

University of North Carolina at Asheville
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Minutes for March 19, 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, M. Grant.

Alternates: W. Strehl.

Visitors: G. Ashburn, A. Boakye-Boaten, C. King, M. Burchard, J. Crave, L. Dohse, J. Dunsmore, L. Friedenber, D. Gillette, W. Haggard, E. Katz, T. King, J. Konz, K. Krumpe, B. Larson, P. McClellan, M. Newlin, H. Parlier, R. Payne, K. Peterson, D. Pierce, J. Pierce, N. Ruppert, A. Shope, J. Whalen.

I. Call to Order, Introductions and Announcements: Dr. Dee Eggers

Dr. Dee Eggers called the Faculty Senate meeting to order.

II. Approval of Minutes:

- [January 22, 2015 \(3:15 p.m.\); February 5, 2015 \(3:15 p.m.\); March 5, 2015 \(4:30 p.m.\)](#)
Moved, second, no discussion and approved without dissent.

III. Executive Committee Reports: Dr. Dee Eggers

Faculty Workload Document. Dr. Eggers has completed a draft of this report which is 48 pages. She sent the report out to the Executive Committee for review to make sure no one was identifiable by their comments. The revised version will be sent out to all faculty once these edits are completed.

Continuity on Faculty Senate. At Faculty Assembly, there was a discussion on the different models schools use to create and retain institutional knowledge and continuity on their Senates. This has been an area of concern in our Faculty Senate where this year three quarters of the Executive Committee will be rotating off the Faculty Senate at the end of this semester. There may be an opportunity to address this concern.

Some of the models were outlined. Several schools have multi-year terms for the Chair of the Faculty Senate. The range in term is from 2 to 4 years. Many schools have a position called "Chair-Elect" whereas they are elected for one year to shadow the presiding chair before assuming the office of the Senate Chair the following year. At other schools, after the Faculty Senate Chair serves their term, they become the "Chair Emeritus" where they perform duties to support the chair. Dr. Eggers said she believes it would be worthwhile for the Faculty Senate to consider different models to provide more continuity for this body.

The Faculty Chair charged FWDC to come up with models for the Faculty Senate to consider. Dr. Eggers invited everyone to make suggestions to FWDC.

Student Government. Mr. Whalen said this is his final Faculty Senate meeting as SGA President. He had three SGA activities to report to Faculty Senate: SGA sponsorship of Greenfest; Open Community Conversation on Monday, March 23 about diversity on our campus and SGA finally have their stickers that advertise the Sexual Assault Awareness and Resources Guide.

Mr. Whalen introduced Maya Newlin, the newly elected SGA President for 2015-16.

Ms. Newlin is overwhelmingly excited to serve as President and looks forward to the coming year.

Chancellor Grant informed the Faculty Senate that annually the UNC System President (President Tom Ross) chooses Presidential interns from nominees of students across the entire UNC System. Three UNC Asheville students interviewed for one of the positions and did extremely well. Mr. James Whalen

will be one of the Presidential interns next year.

Dr. Eggers thanked Mr. Whalen for his exemplary service this past year.

Faculty Assembly. Dr. Lothar Dohse said that President Ross emphasized the faculty's number one focus should be the students. He also highlighted the economic impact that the UNC system has on North Carolina and drew attention to [the study](#) they conducted which shows the UNC system is NOT a burden on the taxpayer, quite the opposite. President Ross also introduced the new Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs for the UNC System, [Junius Gonzales](#).

Faculty Assembly is working on their own assessment of critical thinking and writing, and they request input from faculty. There was a long discussion on the process of closing a center which resulted in a Faculty Assembly Resolution saying the Board of Governors were not following their own rules and called upon the Board of Governors to follow their rules.

The last discussion was regarding how thirty-one (31) members could vote to oust a President who was doing a great job according to all parties concerned. President Ross pointed out that he is still their president and that 31 votes may not be saying lets get rid of Tom Ross but keep him a while in a compromise where he was given a one year contract in which he cannot be fired, giving him some protection.

Chancellor Grant confirmed that the Board of Governors have formed a search committee and the search committee is currently working on a job description. Dr. Dan Pierce confirmed that Faculty Assembly has three of its members on this search committee.

Chancellor Grant also relayed that the Board of Governors this year has been visiting each campus for orientations. Our orientation will be at the end of April. This will be an opportunity for the Board of Governors to know more about who we are, what we do and our special mission within the UNC system.

IV. Academic Policies Committee Report:

Professor Laura Bond

First Reading

- [APC 54](#) Establish a U.S. Ethnic Studies minor within Interdisciplinary Studies
- [APC 55](#) Add new course, ETHN 100, Introduction to U.S. Ethnic Studies
(Agya Boakye-Boaten, Anne Jansen)
- [APC 56](#) Add a Minor in Latin American and Transatlantic Studies
(Agya Boakye-Boaten, Cynthia Canejo)

Professor Bond asked the Faculty Senate to read through the First Reading documents before they come up for Second Reading on April 9 and contact her with any questions.

Second Reading

- [APC 27](#) Update Required Courses for 6-9 Licensure
(Nancy Ruppert)
- [APC 28](#) Increase credit hours and change descriptions of HIST 250 and 451;
Decrease credit hours and change description of HIST 452
- [APC 29](#) Delete HIST 101 and 102, replacing with HIST 210;
Delete HIST 151 and 152, replacing with HIST 220
- [APC 30](#) Change the descriptions and credit hours of HIST 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 309,
315, 318, 319
- [APC 31](#) Change the descriptions and credit hours of HIST 347, 348, 349, 350, 358, 364;
Change the titles, descriptions and credit hours of HIST 357, 362
- [APC 32](#) Change the descriptions and credit hours of HIST 330, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 388, 389, 391;
Change the title, description and credit hours of HIST 381
- [APC 33](#) Change the descriptions and credit hours for HIST 395, 499 and History Special Topics courses
- [APC 34](#) Delete HIST 308, 311, 367 and 368

- [APC 35](#) Add new History courses: HIST 310, 332, 333, 334, 338, 393, 394, 398
[APC 36](#) Changes to Major and Minor Requirements for History
 Appendix I, II, III to History Docs: [APP 1](#) [APP 2](#) [APP 3](#)
 (Dan Pierce)
- [APC 37](#) Add new course, PHIL 308, Philosophy of Literature;
 Change the credit hours of PHIL 312, Applied Ethics
 (Melissa Burchard)
- [APC 38](#) Redesign the capstone teaching methods courses for K-12, middle and secondary school
 licensure programs;
 Delete EDUC 380, 382, 383, 385, 388;
 Replace with EDUC 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438
 (Kim Brown, Reid Chapman)
- [APC 39](#) Delete DRAM 380; Adjust the requirements for Theatre Arts Licensure,
 replacing DRAM 380 with EDUC 430 and 438
 (Laura Bond)
- [APC 40](#) Add new course, INTS 494, Capstone in International Studies;
 Revise major and competency requirements for International Studies
 (Agya Boakye-Boaten)
- [APC 41](#) Add new course: MUSC 140, Music Appreciation;
 Add new course: MUSC 130, Introductory Aural Skills, for Music majors;
 Revise the description of USC 131, adding MUSC 130 as a corequisite;
 Revise the descriptions of MUSC 201 and MUSC 231
- [APC 42](#) Delete MUSC 111, replacing with new courses, MUSC 113 and 114;
 Change the title and description of MUSC 125
- [APC 43](#) Reinstate the Bachelor of Arts in Music
[APC 44](#) Revise the Minor in Music Requirements
 (Melodie Galloway)
- [APC 45](#) Change the level of SOC 280, renumbering it to SOC 368;
 Change number of credit hours and frequency of offerings for SOC 393;
 Add a statement to ANTH/SOC 305 limiting the combined credit for both internships
 to 4 credit hours
 (Karin Peterson)
- [APC 46](#) Add new courses to the Religious Studies curriculum: RELS 326, 342 and 384
[APC 47](#) Delete RELS 420
[APC 48](#) Change the descriptions and credit hours for RELS 200, 215, 280, 312, 381, 386, 387, 388, 389,
 499, Change the descriptions for RELS 313, 330, 398
- [APC 49](#) Delete RELS 490 and replace it with RELS 492
[APC 50](#) Change the Major and Minor Requirements for Religious Studies
[APC 51](#) Change the catalog description for Religious Studies
 (Rodger Payne)
- [APC 52](#) Delete MLAS 670 and 680;
 Add new course, MLAS 681, Capstone Project;
 Change the credit hours and description of MLAS 690, Master's Thesis
- [APC 53](#) Change to MLAS Degree Requirements
 (Ed Katz)

Professor Bond said all documents have received unanimous support from APC. She bundled some of the documents for second reading by department/program.

Professor Bond first introduced APC 27 from the Education Department and recognized Dr. Nancy Ruppert as the contact. A motion was made and seconded to accept APC 27. No discussion.

APC 27 passed without dissent and became SD3515S.

Professor Bond introduced APC 28-APC 36 from the Department of History and recognized Dr. Dan Pierce, the department chair. A motion was made to accept APC 28-APC 36 which was seconded. No discussion.

APC 28 – APC 36 passed without dissent and became SD3615S, SD3715S, SD3815S, SD3915S, SD4015S, SD4115S, SD4215S, SD4315S, and SD4415S.

APC 37 was introduced from Dr. Melissa Burchard of the Philosophy Department. A motion to accept APC 37 was made and seconded. No discussion.

APC 37 passed without dissent and became SD4515S.

APC 38-39 was introduced and Dr. Ruppert was recognized as the representative. A motion was made to accept these documents which was seconded. No Discussion.

APC 38-39 passed without dissent and became SD4615S and SD4715S.

APC 40 was introduced and Dr. Agya Boakye-Boaten was recognized. A motion was made to accept APC 40 which was seconded. Dr. Trautmann asked whether the advisor for this new capstone course would be Dr. Boakye-Boaten or faculty from different disciplines. Dr. Boakye-Boaten replied the advisors will be professors from within his department. The question was called.

APC 40 passed without dissent, with one abstention and became SD4815S.

APC 43 reinstates the Bachelor of Arts in Music. Dr. Melodie Galloway, Christine Boone and Toby King were present to answer questions. A motion was made to accept APC 43 which was seconded. No discussion.

APC 43 passed without dissent, with two abstentions and became SD5115S.

APC 41, APC 42, and APC 44 are also documents from the music department. A motion was made to accept these documents which was seconded. No discussion.

APC 41, APC 42, and APC 44 passed without dissent, with two abstentions and became SD4915S, SD5015S, and SD5215S.

Professor Bond bundled APC 46-51 from the Religious Department. Dr. Rodger Payne was present to answer questions. A motion was made to accept these documents which was seconded. No discussion.

APC 46-51 passed without dissent and became SD5415S, SD5515S, SD5615S, SD5715S, SD5815S, and SD5915S.

APC 45 is from the Department of Sociology and Dr. Karin Peterson was present to answer questions. A motion was made to accept APC 45 which was seconded. No discussion.

APC 45 passed without dissent and became SD5315S.

APC 52 and APC 53 from the MLAS program. Dr. Ed Katz was present to answer questions. No discussion.

APC 52 and APC 53 passed without dissent and became SD6015S and SD6115S.

V. Institutional Development Committee/UPC Reports: Dr. Melodie Galloway
First Reading

[IDC 1](#) Changes regarding Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

IDC 1 is an effort to streamline faculty work, what is assessed and how faculty assess Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). Dr. Galloway said this document points to a larger discussion that she would like Faculty Senate to have regarding assessment where the focus is how to assess to best benefit our students. It is appropriate for this work to come through IDC for the *Standing Rules and Rules of Order* lists it as among their duties:

Institutional Development Committee Duties

a. Evaluate and assess for both resource implications and consistency with the university's Mission Statement, Statement on Shared Values, and planning documents

- i. faculty and administrative policies and activities
- ii. new degree programs, minors, concentrations, and curriculum changes and innovations
- iii. proposed and existing centers
- iv. institutional programs

b. Participate as statutory members of the University Planning Council and, in consultation with the administration, in the review of budget allocation and other institutional development matters.

Dr. Eggers asked for a show of hands of those who are or have been an Assessment Liaison. There were six (6) Faculty Senate members who raised their hands.

Dr. Eggers noticed on her Faculty Workload survey there were many comments concerning assessment. Dr. Eggers knew we were doing more than required; however, she wanted to know how much more we were doing. Although assessment is important and valuable, there needs to be a balance since everything we do towards assessment is at the expense of activities faculty could be doing with their students. Thus, we need to understand what the minimum assessment is.

Provost Urgo referred Dr. Eggers to Jessica Dunsmore, the Director of Institutional Effectiveness, who would know what we are doing and determine the minimum assessment requirements. Dr. Eggers and Director Dunsmore made [a spreadsheet](#) showing what each agency requires of the university. The peach shaded areas on the spreadsheet are what we are required to do by outside bodies. Dr. Eggers wanted the Faculty Senate to be aware of this information and asked for them to think about how we might like to move forward and perhaps revise some of the Student Learning Outcomes.

Dr. Stratton thanked Dr. Eggers and Director Dunsmore for this eye-opening spreadsheet, asked who sets the priorities, and what is the Faculty Senate role.

This year, Provost Urgo said Dr. Bruce Larson is over this area. Dr. Larson said he thinks the point is well made where we ought to find the most elegant and effective assessment means. Conversations like these are really welcomed and important to have.

Provost Urgo said we need to find that balance that is right for this teaching institution. We do not want to assess to the point that we drive ourselves crazy. However, we do not want to do the absolute minimum either because we are doing things at UNC Asheville that are not done at other institutions and we want to be able to prove and show that. So we should have a discussion about the spectrum.

Dr. Ray said that we should assess to the extent assessments are leading to decisions that improve student learning outcomes.

Chancellor Grant agreed that we are in a time where demonstrating what our students know is important. However, we do that better when we are clear about what is important to this institution and how to demonstrate the value of the application of a liberal art education in the 21st century. There are many ways to do that and she

agreed with Provost Urgo that the key is finding that balance so she has evidence that our students are learning. This is a very important conversation for faculty to have.

Dr. Stratton requests we are clear going forward what the Faculty Senate's role is in this.

Dr. Galloway said IDC had a very lengthy, informative session with Dean Ashburn and Director Dunsmore. She appreciates her colleagues on this committee and would like to take this back to IDC for a follow-up discussion that they would report back to the Faculty Senate. She invites anyone to email her or any of the IDC members (Dr. David Clarke, Dr. Don Diefenbach, Dr. James Perkins, Dr. Keith Ray and Dr. Greta Trautmann) their thoughts.

Dr. Eggers said we do need to pass something this semester because of the SACS five year review. We need to formalize something to review for the next two years.

Dr. Betsalel wanted to caution the Senate to determine the history and fully articulate it before deleting a University Student Learning Outcome. The outcome he feels is especially important and needs reconsideration to delete is Civic Engagement – Local and Global. He suggests that the Senate have multiple open meetings and not rush to eliminate outcomes.

Dean Ashburn said that she and Director Dunsmore did discuss Dr. Betsalel's point and concluded these are all important aims for an institution to have and are fine aspirations we hope to obtain but not have to assess them. Many of them we cannot truly assess.

Dr. Betsalel said he is hearing a lot of pressure to streamline this, and he is saying go slow to make strategic wise decisions.

Dr. Lisa Friedenber, Director of Academic Assessment, said every single student learning outcome that has been proposed or rejected has been through this body, the Faculty Senate. The role of the Faculty Senate is to do this work. This body has complete control. Often in the past, the disconnect has been due to this body not being well-informed before making these decisions. Dr. Friedenber asked the Faculty Senate to think carefully and ask questions before voting. Everything in the mission statement does not have to be a learning outcome. A learning outcome is operationally defined in a very specific way because it must be measurable. Dr. Friedenber welcomes any question regarding this.

Dr. Eggers asked who says that a learning outcome has to be operationally defined. Dr. Friedenber said that SACS says that if you define something as a learning outcome, you must provide data from assessment in support of your progress on that outcome (Director Dunsmore confirmed SACS).

Dr. Galloway said they will take this input back to IDC and invite Dr. Friedenber to join IDC as they work on this document for passage before the end of the semester.

VI. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee Report: Dr. Sam Kaplan

First Reading:

[FWDC 14](#) Revision to language on elections

Second Reading:

[FWDC 9](#) Updating Conflict of Interest and Commitment Policy
[FWDC 10](#) Revisions to Peer Review Policy
[FWDC 11](#) Proposal to Revise the Sustainability Committee
[FWDC 12](#) Animal Care and Use Committee and Animal Subjects Policy
[FWDC 13](#) Revisions to Dossier submitted for Post-Tenure Review

Faculty Elections Update:

Dr. Michael Neelon

Senate Approval of Ballots for:

Academic Appeals Board, Faculty Assembly & Alternate Conciliator

[Sense of the Senate](#) regarding the term "University Community"

Dr. Sam Kaplan

Dr. Kaplan first drew the Senate's attention to the first reading document that will be up for second reading on April 9. If Senators have questions, they are to ask Dr. Kaplan.

Dr. Kaplan brought each of the five second reading documents up one at a time.

FWDC 9 makes the Faculty Handbook conform to the current language in the UNC policy manual regarding conflicts of interest. A motion was made to accept FWDC 9 which was seconded. No discussion.

FWDC 9 passed without dissent and became SD6215S.

FWDC 10, regarding the peer review policy, is due to faculty saying reviewing every year is a burden in terms of faculty workload. FWDC felt it was reasonable to say that tenured faculty need only to be reviewed every other year. A motion was made to accept FWDC 10 which was seconded.

Discussion. Dr. Cameron said she does not see this helping the small departments. Dr. Kaplan agreed this does not solve all situations, but it does address part of the issue.

Dr. Cameron also wanted to point out that an untenured faculty member can perform a peer review and she wanted to point that out for the record since in another discussion not long ago some faculty expressed only tenured faculty could perform a peer review. She wants the record to reflect that untenured faculty can perform peer reviews.

Dr. Galloway understood that it was critical for tenured faculty to have a peer review every year. Dr. Eggers and Dr. Kaplan said that they do not have to do that based on this document.

Dr. Stratton asked for clarification regarding untenured faculty allowed to perform a peer review. Dr. Kaplan confirmed that a faculty member can have unlimited peer reviews but at least one of them has to be by a tenured faculty member.

Provost Urgo asked if there was anything preventing a tenured faculty member from asking for a peer review every year. Dr. Kaplan said no, you can't have less than every other year but you can have more peer reviews. The only requirement is you have to have one every other year.

Dr. Cameron asked if there is a standardized evaluation tool that faculty can use to perform a peer review. There isn't a required tool but there is a tool recommended by the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) one can use. Dr. Perkins and Dr. Konz said that there are guidelines already in the Faculty Handbook.

The question was called.

FWDC 10 passed without dissent and became SD6315S.

FWDC 11 revised dated Sustainability Committee language in the Faculty Handbook. A motion to accept FWDC 11 was made and seconded.

Discussion. Provost Urgo said this document came about when Sonia Marcus, the Sustainability Director, wanted to create a council to advise her, and they discovered there was already a committee. They decided, instead of creating a new committee, to revise this committee. The question was called.

FWDC 11 passed without dissent and became SD6415S.

FWDC 12 brings our policy up-to-date regarding animal care. Dr. David Gillette was present to answer questions. Dr. Eggers took a moment to announce that Dr. Gillette received a Fulbright Grant for next year, and the Senate applauded his accomplishment. A motion to accept FWDC 12 was made and seconded.

Discussion. Dr. Betsalel remembers there was a controversy when this document came to Senate last year and asked Dr. Gillette to relay that history. Dr. Gillette said this document brings us in line with what the Federal Regulations, the USDA and the Public Health Service requires. We do little animal research here. Federal Law only requires us to regulate the care of mammals but there is the question of how we as an institution treat all animals. Dr. Clarke said these issues are non-issues because we do not have enough money to keep rats and mice. It costs too much money to house them.

Dr. Konz recalled the concern was why only have regulations regarding mammals when the regulations call for not only coverage of research but also teaching activities in the classroom such as fish.

Dr. Betsalel is concerned about animals and wanted to know what assurances could be provided. Dr. Krumpe said that in order to do anything with mammals, you have to have an animal care facility. If you do not have an animal care facility, you have to have a committee that oversees anything with mammals. Since we do not have the animal care facility, we cannot do anything with mammals in our classrooms or research.

Dr. Diefenbach said that this document will get us in line with Federal Regulations. We can have other policies brought before the Faculty Senate later to protect other classifications also.

The question was called.

FWDC 12 passed without dissent and became SD6515S.

FWDC 13 addresses Post Tenure Review (PTR) and makes it fall parallel with tenure promotion so they are consistent. A motion was made to accept FWDC 13 which was seconded.

The question was called.

FWDC 13 passed without dissent and became SD6615S.

Dr. Michael Neelon presented the ballots of nominees for the Academic Appeals Board (AAB), Faculty Assembly, and the Alternate Conciliator for SGA. All nominees were self-nominated.

A motion was made to approve the ballots which was seconded. No discussion.

All ballots passed without dissent.

Sense of the Senate Resolution regarding the term "University Community." This Sense of the Senate came out of a series of meetings with retirees who testified to UNC Asheville's long history where retirees within months of leaving campus feel hesitant to engage the community. The retirees who talked to FWDC gave a list of concerns and issues.

FWDC thought that a Sense of the Senate is needed to remind ourselves that retirees are part of the university community.

A motion was made to accept this Sense of the Senate Resolution. A motion was made to accept the resolution which was seconded.

Dr. Eggers wanted to confirm this Sense of the Senate was not intended to trigger any action. Dr. Kaplan confirmed it does not trigger, but it does open the door for other policies.

Dr. Stratton, Provost Urgo and Chancellor Grant pointed out that since retirees are no longer employees of the university then they are not legally bound and we cannot hold them accountable nor can they make formal decisions. There is an appreciation to address how they are treated after they leave, but we need to have a healthy discussion for there are real concerns.

Dr. Kaplan explained that the document is asking for affirmation that retirees are members of the University Community as defined in the Constitution. This would affirm the Faculty Senate's right to address policies concerning retirees as outlined in the Senate's powers and duties to "maintain and promote the welfare of all members of the University Community;"

The Senate members felt that retirees are considered part of the university community without formally stating this in writing.

In lieu of passing the Sense of Senate Resolution, Dr. Kaplan asked the for Faculty Senate's approval to work with retirees to make some policies. Other universities have these policies, some are quite extensive where retirees are members of certain committees. UNC Asheville does not have any coherent policy. The Senate responded they believe FWDC already has permission to pursue this with retirees by way of the Standing Rules.

Dr. Kaplan withdrew the document from consideration.

A straw poll was taken in which a majority of the Senators support FWDC continuing to work with retired faculty on future policies to provide better inclusiveness of them in the life of the university.

VII. Administrative Reports:

Provost Joseph Urgo

Budget Process. Vice Chancellor John Pierce presented a budget update. As far as the 2014-15 reversion, UNC Asheville has a \$471,000 cut for this year which is 1.25% of our state appropriation. The year before they received a letter from the Governor which was very descriptive about the kind of items they could and couldn't do. This year Vice Chancellor Pierce received a one sentence email from a member of the General Administration. Regardless, they feel like they have a decent plan. Generally, unless Pat Catterfeld has said you can't spend your money in your budget, you can spend the money in your budget. However, any end-of-year spending is not available. This is due to factors like our enrollment is 75 students short of budget which created a \$350,000 shortfall in tuition receipts. The second thing is our repair and renovation money which was \$1.7 million last year is \$317,000 this year. As a result, the main message is we are really tight these last four months of the year.

As we go forward, we will manage in a more conservative fashion. Some things we are not going to be able to do will be things like the lighting on Lipinsky Stage and the Belk Theater, any progress on the implementation of some of the recommendations from an ADA study (Americans with Disabilities Act survey), and improvements in Carmichael. We are doing some emergency repairs for the Carmichael elevator. That is the tough news for this year.

There is better news coming. One is the state revenue collections through the end of January were \$271,000 behind target. Through the end of February, they were \$159 million ahead due to refunds being lower than last year. So there is an expectation that we will not have an unfavorable April.

There is more major, good news regarding the Governor's budget where we were one of five school held harmless from the 2% (\$750,000) cut. There is a strange provision in this Governor's budget about limiting advancement spending to only one million dollars. That is about a \$20,000 cut for us at this point.

These Governor Budget provisions have to go through the legislature to be enacted, but this is a good sign to start off.

Regarding the budget process, Vice Chancellor John Pierce is a great believer in transparency. This past fall was the first time he has had the opportunity to speak to the entire faculty in terms of the budget. He welcomes these opportunities. When they had to create that plan last fall, they went to the University Planning Council (UPC) and compared the budget with the state and our peer institutions regarding spending per student. They anticipate continuing to share this type of information. The transparency is a paradigm shift from previous years. In the past, UPC approved a one page budget document. There has been a real shift the past year to moving to more transparency.

Vice Chancellor John Pierce turned the floor over to Chancellor Grant. As we start taking charge of our financial future, Chancellor Grant said we need to change the language of how we think about the budget. Chancellor Grant is asking that we stop using language like "reserves" for we don't have reserves. When we use language like that, the state thinks we are sitting on boat loads of cash, which we are not. This institution has done extremely well navigating rough waters with limited dollars. Chancellor Grant wants to engage UPC more and do a better job sharing information in that group for there are smart and engaged people around that table. We also need to include how we target enrollments as part of the revenue budget process. We have work to do.

Chancellor Grant praised Vice Chancellor Pierce and his team for doing a great job.

Provost's report. Provost Urgo reported that Student Affairs is working to come up with a process to choose a student speaker for commencement ceremonies. He believes it is good to hear from the students at their own ceremony since the ceremony is about honoring them. Student Affairs is looking at different models and it may take more than one season to work this out.

There is a PDL document from Dean Konz before FWDC now. The administration is going to start

the program with tenured faculty and eventually move towards pre-tenure PDL. More details will come forth by the end of this semester.

Regarding reassigned time, they are focusing on pre-tenured faculty and new hires. New hires beginning this fall are guaranteed 2 reassigned time courses over the first five years. They strongly encourage new hires to use one of these early, perhaps in their first semester where they are making that transition from graduate school to fulltime employment.

We have a 79% response rate on the COACHE survey which is twice as high as anyone in the UNC system. The folks at Harvard say this is phenomenal, and they don't know what this means.

Provost Urgo encourages everyone to complete the Great Colleges to Work for Survey. He took it and it only takes 15 minutes to complete.

The Board of Governors will visit UNC Asheville on April 24. A number of faculty have opened up their classrooms. A Board of Governors member will visit a class where the students have ten minutes to address and show the member what they are doing in their class. The goal is to show this is a serious teaching-driven, student-centered institution. We want them to see the different models of teaching we use.

After the deans were excused from the Senate meeting, Provost Urgo led the Senate in a discussion regarding how deans are reviewed and how often they are reviewed. If we are going to keep this dean model, Provost Urgo thinks we need to standardize this process. Things that need to be determined are whether there should be set terms and term limits. There is a natural difference in perspective between a provost and faculty members on this issue where the provost will want the dean to stay put as long as they can to give stability which is important to the provost's job. However, faculty want more rotation so the faculty perspective is fresh in the dean's mind. They need to find a balance between those two interests.

Provost Urgo opened the floor up to the Senate members to give him feedback.

The Faculty Senate gave the provost their views and suggestions for him to consider as he proposes a model:

- Include a step in the process to seek faculty input regarding appointment of deans.
- When appointing a new dean or reappointing a dean, keep the faculty aware of the process.
- Include a mechanism to gather faculty feedback regarding the evaluation of deans that is a regular and periodic review as outlined by AAUP.
- Although deanship is an administrative position, it takes up faculty lines. Being a dean may be difficult since they are faculty as well as administrators. Since the deanship at UNC Asheville is a distinctive position when compared to deanships of other institutions, a discussion needs to be held regarding the role and extent of authority that deans have for there is confusion among faculty what deans do and the powers they have.
- There is deep concern of the ambiguity in the Faculty Handbook regarding the role of Dean. Their roles need to be more clearly defined and outlined in the Faculty Handbook.
- Since this management structure developed organically out of necessity, it is time to have a job description, written policies and processes.
- Outline terms and term limits.
- Only full professors may be considered for deanship.
- If this is set up as a rotational position, there needs to be a transparent process developed that establishes how a dean rotates out of this role. Do they reenter a faculty position or do they hold another administrative position? This needs to be thought through more to honor the service a dean has provided as well as do what is best for the institution. If there is an assumption that they return to faculty roles, then they need a PDL and other support

to prepare for that reintegration.

- If deanship is a way to develop leadership experience within the faculty, then the university needs to work in developing our faculty as leaders in institutional capacity. Faculty are not trained to be department chairs either. However, faculty can be mentored to be a department chair since the department chair sits and works among the faculty. That is not the case with dean positions which needs to be addressed. Formal mentoring of deans is needed.
- Going forward, when the provost and deans meet, there could be other faculty members also appointed to that group so faculty are “witnessing” the decisions being made administratively.
- There are also issues of compensation. When they become dean, there is a formula of base salary plus “something else.” That “something else” goes away when they go back to a faculty position which is similar to department chair positions. There are potential problems that need to be evaluated to fairly compensate.

When the issue of compensation was brought up, Dr. Eggers discussed a pay equity study of the entire faculty that was done by the Task Force on Salary and Equity in 2005. Bruce Larson led that body. Dr. Eggers served on it. She said such studies should be done every ten years or so. The impetus for the last study was that, after years of no raises, funding would be available for raises. At this time, the coming tuition increases will allow faculty raises and salary adjustments. Dr. Eggers asked the senate if it was OK for her to look into setting up another study. Most nodded in support. No one dissented.

VIII. Old Business

No old business.

IX. New Business

No new business.

X. Adjourn

Dr. Eggers adjourned the meeting at 6:31 pm.

Respectfully submitted by: Lisa Sellers
The Executive Committee