passed without dissent.

Student Government:

Meredith McLain, SGA Chief of Staff

Ms. McLain wanted to be brief. Here are their events for this semester:

- Black Lives Matter 3rd Annual Event is the week of February 12
- They will hold their first Student Experience panel for the semester on February 12 at 5:30 p.m. in Brown 217. The panel discussion is with multicultural students.
- Greenfest is March 24 through April 1st. They have a total of 20 events on campus from workshops to speakers, including on and off campus days of service.
- They have a #knowyourpower Sexual Assault Prevention Awareness Week starting April 2, working in cooperation with the Title IX office.

Finally, they are working with Dr. Stratton to schedule a time for him to attend a SGA meeting to discuss how SGA can better work with Faculty Senate this semester.

Staff Council:

Vice Chair Anna Peitzman

Vice Chair of Staff Council Amy Peitzman was reporting on behalf of Chair Josh Cavanaugh. Staff Council is making continued efforts to reinvigorate the council.

On February 20, they will hold their semi-annual Staff Forum. They will gather data to compare to their baseline data that they gathered at the previous forum.

They are reviewing their nominations and elections process hoping to move to a more democratic process for their succession plans.

They will be rolling out a new Staff Council website in March.

IV. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee Report: Dr. Lyndi Hewitt
[FWDC Decision Summary 2017-18](#)

FWDC will be putting out the word soon calling for those interested in the First-Year Coordinator position.

Sense of the Senate

[FWDC 7](#) Sense of the Senate: Revisions to Senate Leave Policy and Election of Alternates

FWDC 7 passed without dissent and will go to the faculty at-large for vote.

Since the Sense of the Senate passed, the Constitutional Edits will now go before the faculty at-large for vote. The edits are announced a month before the vote is taken per [Amending the Constitution instructions in Article III, Section 1 of the Constitution](#). If the faculty at-large pass the edits, the edits are made to the Faculty Senate Constitution, and the standing rules edits will come before the 2018-19 Faculty Senate for approval at their first Fall meeting. The Standing Rules and Rules of Order can only be changed at the first fall meeting of the academic year.

***First Reading**

[FWDC 8](#) Clarification of Election Procedures

**If you have questions or issues to be addressed regarding this first reading document, please contact Lyndi Hewitt, FWDC Chair, at lhewitt@unca.edu*

Second Reading

[FWDC 6](#) Personnel Decisions for Joint Appointments

FWDC 6 passed without dissent.

Dr. Hewitt clarified that this policy is for anyone who holds formal joint appointments, which are part of their agreement, but not those who have a single appointment and teach courses in other disciplines.

Faculty Elections Update

Professor Judy Beck

Professor Beck encourages Senators to encourage their colleagues to nominate, especially for Senate since there are 6 faculty elected as well as 3 alternates. For your information regarding the number of emails during the faculty election cycle, the handbook actually tells Professor Beck how many times she has to send out notices. She is just following the rules.

V. Academic Policies Committee Report:
[APC Decision Summaries 2017-18](#)

Dr. Marietta Cameron

***First Reading**

- [APC 23](#) Add new course: HIST 312, U.S. Constitution in Context; Update requirements for History majors with Teacher Licensure
- [APC 24](#) Delete BIOL 223, Human Anatomy, replacing with BIOL 328, Human Anatomy and Histology
- [APC 25](#) Change to Minimum GPA for Transfer Admission

**If you have questions or issues to be addressed regarding these first reading documents, please contact Marietta Cameron, APC Chair, at mcameron@unca.edu*

Second Reading

- [APC 10](#) Remove DRAM 213 as a requirement from 6-9 Language Arts Licensure; Remove DRAM 213/NM 101/VMP 205 as a requirement from 9-12 English Licensure (Dr. Nancy Ruppert)
- [APC 11](#) Revise Requirements for IST Concentration in Ethics and Social Institutions (Dr. Jeff Konz)
- [APC 13](#) Removing Language for Computer and Oral Competencies from Descriptions of the Majors (Assistant Provost Pat McClellan)
- [APC 15](#) Delete WLNG 110 and 120, replacing with CHER 110 and 120; Add new courses: CHER 230, 310 and CHER Special Topics
- [APC 16](#) Change the course titles of FREN 340 and FREN 341
- [APC 17](#) Change the titles and descriptions of GERM 210, 220, 310, 320, 390 and 490
- [APC 18](#) Delete GERM 345, 355 and 420
- [APC 19](#) Delete PORT 210 and 220, replacing with PORT 230 (Dr. Elena Adell)

A motion was made to Bundle APC 10-11, 13, 15-19, which was seconded.

APC 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19 passed with 1 abstention (A Senator had a document in the bundle and had to abstain).

- [APC 12](#) Change credit hours for DAN classes from 3-4; Change the required credit hours for a minor in Dance (Dr. Celia Bambara)
[Statement of Support](#)
[Dr. Peter Haschke's dissent.](#)
APC 12 passed Senate 12-5.

VI. Institutional Development Committee / UPC Reports: Dr. Brian Butler

[IDC Decision Summaries 2017-18](#)

***First Reading**

*[IDC 1](#) Add new course, LL 313, Language and Contexts

*[IDC 2](#) Delete the entries for French, German and Spanish, consolidating them into the Major in Languages and Literatures; Incorporation of Cherokee and Portuguese into the umbrella of the Department of Languages and Literatures.

Appendices: [A](#) [B](#) [C](#) [C Detailed](#) [D](#) [E](#)
(Elena Adell)

A motion was made to waive the Comer Rule for IDC 1 and IDC 2 to give proper notice to students and downstate. The motion was seconded.

Professor Bond is opposed to waiving the Comer Rule because she believes we need more time for discussion.

The motion to waive the Comer Rules passed 11-2-4.

Introduction by Dr. Elena Adell:

This proposal consolidates the existing majors – Spanish, French and German - into one major with language concentrations in order to offer shared experiences across languages. The degree will be a B.A. in Languages and Literatures.

A motion was made to accept IDC 2, which was seconded.

Discussion:

Professor Bond emphasized that the dissent is about questions and not asked with ill intention nor pointing fingers. The dissent is making sure we have shared governance as well as process. It is the Senators' job to ask these questions, which are standard questions they ask all the time. We have gone through a number of items this evening going, "Wait a minute, we are the ones that are supposed to be championing the process." There is a reason for the process. It is important we don't take it personally. It is through the questions that important items are unearthed.

Professor Bond had a couple of additional questions. She wanted clarification from the Registrar's office regarding the dissolution of the majors. The transition of the languages to concentrations would mean students cannot have two concentrations. So students who double major in the Modern Languages and Literatures, they can no longer do that. They can have only one concentration. The Registrar's Office confirmed that.

Dean Strehl stated that over the past five years there were only 3 double majors.

Dr. Stratton asked why they can't have two concentrations.

Associate Registrar Alicia Shope said you can only have one concentration within a major. Students may take the additional courses, but only one concentration can be noted

officially. There are departments that have different majors within the department where interested students complete double majors.

Dr. Adell hopes with this model would create a platform to promote the interest in students to go across languages.

Dr. Criser said the new major encourages students to have interdisciplinary inter-linguistic experiences. This caters more to the need of the students to have these opportunities without locking into a double major or double minor or a major and a minor. This caters to the students' interests.

Professor Bond asked about how these are documented. Associate Registrar Shope said that the concentrations are not listed on the diploma, the major is: B.A. in Languages and Literatures. The concentration is listed on the transcript.

Dr. Trey Adcock clarified that he is supportive of the Languages and Literatures proposal. He does believe some wires were crossed where he was not aware of the language of Cherokee coming under the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures. The Modern Languages and Literatures Department has been very supportive of Cherokee studies and so he is fine with the proposal.

IDC 2 passed 16-1.

A motion was made to accept IDC 1, which was seconded.

Dr. Boyle just wanted to make a suggestion that later they may fine tune the description for the LL course.

Dr. Ruppert likes this liberal arts model of bringing these languages together to gain understanding through cross-culture experiences. IDC 1 passed 16-0-1.

The floor was yielded to Dr. Cameron to move waive the Comer Rule for APC 20, 21, 22. The motion was seconded. Motion to waive the Comer Rule passed unanimously.

***First Reading**

- *[APC 20](#) Delete SPAN 230, returning to the sequence SPAN 210 and 220
- *[APC 21](#) Add new course, LL 313, Language and Contexts
- *[APC 22](#) Delete the entries for French, German and Spanish, consolidating them into the Major in Languages and Literatures; Incorporation of Cherokee and Portuguese into the umbrella of the Department of Languages and Literatures.
Appendices: [A](#) [B](#) [C](#) [C Detailed](#) [D](#) [E](#)
(Elena Adell)

Dr. Cameron bundled the documents and made a motion to accept APC 20, 21, 22, which was seconded. APC 20, 21, 22 passed 16-0-2.

Dr. Cameron wanted to reiterate that APC gets many requests to accelerate documents through APC and Faculty Senate. This is the rare exception that was granted.

VII. Administration/Academic Affairs: Acting Provost Karin Peterson

Based on feedback from the chairs, Provost Peterson announced the PAC process has extended the deadline for position requests to February 12.

Provost Peterson has been working with others regarding issues around campus climate. She acknowledged FWDC and Dr. Hewitt in this regard. There are two upcoming required workshops for Department Chairs and Program Directors. The Provost Cabinet has already had these sessions and will have a follow-up session on how to work with professional staff. Provost Peterson is collaborating with Jill Moffitt, Nicole Norian, Clifton Williams, and Lyndi Hewitt on policies around managing issues around harassment and bullying.

There was a Provost Forum last Friday on the SRI Taskforce work. The instrument was well-received. They are going to send out an email regarding the 2-3 week comment period. They want faculty to look at the form and raise additional questions so they will have a final form to bring to FWDC in March or April.

Upcoming Provost Forums will be concerning the Strategic Plan. February's forum will be on the theme of Student Success and in March, the Diversity Action Council will hold a forum regarding rigor in the context of diversity.

Provost Peterson asked Senators to encourage colleagues to participate in the Engagement Survey.

Provost Peterson also asks faculty to participate in issuing of the academic alerts. There is a quite a bit of evidence showing we are catching students through this system so this is important.

In closing, Provost Peterson asked for Senators' help in learning this role she is in this semester. If a faculty member has feedback or questions for her, her door is open to the degree that her calendar allows and her email is always open.

VIII. Old Business

IX. New Business

X. Adjourn

Dr. Cameron adjourned the Faculty Senate meeting at 5:55 p.m.