

University of North Carolina at Asheville
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Minutes for April 9, 2015 (3:15 pm)

Senate

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

Alternates: W. Strehl.

Visitors: G. Ashburn, A. Boakye-Boaten, C. Canejo, J. Dunsmore, W. Haggard, A. Jansen, A. Jesse, J. Konz, K. Krumpke, A. Lanou, B. Larson, L. Mathews, P. McClellan, M. Newlin, H. Parlier, J. Preston.

I. Call to Order, Introductions and Announcements:

Dr. Dee Eggers

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

II. Approval of Minutes:

- [March 19, 2015 \(3:15 p.m.\)](#)
Moved, second, no discussion and passed without dissent.

III. Executive Committee Reports:

Dr. Dee Eggers

Student Government.

Newly Elected SGA President Maya Newlin formally introduced herself to the Faculty Senate. Ms. Newlin is a Political Science / Sociology double major also seeking a minor in Africana Studies with a pre-med focus. She is currently hiring her executives and completing the work of the previous administration. She introduced Jenn Preston who talked to the Faculty Senate about Student Government's divestment project.

Jenn Preston is a sophomore at UNC Asheville and represents the UNC Asheville Divestment Coalition. They are advocating for the divestment of fossil fuel companies from the entire UNC System's portfolio.

Questions:

Dr. Eggers asked Ms. Preston what specifically SGA was asking from the Faculty Senate.

Ms. Preston will be sending Dr. Eggers and Ms. Sellers SGA's passed resolution [SSB 014-051 Resolution in Support of the Divestment Coalition](#) and the [Report on Options for Incorporating Sustainability into Investment Practices](#). SGA is asking for the Faculty Senate's support of that resolution or specific feedback to how SGA and Faculty Senate can work to pass a similar joint resolution.

Dr. Eggers asked the Senators to review the resolution that SGA passed so the Senate may consider it at their next meeting.

Ms. Newlin invited everyone to her inauguration on Wednesday, April 15 at 6:00 p.m.

Faculty Workload Survey Responses. Dr. Eggers asked for volunteers to work on a summary document so this survey could be officially published. Volunteers will mark this item on their Senate Interest Survey.

Dr. Eggers passed out the Senate Interest Survey to collect the members' interest for items that have been brought before Senate for work. She asked the Senators to fill one out and turn it in by the end of the meeting.

First Reading

- [EC 1](#) Academic Assessment Revision Proposal
(includes an explanation for revisions to [SD0713F](#) and [SD10214S](#))
- [EC 2](#) Revision of SD0713F: Liberal Arts Core Implementation Proposal Introduction
- [EC 3](#) Revision of SD10214S: Replace the Integrative Liberal Studies Program with The Liberal Arts Core

Dr. Eggers introduced the first reading documents which will reestablish a more sustainable assessment baseline.

IV. Institutional Development Committee/UPC Reports: Dr. Melodie Galloway
[UPC Minutes](#)

UPC will not meet this month but Dr. Galloway relayed a report given by Dr. William Spellman at the last UPC meeting where he talked about COPLAC and explained UNC Asheville's connection to it.

First Reading

- [IDC 2](#) Provisional Minors
- [IDC 3](#) Provisional Minor in Food, Food Systems and Culture

Dr. Galloway introduced the first reading documents. One of the best features of the ILS curriculum were the clusters, and one among the highly recognized and praised of the clusters was the Food Cluster. IDC was recently given the Food, Food Systems and Culture proposal to determine how this curriculum could be incorporated into the new LAC Curriculum. At their March meeting, IDC considered the proposal to make it an undergraduate certificate. Upon approval, the document was slated for first reading for Faculty Senate. Dr. Bruce Larson saw the document and contacted Dr. Galloway about the complexities of undergraduate certificates in regards to SACS requirements that would have to be met since undergraduate certificates are a substantive change for UNC Asheville.

IDC held a special session on Wednesday, April 8 to understand the complexities and to discern a solution in order to include Food Studies in our present curriculum. At this meeting, after conferring with Dr. Larson and Director Jessica Dunsmore, IDC decided to presently take the consideration of undergraduate certificates off the table due to the many issues they present that need to be discussed by the faculty at large.

IDC discerned the Food Studies program looked like a minor. Bruce Larson and Lisa Sellers found a Senate document that defines minors as between 17-24 hours [Alicia Shope found a later minor program document change that approved minors at 18 hours, our current policy]. Thus, the research indicates that number of hours for a minor is determined by the Faculty Senate.

Since the Food Studies' faculty do not wish to have an 18 hour minor and IDC feels that 12 hours is too small for a minor, a compromise was proposed where Food Studies could operate for one year under as new pilot program. This one year provisional minor pilot program is outlined in document IDC 2.

IDC 3 is the specific provisional minor proposed for the Food, Food Systems and Culture Program.

Although IDC has approved a provisional minor for the Food Studies program, their proposal needs to go to APC next, if the Faculty Senate concurs with IDC's determination. Not to rush the proceedings but as a suggestion only, Dr. Galloway said that IDC is willing to work in joint sessions with APC in the coming weeks and is not opposed to waiving the Comer Rule at Faculty Senates' last meeting to vote on an APC approved document regarding the Food, Food Systems and Culture provisional minor.

Questions:

Dr. Chris Bell asked why the proposal was coming through IDC instead of APC.

Dr. Galloway explained that the proposal did begin in APC. However, the Standing Rules state that one of IDC's duties is to, "...Evaluate and assess for both resource implications and consistency with the university's Mission Statement, Statement on Shared Values, and planning documents [for the following items]...new degree programs, minors, concentrations, and curriculum changes and innovations..."

In light of this, the Executive Committee decided to forward the proposal to IDC first, and upon its determination of how to house this study, then the proposal would be forwarded to APC for their consideration. The Faculty Senate Secretary confirmed that this process is the same process Senate has used for proposals that IDC considers first or initiates. IDC recommendations come before Senate, and upon Senate's approval, the proposal is then forwarded to the appropriate subcommittee for consideration and/or implementation documents. Historically, the application of the standing rules has not been consistent and needs to be clarified and improved in light of our recent curriculum changes.

An initial discussion was held not on the documents nor was a vote taken but a general exploration of concerns regarding provisional minors, pilot programs, undergraduate certificates and other possible ideas to incorporate worthy clusters from the previous curriculum in the new Liberal Arts Curriculum. The major points of the discussion were the following:

- IDC thought a provisional minor for one year would allow Food Studies to return this fall while providing the time to work through the complexities regarding SACS, certificates, interdisciplinary studies and minors.
- The Standing Rules are "blurry" regarding what determines whether a document should go to IDC or APC. A recommendation to clarify and revise the rules for the upcoming year has been noted.
- Dr. David Clarke relayed the reason the Food Studies group did not want to make this a minor. Since a minor has to be 18 hours, they do not wish to put a burden on students by requiring more than 12 hours. Dr. Leah Mathews relayed that they were wanting a way to recognize students who completed this course of study that at only 9 hours showed significant learning gains. They would like completion of the study noted on the student's transcript.
- The Food Studies courses are themselves interdisciplinary courses where a course is constructed from the material of various disciplines and faculty. This is different as other minors which are various established courses from different departments combined to form an interdisciplinary study.
- Being a Liberal Arts Institution, other professors argued there are many collaborations going on between disciplines at UNC Asheville. If a student wishes to have their study recognized, they work within the Interdisciplinary Studies program to accomplish that goal.
- Dr. Boakye-Boaten was asked by Dr. Cameron to explain how an interdisciplinary minor is administered. Contrary to what he has heard, Dr. Boakye-Boaten said there isn't a problem with oversight for those who administer minors in Interdisciplinary Studies have absolute control over their curriculum and the day-to-day operation of the minor. Dr. Boakye-Boaten said his role is to give support and represent our faculty at open houses.
- There is also a need to have a larger conversation by the UNC Asheville community regarding minors and certificates. There are many factors to consider. One is when and for what reason is a cross-curriculum minor housed in a department as opposed to Interdisciplinary Studies. Many feel the criteria needs to be worked out before approving additional minors or creating undergraduate certificate programs.

- Some feel that UNC Asheville, of all places due to our unique mission dedicated to a liberal arts education, should have a means to try out pilot programs for a one year commitment. “Provisional minor” does not have to be what these are called.
- Others, while agreeing we need the criteria first, believe Faculty Senate should have the flexibility to not further delay Food Studies from being incorporated into the new curriculum for an additional year.
- Dr. Amy Lanou, one of the faculty from the Food Studies group, clarified that they were not trying to have something pushed through Senate at the last minute. Last year, they submitted a proposal for a cluster of nine hours to be included in the new curriculum which did not get far in the process. This year they submitted before the APC deadline a proposal for a small minor of 12 hours. That proposal was sent back as well, and they were asked to talk with many people, including Professor Bond. She met with the group about possibilities under our current system. This was where they were in the process when the proposal was forwarded to IDC for consideration on how to house this within the current Liberal Arts Core Curriculum.

Upon advisement of the discussion, IDC will take the ideas offered and further consider how best to move this project forward. Dr. Galloway asked for Faculty Senate to forward to her any further comments, considerations, and friendly amendments.

Second Reading

[IDC 1](#) Revision of LAC (General Education) Assessment Protocol and Student Learning Outcomes
[*Note: IDC Approved Friendly Amendment to IDC 1](#)

IDC 1 was approved by IDC with a friendly amendment, which has been distributed for Second Reading. IDC 1 is a revision to streamline the assessment protocol and Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for the LAC Curriculum. In a nutshell, IDC 1 takes out the details under Outcome 1 and Outcome 2 and puts them under the Core Curriculum (LAC) Outcomes. The friendly amendment was an addition of a summary statement.

Dr. Galloway asked for a motion to accept IDC 1. A motion was made and seconded.

Discussion:

Dr. Walters asked whether IDC 1 reduces assessment as far as it needs to be.

Dr. Galloway said that SACS requires three out of the four of the outcomes listed. Four is well above what we are required to assess. The documents from the Executive Committee that were up for first reading relay the details regarding assessment.

Director Dunsmore confirmed that we can make assessment as simple or as complicated as we wish. More than five outcomes is going too far. Three is the agreed upon minimum. Two of the four are also required by the General Administration which explains why there are four outcomes in this proposal.

Dr. Galloway and Dr. Eggers also added that this document allows departments to assess what they want, but this is an appropriate baseline.

The question was called to a vote.

IDC 1 passed without dissent and became SD6715S.

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

First Reading:

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

FWDC 16 brings our Hearings Committee’s Procedures back in alignment with the state code.

Second Reading:

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

FWDC 14 is a revision of [Section 10.2.1.3](#) from the Faculty Handbook regarding the details of faculty elections.

There are three main changes:

1. Striking the language regarding ranked librarians since we no longer have ranked librarians.
2. Changing the language for all Standing Committees to the same that is for Faculty Senate regarding filling a vacate position. Currently, if a member of the Senate steps down, the alternate who fills the seat serves the remainder of the term. This document mandates this practice for all standing committees as well.
3. Extending the time to have elections completed to the Friday after April 15 in order to give more time for possible runoffs.

Dr. Kaplan made a motion to accept FWDC 14. The motion was seconded. No discussion. He called the question. FWDC 14 passed without dissent and became SD6815S.

Faculty Elections Update:

Dr. Michael Neelon

Dr. Neelon said faculty elections should finish up tomorrow. Hopefully, there will not be a runoff. However, elections are going smoothly at this time.

VI. Academic Policies Committee Report:

Professor Laura Bond

First Reading

- | | |
|------------------------|---|
| APC 57 | Change prerequisites and/or timing for ACCT 216, 301, 302, 317, 321, 322, 340, 341, 411, 417, 418 |
| APC 58 | Change to Accounting Narrative and Major Requirements (Micheal Stratton) |
| APC 59 | Change course description and grade mode of SPAN 110 |
| APC 63 | Change the name of the Department of Foreign Languages to the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures (Greta Trautmann, Wiebke Strehl) |
| APC 60 | Add new courses, EDUC 230, 231, 305, 342, 348, 349, 384 for a new area of licensure in Special Education |
| APC 61 | Add K-12 Special Education: General Curriculum Licensure to EDUC licensure areas |
| APC 62 | Remove PSYC 319 from the requirements for Elementary Education (K-6), and add EDUC 230 (Tiece Ruffin, Kim Brown) |

Professor Bond asked all to review these first reading documents and let her know of any questions to share with APC before their second reading at the April 30 meeting.

Second 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 prefaced the presentation of these documents with some pertinent information before asking the Faculty Senate to consider accepting them.

APC documents APC 54, APC 55, and APC 56 had a lengthy development process that she would like to share with the Senate. When these documents came to APC, she heard various faculty responding to these two proposals where some faculty had issues signing concurrences. Their reluctance to sign a concurrence was not due to any issue with these particular minors, but due to how these minors were structured within the Interdisciplinary Studies Program. This prompted Professor Bond to invite many people to the table with APC where they had excellent discussions over a period of two APC meetings.

APC first discussed the structure of these minors including the many misconceptions about the Interdisciplinary Studies Program and its function within the university. She thanks Dr. Boakye-Boaten, Dr. Katz, Dr. Jansen, Dr. Canejo and all her colleagues for coming to the table and being open as APC went through that process. They also talked about resource support for these minors. They talked about the framework and design of these minors. Then these minors were sent back with APC's concerns for two revisions.

At the end of this lengthy process, APC members felt these minors are very good to support and these documents come to Senate with APC's unanimous support.

Professor Bond proceeded to bring APC 54 and APC 55 before the Faculty Senate first and asked for a motion to accept them. The motion was made to accept APC 54 and APC 55 which was seconded.

Discussion:

Dr. Trautmann suggested that the Senate work on documenting clear procedures for developing new curriculum to relieve this undue burden on faculty.

Dr. Jansen said the new U.S. Ethnic Studies minor came from discussions with many colleagues across the campus. She does not feel like she owns this minor but is speaking on behalf of this program. She hopes next fall to have a number of discussions, listening sessions and roundtables around diversity in general as well as specifically explore how the campus community can participate in this program. She welcomes collective ownership and collaborative work. The group had talked about this functioning similarly to the WGSS program where they have several meetings each semester as well as creating a task force to determine the program's short and long term goals.

She wants all who wish to be part of the program to participate. She had talked with all department chairs whose courses are listed in the proposal as well as all faculty of record for the past 5 years.

Not hearing any further discussion, Professor Bond called the question and put the motion to a vote.

APC 54 passed without dissent and became SD6915S.

APC 55 passed without dissent and became SD7015S.

Professor Bond asked for a motion to accept APC 56. A motion to accept was made and seconded. There was no discussion so Professor Bond brought the motion to a vote.

APC 56 passed without dissent and became SD7115S.

VII. Administrative Reports:

Provost Joseph Urgo

Provost Urgo began his report with a reassuring comment regarding the confusion faculty felt concerning the Interdisciplinary Studies Program. He stated it is not uncommon to have this type of resistance and confusion. Interdisciplinary Programs by their definition are not apparently coherent. Interdisciplinary programs are recognized as having coherence by those who spend a lot of time working on the coherence of these programs. If these programs were immediately and apparently coherent, they would be recognized as their own discipline as in a recognized discipline.

The Board of Trustees' Academic Affairs Committee met back in January to generate topics they believe the community is interested in hearing about in the next academic year. The two topics the Board of Trustees want to talk about are the issue of growth of the university and the issue of graduate programs, in particular graduate programs as revenue resources. Along those lines, Provost Urgo has asked John Pierce and Pat Catterfeld to report on whether the graduate programs we have now are generating or losing revenue as well as report on where these stand in terms of our budget. He believes this report will help us better understand the financial nature of what we will be discussing in the upcoming year.

This Academic Affairs Committee also wants to know from the faculty what their guiding principles for creating and not creating graduate programs. As a group, the Provost recommends we think about this and be prepared to discuss why in favor or not in favor of graduate programs.

The Board Members also asked to meet with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to learn what the Faculty Senate does, its governing principles behind how we operate and why do faculty serve on the Senate. Provost Urgo finds this to be a healthy curiosity on the Board's part. Each meeting, the Office of the Provost tries to present an aspect of the faculty work to the Board of Trustees so they have a better understanding since most of the members' experience of universities is from an undergraduate perspective when they obtained their degree. Many do not know what it is like to be a professional whose career is in the university. Provost Urgo said we must continue to educate them, and he is thankful that we have a Board of Trustees that is interested in its faculty's work.

At the Board of Trustees meeting, there was a presentation on undergraduate research where advisors and their students presented their research work. The Board found this extremely interesting.

They also had a discussion with the students to learn what students are thinking about these days. Students raised three topics: social entrepreneurship, divestiture of fossil fuels, and names on buildings. Regarding the names on buildings, they had an interesting and engaged discussion regarding names of buildings, especially those that the students found to be less than pleasant. The students wanted to know how buildings get their honorary names and how can names come off buildings, specifically regarding Vance Hall which is named after Zebulon Vance, the two time NC Governor from Weaverville who owned slaves.

The Board approved two faculty emeritus appointments for Alice Weldon and John Stevens.

On April 24, the Board of Governors will be coming to UNC Asheville. They will visit an array of classes where students and faculty will briefly introduce their class to them. They will also spend time at both the Career and Peace Centers. We will also have an undergraduate research presentation for them. [This visit was subsequently postponed by the BOG.]

The western representatives of the Board of Governors (Louis Bissette, Joan MacNeill, and Roger Aiken) would like to visit this body sometime (probably next semester) and allow the Senators to ask them questions about the Board of Governors. This may be a good chance to answer some of our questions we have had regarding what the Board of Governors is doing, what their agenda is in terms of this institution and the UNC System at large.

Questions:

Dr. Eggers asked when the Provost expect the MLAS program report to come out. The Provost said, although it is not an easy question to answer, he hopes to have the report for the Board of Trustees sometime this month.

Dr. Kaplan said there was an article regarding a call for the entire UNC System move to a 4/4 faculty course workload. Provost Urgo said he was told by Greg Carter (State Relations Council Member and Assistant Vice Chancellor for External Relations at UNC Asheville) that that idea isn't going anywhere. Provost Urgo said the columnist was wanting to begin a discussion.

Dr. Clarke asked Provost Urgo what faculty need to do to get ready for the graduate programs discussion next year.

Provost Urgo wants to find out more about the faculty's attitudes towards graduate programs. He knows some from people he has spoken to, but he does not know all the differing opinions and what the past discussions have been. Dr. Eggers asked Ms. Sellers to dig up her report where she made a major effort last year to inform the Executive Committee. Dr. Galloway said there are also IDC documents where they discussed this topic all three years she has been a member of IDC.

Dr. Trautmann said that there are faculty who first want to know what the conversation is outside the university in order to be properly informed before relaying an opinion to the administration.

Provost Urgo said that it is so important to have the report from John Pierce and Pat Catterfeld on whether the MLAS is a money maker or a huge drain on our budget before having these discussions.

Dr. Larson made his "continual economist plea" to look at the costs as well as the revenues when considering graduate programs.

VIII. Old Business

No old business.

IX. New Business

Dr. Walters was quite puzzled by the commencement issue and asked Provost Urgo for clarification. Provost Urgo said there have been many discussions regarding the expense of setting up two commencements in order to be prepared for adverse weather. There are also growing issues from Public Safety regarding securing the Quad in accordance to their new guidelines about how many open areas and how many points of egress. Although the Commencement Committee was in favor of permanently moving commencement indoors, they waited for the new chancellor to arrive before making a decision since the decision is hers to make. The Chancellor said she moved the commencement indoors at MCLA years ago. The committee thus recommended that commencement be moved indoors.

When this decision was being circulated, the students and alumni reacted very strongly against this. In particular, alumni started a CHANGE.ORG petition on Facebook which is up to around 1,000 signatures. As a result, Provost Urgo brought the Commencement Committee together and told them we need to find out what the students think. He wrote to the students explaining why the decision was made and invited them to let their preference be known. With 50% reporting, the vote is currently heavily in favor of commencement on the Quad. That information will go back to the Chancellor to inform her decision.

Dr. Walters said one of the things that puzzled him is why the faculty was not polled as well since it is an annual ritual that the faculty is involved. Also, he is not certain how this Commencement Committee was formed and how there was a justification of an indoors commencement considering that for indoor commencements the students are given only six tickets for their family to attend. This is a huge stressful issue for students on this important, long-awaited day.

Provost Urgo said that Dr. Walters is making a good point regarding the seriousness of this and how they could have done a better job communicating to the campus community. Provost Urgo added the students here are marvelous. He has received very thoughtful, sensitive and moving emails from students. They relay in the emails how many family members they have coming and the symbolic importance of the Quad. The Quad is a space of special meaning in their imagination and their hearts.

At this time, the Provost can't go on the record to what the Chancellor's decision will be.

Dr. Eggers said that it would be lovely for the Chancellor and the Provost to experience graduation on the Quad before making a decision. Some Senators said, "...but not in the rain."

Dr. Eggers announced the last Senate meeting will be on April 30. On that day, the Senate convenes for two back to back meetings. The second meeting is when the new Senate Chair and Vice Chairs will be elected [For those who are new, the first meeting is where the current senate completes outstanding business, and the second meeting, called the Organization Meeting, is the gathering of the newly elected Senate for 2015-16]. At the Organization Meeting not only will the officer elections be held, all Senators will turn in their preferences to serve on senate subcommittees (APC, IDC, FWDC) for 2015-16.

If any of the continuing Senators are interested in being considered for Senate Chair or one of the Vice Chair positions, they are asked to communicate with other senators and notify Dr. Eggers of their willingness to serve. The nomination process will include taking nominations from the floor on the day of the election as well. Senators can self-nominate themselves as well as nominate others (although as a professional courtesy, please ask them first).

Regarding Senate Orientation for the new Senators, Ms. Sellers has a great binder of introductory information along with a presentation. However, it makes more sense to Dr. Eggers for the senate orientation to take place in the fall when the work begins rather than now when the knowledge could get lost over the summer. In regards to the Vice Chairs elections, Dr. Galloway encourages all senators to consider which subcommittee they wish to serve next year and to talk among their fellow committee members regarding a Vice Chair for that committee.

X. Adjourn

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

Respectfully submitted by: Lisa Sellers
The Executive Committee