

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT ASHEVILLE  
**FACULTY SENATE MINUTES**  
May 3, 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, A. Rote, N. Ruppert, M. Smith, K. Peterson.

Members Excused: C. Oakley, M. Richmond, M. Smith (4:15 p.m.).

Visitors: P. Bahls, A. Batada, B. Bourne, E. Boyce, J. Brock, S. Clark Muntean, M. Davis, S. DiPalma, L. Dohse, A. Dunn, M. Gass, B. Haggard, L. Han, H. Holt, L. Horgan, A. Jessee, J. Konz, P. McClellan, A. Moraguez, J. Pisano, A. Peitzman, A. Shope, W. Strehl, R. Tatum, S. Traboulsi, D. Traywick, S. Wasileski, A. Wertz, C. Williams.

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes:  
April 5, 2017 3:15 p.m.  
Passed without dissent (one abstention due to Senator's absence).

III. Executive Committee Report: Dr. Micheal Stratton  
Chancellor Search Committee Report. Dr. Stratton thanked Senators who attended the five sessions to meet the candidates. The Board of Trustees reviewed the final candidates from the Search Committee, which were three unranked recommendations. Dr. Stratton understands these candidates are being reviewed by President Spellings, and UNC Asheville should know within three weeks who the new Chancellor shall be.

Sense of the Senate presented to Chief Boyce. The picture shows Chief Boyce accepting the signed and framed Sense of the Senate praising his and the University Police Department's work. (From Left to Right: Dr. Stratton, Chief Boyce):

*The Faculty Senate would like to express its appreciation and gratitude to Chief Eric Boyce for his exceptional leadership and dedication to the University of North Carolina at Asheville campus and community. Chief Boyce's handling of the challenges caused by the construction projects, with the limited resources and options available to him, is commendable. The officers and staff of the University of North Carolina at Asheville University Police deserve our appreciation and support. Their high level of professionalism and commitment to the safety and efficient operation of our campus reflects the University of North Carolina at Asheville's commitment to responsible, creative, and engaged service to the community.*

Student Government:

President Michael Davis

Faculty Senate congratulated the newly elected SGA President Michael Davis and welcomed him to Faculty Senate.

SGA has been working on an initiative to present to President Spellings the importance of Diversity from each UNC system schools' perspective. President Davis thanked Senate for sending their [Sense of the Senate](#) document to the SGA President to be included in their report.

President Davis has picked his cabinet for the 2018-19 academic year. His cabinet is the first cabinet in the history of UNC Asheville that consists of all female students who come from many different walks of life. At this time, they have been reaching out to departments asking how SGA can best serve students.

Staff Council:

Chair Anna Peitzman

Staff Council's nominating committee has been working hard and they hope to implement a more democratic nomination and election process that they hope will start in this fall.

Chancellor Urgo is sponsoring a team to participate in the Chancellor's Cup Golf Tournament in mid-May. This event raises funds for the Janet B. Royster Scholarship.

Faculty Assembly:

Dr. Lothar Dohse

UNC System's Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs Junius J. Gonzales will be leaving for a position elsewhere. He was well liked and Faculty Assembly Representatives will miss him.

Retention and graduation rates were the two main topics at the last session. They talked about UNC Asheville's initiative to build up summer school to aid in retention and curriculum completion.

Since this was his last report before retirement, Dr. Dohse wanted to say that UNC Asheville is viewed in a very positive light at the system's office. Dr. Dohse has had to explain how things are done at UNC Asheville as a model for other institutions.

Faculty Senate thanked Dr. Dohse for his service over the many years to Faculty Assembly and Faculty Senate.

[Faculty Senate Chair's Year End Report:](#)

Dr. Micheal Stratton

IV. Institutional Development Committee / UPC Reports:

Dr. Brian Butler

[IDC Decision Summaries 2017-18](#)

[IDC 4](#)

Sense of the Senate Regarding Sustainable Investment Strategies  
Motion made to accept IDC 4, which was seconded. IDC 4 passed without dissent.

[IDC's Master Program Statement](#)

Dr. Butler read the aspirational statement and opened the floor up for discussion. No motion for acceptance was asked nor made.

**Discussion:**

Dr. Butler explained that during their discussions this year, IDC realized the benefits if UNC Asheville graduate 50 Graduate Students a year that the funding for the university goes up significantly.

Dr. Mark McClure said he personally agrees with this statement, and he is open to the expansion of masters programs. However, from his experience, the faculty at-large seems to not share his views. Dr. Lora Holland said that this might be due to the faculty at-large not having the information they have seen. IDC's intention is to get the information they have seen before the faculty and let them know that IDC will be having this discussion and investigating the information before considering further masters programs.

Dr. Butler emphasized that IDC is not saying yes, but they have a willingness to look at the data, deliberate, and may support further expansion of the graduate programs. Dr. Butler thanked Michael Gass for the information.

Dr. Marietta Cameron sees this document as an indication of our willingness to go into "Research Institution Land" where we try to compete with a set of institutions that have played this game a long time instead of focusing on what we do best. She thinks as a matter of process that a document should come before Senate that says that we are going to accept masters level programs before a program that establishes that comes in. It behooves this body to have the discussion on record, have the faculty's feedback, have a vote on having masters programs first, and then look at individual masters programs. Many times UNC Asheville let other institutions drive what we do, but as Dr. Dohse points out, the UNC system is interested in what we initiate. We are leaders and can initiate programs where the other institutions follow us. Dr. Cameron understands funding may be enticing, but we should follow the processes we have in place and have a formal deliberation on whether to expand graduate programs. This document gives the impression that this discussion has already been held and the decision has been made to expand the masters program.

Dr. Betsalel asked how we start the conversation. This statement reflects IDC's deliberate, incremental conversation they have had this year where they recognize we are in a different demographic than we were twenty-thirty years ago. This demographical area is asking for masters level education in areas of public health professionals and writers among many other areas. The community is asking for this and it is prudent that we consider their requests.

Dr. Stratton commends IDC's work and reminds Senate that many IDCs of the past have held these conversations. He understands this statement to be a carefully considered statement regarding their conversations this year and is not an automatic green light for more masters programs.

Dr. Holland said she admits being in a department that is resistant to change (Classics), but Dr. Holland is very much in favor of exploring this. Given our situation in the western part of the state and the changes that are inevitably coming to this region, if we do not get on "this boat," we will be sorry later. This is a tremendous opportunity not to change who we are but to enhance the opportunities of the region.

Dr. Butler wanted to point out that Dr. Cameron wasn't dissenting. She was starting the conversation and this is exactly where it needs to be. Dr. Butler believes we need to get the information on the ground and then decide. Dr. Butler did not understand IDC to mean, "Let's put the pedal to the floor" but to say, "Let's get the information in the room so the faculty can decide in light of the information."

Dr. Kevin Moorhead wished to share two observations. He found it interesting that part of the justification is driven by resource implications, and in particular, in numbers of potential graduates at the Graduate level. First, he hopes that those numbers are not driving us to find some critical mass in order to reduce the teaching load. Second, Dr. Moorhead finds the ramifications of dropping down the number of courses interesting in light of changes from the past five to ten years where many departments have moved to the four-credit hour course model.

Dr. Butler says he thinks it is an easy argument to see if we are teaching two less courses a year then we have more time for the courses we will be teaching as well as being supported at a

higher level of funding for research and resources. Again, this is a conversation that needs to happen. This statement was not meant to jump ahead of the conversation. The statement was meant to raise the idea in the room for conversation.

Dr. Hewitt said that some of us had an opportunity to sit in an Enrollment Management Workshop and she learned a whole lot that she did not know before. She thinks it would be great if those presenters could come to Faculty Senate in the fall and give some of those presentations again. If more faculty had that knowledge and understanding, decision-making would be informed in a new way. Dr. Stratton agreed to bring those presenters to Senate next fall.

### **Second Reading**

[IDC 3](#) Add a minor in Human Rights Studies to be administered by the Political Science Department  
(Linda Cornett, Political Science)

Motion was made to accept IDC 3, which was seconded.

### **Discussion:**

Dr. Holland said the resources were discussed at length. IDC has reservations about a department overseeing a minor whose student population would not necessarily take courses in that department. They also talked about the potential of this minor being a heavy workload for the director in the Political Science Department, which resulted in the friendly amendment that if the minor proves more popular than anticipated that it would be revisited.

This document also has come before APC and since we are talking about the directorship, it would be a good time for Dr. Cameron to express her concern. She has a friendly amendment to state the possibility of a faculty member from outside the Political Science Department could have access to being the director with the understanding that the Political Science Department is still hosting this minor and the director is accountable to the Political Science Department. Dr. Cornett was agreeable to the friendly amendment and sent Ms. Sellers the corrected wording.

Dr. Stratton applauds the creativity of this minor and the opportunity to work with others and that the advisory committee could be open to faculty from other departments.

Dr. Cornett concurred and said they envisioned that the advisory committee would be self-select so the faculty would have a stake in the program. This would allow the Political Science Department to receive input from the campus as well as keep the campus informed.

IDC 3 passed without dissent with four (4) abstentions from those who were involved in the proposal.

[IDC Chair's Year End Report:](#)

Dr. Brian Butler

V. Academic Policies Committee Report:

Dr. Marietta Cameron

[APC Decision Summaries 2017-18](#)

### **Second Reading:**

[APC 59](#) Change the descriptions of NM 251 and 410

[APC 60](#) Change the names of NM 231, 350 and 450

[APC 61](#) Add new course, NM 313, Virtual Reality, crosslisting it with CSCI 313

[APC 62](#) Change when NM 330 and are offered

[APC 63](#) Edit the introductory narrative of the New Media major;

Change the name of the Interactive Art and Design Emphasis Area to Interactive Media (Lei Han, New Media)

- [APC 64](#) Change prerequisites for CSCI 280 and CSCI 338  
[APC 65](#) Change when CSCI 412, Computer Vision, is offered  
(Marietta Cameron, Computer Science)
- [APC 66](#) Delete the Application Process for the Creative Writing Concentration in English and for the Creative Writing Minor  
(Kirk Boyle, English)
- [APC 67](#) Add a minor in Human Rights Studies to be administered by the Political Science Department  
(Linda Cornett, Political Science)
- [APC 68](#) Change the description of CHEM 323, Foundations of Biochemistry;  
Change title and description of CHEM 437, Modern Biochemistry
- [APC 69](#) Change the major competency requirement for the B.S. degree in Chemistry  
(Sally Wasileski, Chemistry)
- [APC 70](#) Remove LANG 120 as a prerequisite to declaring a major  
(Deaver Traywick, LAC)
- [APC 71](#) Removal of references to Information Literacy and Writing Competencies in the Liberal Arts Core (LAC) and throughout the catalog  
(Jessica Pisano, Dee James, Patrick Bahls, Brandy Bourne, Amanda Werts, Rick Chess and Chris Bell)
- [APC 72](#) Atmospheric Sciences Credit Hour Exception Petition Document  
(Chris Hennon, Atmospheric Sciences)  
Reference Documents:  
[SD1814F](#)      [SD2015F](#)      [Appendix](#)      [SD9816S](#)
- [APC 73](#) Change when HWP 250 is offered;  
[APC 74](#) Change course description and semester offered for HWP 253;  
Change course description for HWP 335;  
Change course description and prerequisite for HWP 380
- [APC 75](#) Delete HWP 154, Women's Health, changing to HWP 254 with updated description
- [APC 76](#) Add new course, HWP 381, Body Fat and Body Image  
(Jason Wingert, Health and Wellness Program)

Dr. Cameron pulled APC 67 out of the bundle so that the friendly amendment could be made to this document as well (IDC 3 and APC 67 are not the same document but the resulting Senate Document will have the end product of both committees friendly amendments).

A motion was made to accept APC 59 - APC 66 and APC 68 - APC 76, which was seconded. No discussion. APC 59 – APC 66 and APC 68 – APC 76 passed without dissent.

A motion was made to accept APC 67 with the same friendly amendments that were made to IDC 3, which was seconded. No discussion. APC 67 passed as amended without dissent and four (4) abstentions from those who were involved in the proposal.

[APC Chair's Year End Report:](#)

Dr. Marietta Cameron

VI. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee Report:

Dr. Lyndi Hewitt

[FWDC Decision Summary 2017-18](#)

[Student Feedback on Instruction \(SFI\) Update](#)

[FWDC 17](#)

Sense of the Senate expressing gratitude to the Task Force on Student Feedback on Instruction (formerly the Task Force on Student Rating of Instruction)

FWDC 17 does two things: it expresses gratitude to our hard-working, diligent Student Feedback on Instruction Taskforce and expresses support for moving the instrument forward.

A motion was made to accept the Sense of the Senate Resolution FWDC 17, which was seconded.

**Discussion:**

Dr. Holland went on record for being against the instrument. There has been report after report over the past year that shows these instruments are still discriminatory in terms of gender and race. The statements that students made have been detrimental to minority faculty and other underrepresented faculty on this campus. She does not agree that we should go forward with this instrument. There has to be another way to bring this work forward that does not damage our faculty.

Dr. Hewitt appreciated Dr. Holland's comments. The consensus of FWDC does not necessarily disagree with most of what Dr. Holland said. FWDC's position is to move forward on parallel tracks. The new instrument is vastly better than the old one in terms of mitigating some of those tendencies. One of the findings based on the listening sessions is that many faculty members have these concerns for good reasons. There is plenty of research that questions the validity of traditional course evaluations as an instrument for assessing student learning or quality of teaching. Dr. Holland's points are well taken. On another track, that information is being brought forward.

Dr. Cameron thanked Dr. Holland for bringing the point forward and for her statement. Dr. Cameron greatly appreciated her statement because if Dr. Cameron made that statement, she does not feel it would be as effective because of being seen as having "a dog in that fight."

Dr. Holland believes the entire system of Student Rating of Instruction reeks of white privilege. Dr. Hewitt added, "Yes, white privilege and other forms of privilege, as well. Research is clear about that."

Dr. McClure agrees with what he is hearing and believes that student evaluations have to be read with a lot of care. Dr. McClure does not see a guidance in how to interpret them.

From the listening sessions, Dr. Hewitt confirmed there were recommendations to have careful training for Department Chairs and members of the Committee of Tenured Faculty on how to interpret this data and we intend to take those recommendations seriously.

Dr. Peterson said the SFI Taskforce has explicit recommendations for the need of training with the intent that the implementation phase incorporates designing instructions for completing evaluations and interpreting feedback.

Dr. Hewitt appreciates the expressed concerns. She believes that it is best to move forward with this carefully researched and designed instrument that represents a vast improvement over the current instrument, while also continuing to question the weight that SFIs carry in evaluation of faculty.

Dr. Stratton asked if the Taskforce found any institutions that said they were going to scrap having any type of evaluation of the faculty by the student.

Dr. Peterson, Co-chair of the Student Feedback on Instruction Taskforce, said she does not know of a public institution that does not have a quantitative rating of instruction. She believes as a state public institution that we have to have one. She personally would love not to have a survey instrument. Alternative means of evaluating faculty are more labor intensive. They involve interviewing and observations. If we really care about developing people's capacity as teachers, there have to be ways of assessing them, giving feedback that is both informative and summative. Although, she believes the other paths involve more work, she would love our institution to invest in this trade-off because it would enforce our teaching culture. However, it is not clear if we are allowed to make that decision.

Dr. Nancy Ruppert believes the values of our institution are highly related to our teaching. The only thing she sees that faculty are evaluated on is what number the student gives to our courses. This is insane. She would support a more authentic and valuable instrument of evaluation.

Dr. Hewitt added we do have peer observations as well.

Professor Bond proposed a friendly amendment to change the name of the team from implementation team to implementation and review team to emphasize the ongoing work that will continue after implementation of the new feedback instrument. Dr. Hewitt agreed with the change in wording as long as everyone understood it is not a change in policy for there was always the intention of ongoing review.

The Sense of the Senate FWDC 17 passed as amended with one (1) vote of dissent.

### **Second Reading:**

<a href="#">FWDC 10</a>	Faculty Assembly Election Process
<a href="#">FWDC 11</a>	Faculty of Record
<a href="#">FWDC 12</a>	Clarification of Service
<a href="#">FWDC 13</a>	Supplemental Pay and External Activities for Pay for Faculty Members on Leave with Pay
<a href="#">FWDC 14</a>	Revisions to Procedures for Promotion
<a href="#">FWDC 15</a>	Clarification in Annual Evaluation
<a href="#">FWDC 16</a>	Revisions to PTR Process

Dr. Hewitt asked to bundle FWDC 10 – FWDC 16. Two documents were asked to be pulled from the bundle: FWDC 13 and FWDC 15. A motion was made to accept FWDC 10 – FWDC 12, FWDC 14, and FWDC 16. The motion was seconded. No discussion. FWDC 10 – FWDC 12, FWDC 14, and FWDC 16 passed without dissent.

FWDC 13. A motion was made to accept FWDC 13, which was seconded.

### **Discussion:**

Dr. Peter Haschke wondered if an isolated incident is being addressed, which might restrain all faculty forever in their pursuit of work from outside the institution.

Dr. Hewitt clarified that this document says if you are on leave with pay that there are some restrictions on how you can earn additional pay from other universities. For instance, you cannot be a department chair while on leave with pay and receive your additional salary for a service

assignment. We already have a policy in place and this proposal refers to that policy where we are saying to receive the pay from external agencies you have to complete the form.

Dr. Jeff Konz further clarified saying that currently if you are on leave with pay from the university including FMLA, there is nothing preventing you from taking a teaching position at another university. The policy is designed to address that circumstance.

Dr. Haschke explained that is his concern that we are dealing with one very specific issue, and by addressing that one very specific issue may constrain opportunities generally across the board.

Dr. Hewitt asked what opportunities would be constrained by this proposal.

Dr. Holland said that there are outside consulting opportunities that come up for faculty that could involve quite a bit of money. You would not want to restrict someone from being able to take advantage of those opportunities.

Dr. Hewitt maintained that FWDC 13 does not necessarily restricts a person from doing so but requires them to notify and get consent, which we already are supposed to do.

Professor Bond asked regarding the situation of those faculty members who have income from book sales and independent LLCs that are very small. Do they have to write for permission about all those tiny things?

Dr. Konz confirmed that these are all under state policy regarding the external activities.

General Counsel Clifton Williams explained that [the university's external pay policy](#) is from the [Board of Governors policy](#), which is intended to help the institution to determine if there are conflicts of interest and commitment. The only way to examine those issues is by reporting of faculty who desire to have some type of external activity for pay. The classic example is a faculty author assigns their book to their class and require the class to buy their book, which is inappropriate.

Dr. Hewitt says this policy only refers to those who are on leave with pay, which means if they are on FMLA or PDL.

Dr. Stratton asked if FWDC talked about situations where faculty are on leave without pay. Is there any implications for departments when faculty go on leave without pay and take faculty positions elsewhere without resigning? In addition, he sees where it states the Provost is consulted. Does that mean the Provost will consult with the department chairs when these activities are approved that have adverse implications on the students and faculty? Did FWDC talk about faculty members on leave without pay?

Dr. Hewitt said they did discuss this as well. There are instances where faculty are on leave without pay, and during that time, they take another position to try something. There are many reasons why faculty may do this. FWDC discussed whether there should be restrictions and determined due to the many variations in these situations that those should be treated on a case-by-case basis. We cannot prohibit someone from earning outside income or taking another position, whether perceived as temporary or potentially permanent while they are on leave without pay. Furthermore, FWDC discussed that it would be very difficult to enforce such a policy. In practical terms, what would stop a person from doing this when the penalty is they do not return. Dr. Hewitt concluded that Dr. Stratton is raising an important concern; however, FWDC did not feel there was enough evidence to support creating a new policy for those conditions.

Dr. Stratton thanked Dr. Hewitt for her response, and although he is not advocating for a change or a friendly amendment, he does encourage that the Provost as well as colleagues going on leave to consult with their department chair.

Dr. Holland raised the concern that when faculty are on leave without pay from their department, she prefers that vacancy to be a VAP rather than an adjunct for that situation is a big loss for the department and is detrimental to students.

Dr. Konz said that the person on leave still occupies that line so implementing that proposal is difficult and depends on whether Academic Affairs has additional lines. Dr. Stratton understands the line is still with the person on leave but the salary is still available and believes that is what Dr. Holland is expressing that teaching work load could be backfilled by adjuncts, lecturers, and visiting professors., which is at the determination of the Academic Affairs in consultation with the chair.

FWDC 13 passed with two (2) dissenting votes.

FWDC 15. A motion was made to accept FWDC 15, which was seconded.

**Discussion:**

Dr. Stratton asked whether this document is just a reaffirmation or clarification of the language in the current policy.

Dr. Hewitt said that her experience on FWDC the past three years is there are continued calls for clarification of language in various facets of evaluation. She understands, particularly among non-tenured faculty, there is an anxiety and we want to know what is required and what demonstrates compliance of a particular criterion. The truth is evaluations have elements of subjectivity and we have to acknowledge that. FWDC's goal has always been to introduce greater clarity when we could while continuing to acknowledge that perfect clarity is not possible. This particular document makes tiny tweaks that for some will not help at all while others may find these helpful.

If FWDC 15 passes, Dr. Holland asked how this would be assimilated to department chairs and program directors.

Dr. Hewitt says this goes directly into the handbook and Dr. Hewitt will send notice to the CPD list.

FWDC 15 passed without dissent.

[FWDC Chair's Year End Report:](#)

Dr. Lyndi Hewitt

VII. Administration/Academic Affairs:

Provost Karin Peterson

As of May 1, we have 768 freshman deposits, which is up 100 from last year. While planning how to accommodate this huge class, this is very good news in terms of state appropriation. Since we are graduating a huge senior class, this does not necessarily mean that we will have more students on campus. The Chancellor and Provost want to thank all those who worked on an admissions event. They also want to thank the hard-working admissions and financial aid staff who deserve all our thanks.

Pat McClellan, Assistant Provost for Academic Administration, is retiring and asked Faculty Senate applaud her many years of service to the university. She received a standing ovation from the Faculty Senate.

Provost Peterson will be asking faculty to participate on some searches over the summer that will replace Karen Cole's position. Karen is returning to a faculty position. The Academic Advising position is being rewritten to absorb some of Pat McClellan's work. They are also looking to find a new person for the position that is held by Deborah Miles, who is retiring. The Key Center Director vacancy will be expanded to an additional faculty position with one release time per semester plus a stipend to collaborate with the Key Center Director. The additional position will be focused on the classroom and curricular components of service learning. This is an opportunity to reinvigorate the area and include people with vision and understanding of what it takes to do community work well.

The Enrollment Planning Workshop was held during the last day of classes, which prevented many faculty from attending. Provost Peterson's intent is to have a version of this workshop offered prior to the start of school. This workshop gives a 360-degree view of how students process into school to graduation

including the financial challenges and other hurdles students experience. This is a collective consciousness that we need.

Provost Peterson asks for topic suggestions for the Provost Forum for next year. Someone else may shape the calendar, but she wants to collect those ideas.

She is working on a pilot program for evaluating the Deans. The instrument will be an open-ended questionnaire that will go out to the department chairs and program directors.

Provost Peterson closed expressing her appreciation to the Senate Executive Committee who have been quite kind to her. She also would like to express a special thanks to FWDC and Lyndi Hewitt for all their work on campus climate, which has made her conscious of the seat that she is sitting in quite different. She is very appreciative and wants to encourage Senate to hold on to work on campus climate as a crucial agenda item. She also thanks all of Faculty Senate for their trust in her, and she is very grateful for this opportunity.

Let us ride the transition that is before us, though it is a time of great uncertainty, with as much grace as we can muster. We will come out the other side and be okay. Thank you for working with me this year.

The Faculty Senate thanked Provost Peterson for her service.

#### VIII. Old Business

#### IX. New Business

Senator Ken Betsalel wanted to make sure we thank the Interim Chancellor, Joseph Uργο, for taking up what is a very difficult task in this transitional period. Senate seconded his sentiment.

#### X. Adjourn

Dr. Stratton adjourned the meeting at 5:17 p.m.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT ASHEVILLE  
**FACULTY SENATE AGENDA**  
May 3, 2018, 5:22 p.m.; First Meeting of 2018-2019 Faculty Senate  
**Red Oak Conference Room**

Members Present: M. Stratton, K. Boyle, K. Betsalel, J. Beck, P. Bahls, L. Bond, J. Brock, S. Clark Muntean, S. DiPalma, P. Haschke, M. McClure, A. Moraguez, A. Rote, N. Ruppert, K. Peterson.

Members Excused: R. Criser, C. Oakley, M. Smith, A. Wray.

Visitors: A. Dunn, H. Holt, J. Konz, W. Strehl. C. Williams.

- I. Call to Order, Introductions and Announcements Dr. Micheal Stratton
  
- II. Election of an Alternate to fill seat vacated by Samer Traboulsi via resignation.  
Patrick Bahls was elected to serve the remainder of Dr. Traboulsi's term (2018-2020).
  
- III. Election of Faculty Senate Officers
  - a. Chair of the Senate and Chair of the Executive Committee (EC)  
Micheal Stratton was elected for an additional year (2017-19)
  
  - Election of Faculty Senate Vice Chairs by new elected Senate Chair
  - b. First Vice Chair and Chair of the Academic Policies Committee (APC)  
Kirk Boyle was elected for term 2018-19.
  
  - c. Second Vice Chair and Chair of the Institutional Development Committee (IDC)  
Ken Betsalel was elected for term 2018-19.
  
  - d. Third Vice Chair and Chair of the Faculty Welfare and Development Committee (FWDC)  
Judy Beck was elected for term 2018-19.
  
- IV. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee Report
  - a. Committee Work-in-Progress (Nominees to Standing Committees)  
Faculty Senate passed [the slate of nominees](#) without dissent.
  
- V. Committee Assignment Preferences  
Senators submitted their annual preferences for one of the Senate Subcommittees:  
Academic Policies Committee (APC), Institutional Development Committee (IDC), and  
Faculty Welfare and Development Committee (FWDC).  
The Executive Committee considers these submissions when appointing senators to their  
subcommittee assignment for the 2018-19 academic year.
  
- VI. Old Business
  
- VII. New Business
  
- IX. Adjourn: Dr. Stratton adjourned the meeting at 6:12 p.m.