

University of North Carolina at Asheville  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
Minutes, December 4, 2014 (3:15 pm)

Senate

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

Alternates: W. Strehl, K. Moorhead.

Excused: K. Betsalel, J. Urgo.

Visitors: G. Ashburn, P. Catterfeld, L. Dohse, R. Dunning, W. Haggard, E. Katz, J. Konz, K. Krumpke, B. Larson,  
P. McClellan, H. Palier, A. Peltack, J. Pierce, D. Race, C. Riley, 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 and Standing Rules and Rules of Order for 2014-15:**

- [November 13, 2014 3:15 p.m.](#)  
Moved, second, no discussion and approved without dissent.

**III. Executive Committee Reports: Dr. Dee Eggers**

The Faculty Assembly and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee did not meet in December.

**IV. Academic Policies Committee Report: Professor Laura Bond**

**First Reading:**

- [APC 15](#) Add PSYC 355, new Lab Course in Psychology; Add PSYC 355 as a Psyc laboratory option to the Psychology major and minor (PSYC, Pam Laughon)
- [APC 16](#) Change the description of ENVR 381, and add it as a required course for the Earth Science concentration (ENVR, Jackie Langille)
- [APC 17](#) Clarify GPA requirements for the BFA application in Art (ART, Leisa Rundquist)

Professor Bond asked the Faculty Senate to read through these documents before they come up for Second Reading on January 22<sup>nd</sup> and contact her with any questions.

**Second Reading:**

- [APC 4](#) Add new course, IST 325, Internship in Interdisciplinary Studies (IST, Tommasanne Davis, Agya Boakye-Boaten)  
Passed APC Vote: 5-1
- [APC 5](#) Change the course description for INTS 354 (INTS, Agya Boakye-Boaten)
- [APC 6](#) Add new courses, INTS 334 and INTS 364, cross-listing with new Asian Studies courses, ASIA 334 and ASIA 364, respectively (INTS, ASIA, Agya Boakye-Boaten)
- [APC 7](#) Change titles and descriptions of MATH 211 and 215 (MATH, Dave Peifer)
- [APC 8](#) Change Pre- and Corequisites in EDUC 340 (EDUC, Kim Brown)
- [APC 9](#) Add ATMS 464 as a required course for Atmospheric Sciences majors, designating it as the course that will satisfy Writing and Information Literacy competencies in the major (ATMS, Doug Miller)
- [APC 10](#) Change course title for ECE 455 (Rebecca Bruce)
- [APC 11](#) Add new course: MAE 308, Fluid Mechanics; Add MAE 308 as an option to ECE 456 for the Engineering (Mechatronics) major (Rebecca Bruce)
- [APC 12](#) Delete DRAM 358: Topics in Dramatic Literature, Theory, or History (Laura Bond)

- [APC 13](#) Delete ECON 316 and 406; Adjust requirements for major in Economics and major in Economics with Teacher Licensure (Chris Bell)
- [APC 14](#) APC Proposal Regarding Caps On Majors

To make the list of documents manageable, Professor Bond bundled APC 5 - APC 13 for a Senate vote. All these documents received the unanimous support of APC for they were minor changes to department courses and major requirements. Then she will bring APC 4 to the Senate. APC 4 received a majority vote from APC, but it was not unanimous support. As a result, this document will be discussed and voted on separately. Finally, Professor Bond will present APC 14 separately since it is a policy that affects the entire campus. She asked the Senate if they were agreeable. There were no objections.

APC 5 – APC 13. There was a motion made to accept APC 5 – APC 13. The motion was seconded. There was no discussion. The question was called.

APC 5 – APC 13 passed without dissent and are Senate Documents [SD0814F – SD1614F](#).

APC 4 proposed to add a new course, INTS 325, An Internship in Interdisciplinary Studies. An APC colleague asked Professor Bond to share his comments since he could not attend the Senate meeting today. His vote documented his concern for the University offering courses which are taught by staff members. APC discussed this issue and acknowledged UNC Asheville has a number of courses taught by individuals who hold dual positions where they are staff who also teach classes on our campus. An example is Deaver Traywick with the Writing Center as well as Thomasanne Davis of the Career Center, who is teaching this course and has been teaching this course as a special topic for some time now. APC decided this was not an issue with this particular document, but they did suggest future discussions could be held to further explore the issue this faculty member raised in the meeting. The document passed APC with a 5-1 vote.

A motion was made to accept APC 4. The motion was seconded.

**Discussion:**

Dr. Neelon asked what were the conditions by which a staff member could teach a course.

Professor Bond said APC was told that the staff who teach are accredited and their credits are checked for their specialty in that area.

Dr. Katz said the rule regarding teaching at an undergraduate institution is eighteen hours or more at a graduate level so a Masters degree is in excess of that level. To teach at the graduate level, they need a terminal degree (Ph.d, MFA, or other degrees which are appropriate to the course).

Dr. Walters asked for clarification. His understanding is they are adding a course which is not tied to a particular person. Professor Bond confirmed that is correct. Professor Bond said at the present time it is taught by a staff person and the APC member who voted against the document wanted to express his concern through his vote.

Professor Davis said this is the fifth year she has taught the course. The course has clear learning objectives and is very standardized. The course has been adopted by different departments on campus. They track their learning outcomes from the course.

Dr. Ray confirmed that Professor Davis taught the course in the Health and Wellness Program.

Dr. McKnight said this course was taught in the past in the Health and Wellness Program and moving it over to Interdisciplinary Studies will allow more students to have access.

Dr. Cameron advised her colleagues to be extremely careful in making comparison statements regarding staff and faculty positions. We are all jointly united in our mission and we need to be extremely careful to avoid invoking some antagonism based on classifications of employment.

Hearing no further discussion, Professor Bond called the question.

APC 4 was passed without dissent and becomes [SD1714F](#).

APC 14 is a proposal for a cap on majors. This document supports the spirit and intention of the Curriculum Review Task Force recommendation. The document states the policy is as read:

- APC recommends the combination of major and LAC requirements (for all concentrations excluding teacher licensure) not exceed one hundred (100) hours and no more than forty-five (45) hours in the major (for all concentrations excluding teacher licensure) may come from a single prefix.
- Departments may petition APC for exceptions by providing supportive data and curricular comparisons with peer universities.

APC feels this proposal affords departments and programs who currently exceed the proposed credit cap the opportunity to petition for an exception that is based on professional disciplinary judgment using a systematic data-driven comparative analysis of curricula at peer institutions.

APC is developing an articulation of this petition process.

A motion was made to accept APC 14. The motion was seconded.

**Discussion:**

Dr. Diefenbach asked for clarification. Professor Bond said the major cap is 45 hours from the same prefix and the major and LAC requirements may not exceed 100 hours. There is plenty of room for overlap for departments that use LAC courses as part of their major requirements.

Professor Bond said the Curriculum Review Taskforce felt that departments need to review and evaluate their curriculum. They believed they should run comparisons to peer institutions in order to consider adjusting their curriculum. Thus, APC is recommending departmental analysis of programs that are over the caps.

APC is still developing the departmental analysis process and generating the list of peer institutions.

Professor Bond passed out a visual as general information regarding the concentrations as an aid in understanding what is generally happening on campus. She thanked Pat McClellan and Lisa Sellers for their research work. APC used the visual aid only for reference since the numbers were only approximations and varied depending on whether the major is using the 3 credit or 4 credit course model. Also, the numbers did not reflect those departments which were going through many changes. Accordingly, the visual aid is for reference only and is not part of the APC 14 document.

Rather than a statement of a typical major or concentration which has been traditionally in the catalog, this APC document is asking this cap and limit policy to be made the official policy.

Dr. Bell pointed out that departments can have many practices to easily move under the cap, which are best practices to consider such as offering major courses that count toward the LAC requirements. Another practice is to design courses that cover the same material in fewer hours. These practices give the students more opportunities to explore many disciplines which is a valued principle of the liberal arts.

Dr. Diefenbach said this was debated within the CRTF. Professor Bond agreed; however, she has not received any questions regarding APC 14 from the faculty at large. This policy has been out on both the November and December agendas for first and second readings.

Dr. Stratton said APC 14 came out of considerable debate and compromise within APC. There was a lot of discussion centered around respecting departments and disciplines.

Dr. Cameron said that APC was asked by Senate to look at an institutional policy for setting the caps. The question is does this Senate want to set a policy, and if so, what are the limits. Professor Bond confirmed that last year's Senate did charge APC to explore and develop a policy and a cap.

APC chose to honor the numbers that the CRTF determined from their two years of curriculum consideration. Professor Bond said CRTF researched other COPLAC institutions comparing department and major caps, as well as the number of electives students have available to them in other institutions.

A few senators suggested the total cap be changed from 100 hours to 105 hours.

Dr. Cameron pointed out that would lower the number of electives students could take. One of the objectives in considering the caps were to allow students more electives.

Dr. Stratton said APC discussed having all the departments and concentrations complete the analysis prior to setting caps in order to have exact numbers. However, they felt that was too much work and perhaps unnecessary for all the departments to come proactively to APC. Many departments could easily designate more courses to satisfy the LAC requirements in order to clearly fall well within the caps.

Dr. Cameron wanted to assure her Natural Science colleagues that APC did recognize any policy they looked at would affect the Natural Sciences. APC had many spirited discussions to arrive at a compromise that would work for the Natural Sciences as well. (For the most part, the Natural Science departments currently have the highest credit hour requirements and will be most affected by the caps.)

Dr. Bell offered that although the Economic Department is nowhere near going over either cap, his department is doing the analysis because they believe it is a good idea to look and see what their peers are doing.

Dr. Krumpke also added that APC not only considers the COPLAC institutions, but the institutions the Board of Governors consider our peers. APC also decided departments could add institutions to their list that they believe are aspirational.

Dr. Statton also added departments did not have to compare 20 schools, but only six schools (2 COPLAC, 2 by the Board of Governors and 2 by the department).

APC said once this policy is approved, they will bring to the Senate the process to comply with the policy.

The Question was called.

APC 14 was passed 12-4 and becomes [SD1814F](#).

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

[UPC Minutes](#)

IDC Update: At the February Faculty Senate meeting, IDC will be bringing a new certificate proposal that is now before them.

UPC Update: UPC's work this semester has been to provide a document for Chancellor Grant. The document will be a summation of what UNC Asheville celebrates as well as our challenges. This document is the product of the breakout groups and the followup meeting that UPC has held. In the summary, the categories are teaching, student retention, financial, community engagement and general. Within these categories, the details outline what we celebrate and what we wish to work on in order to

give Chancellor Grant “the lay of the land” upon her arrival so she may have a smooth incoming process.

Under the General category, UPC talked about growth as a campus.

Dr. Galloway suggests that the Faculty Senate considers preparing a document for our new chancellor. The Senate is scheduled to meet with Chancellor Grant on February 5 at 3:00 p.m.

**Discussion:**

Dr. Walters asked what would be different in a Senate document from the UPC document.

Dr. Galloway said that UPC is more than the faculty voice. The Faculty Senate document would be centered on the faculty voice and a sense of where UNC Asheville is and what do we want to do within the next five years. It may not be a document that the Senate could quickly write, but a welcome letter would be nice to introduce the Faculty Senate to the new Chancellor.

Dr. Eggers suggested faculty email Dr. Galloway with suggestions of what would need to be in such a letter or document.

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

Since Dr. Kaplan was giving a final, Dr. Steven Patch gave the FWDC report.

**First Reading**

\*[FWDC 7](#) Revisions to Post Tenure Review ([Faculty Handbook Section 3.7](#)) and Development of Long-Term Faculty Plans

*\*The Senate intends to waive the Comer Rule to discuss as well as vote on this document.*

[FWDC 8](#) Updates the Responsibilities and Membership of the Enrollment Services Advisory Committee ([Faculty Handbook Section 10.4.7 \(SD1898S\)](#))

[FWDC 7](#) is the rewritten document [FWDC 2](#) which was withdrawn at the November meeting so [FWDC](#) could make the necessary changes as advised by the Faculty Senate. They were instructed to only include the changes the Board of Governors mandated and all references to long-term plans for faculty receiving their first reappointment.

A motion was made to waive the Comer Rule in order to consider and vote on [FWDC 7](#). The motion was seconded.

**Discussion to Waive the Comer Rule:**

An explanation of the Comer Rule was given. The Comer Rule is a UNC Asheville rule where senate documents receive two readings before they are considered. If the motion to waive the Comer Rule passes, the Faculty Senate will waive the second reading and consider the document at its first reading. The question was called and a vote was taken.

The Comer Rule was waived without dissent, and [FWDC 7](#) was brought before the Faculty Senate for consideration and vote.

A motion was then made to accept [FWDC 7](#). This motion was seconded.

**Discussion to accept [FWDC 7](#):**

Dr. Eggers asked [FWDC](#) to confirm that the requirements in [FWDC 7](#) are only those that the Board of Governors requires.

Dr. Patch confirmed the changes that remain are the Board of Governors’ mandated changes.

The question was called.

[FWDC 7](#) passed without dissent and becomes [SD1914F](#).

[FWDC 8](#) was the other document up for first reading, which will be considered in January.

**Second Reading:**

[FWDC 5](#) Revisions to Position Allocation Committee ([Faculty Handbook 10.1.2](#))

[FWDC 6](#) Faculty Reassigned Time Policy ([Faculty Handbook Section 3.1.4.1.4, SD2799S](#))

[FWDC 5](#) makes revisions to the Position Allocation Committee.

A motion was made to accept [FWDC 5](#). The motion was seconded.

**Discussion:**

Dr. Stratton proposed that it may be more beneficial to PAC to have an IDC representative rather than any Faculty Senate member on PAC given IDC is charged around strategic planning. Dr. Stratton said, as the current Faculty Senate member on PAC and a member of APC, he could see the benefit of having an APC member on PAC as well. However, as he thought of the charges and the roles of the three Faculty Senate subcommittees and what PAC does, an IDC representative seemed to align quite well.

Dr. Galloway agreed with Dr. Stratton since IDC has the broader scope.

Dr. Bell said a similar argument could be made that a member from APC should be the representative from the Faculty Senate. He thought it would be better not to get that specific for he felt the Faculty Senate needs to be informed and there are strong arguments that the Senate member be from any Senate subcommittee.

Dr. Eggers agreed that many arguments could be made that the representative have various backgrounds that would

make the representative uniquely suited regardless of their role in the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Stratton suggested perhaps they have two Faculty Senate representatives one of which would be from IDC.

Dr. Patch said since the Faculty Senate is trying to reduce committee loads, the proposal of two representatives would go against the grain. Since there seems to be enough controversy regarding these suggestions, Dr. Patch felt FWDC should not accept these suggestions as friendly amendments.

Dr. Ray said this is the type of discussion that the Faculty Senate needs to have annually in order to discern the best representatives which could vary from year to year. Determining the background that is best to serve would have to be based on present circumstances that are hard to predict.

No friendly amendments were made to the document.

The question was called.

FWDC 5 passed without dissent and becomes [SD2014F](#).

FWDC 6 concerns faculty reassigned time. There was a motion to accept FWDC 6. The motion was seconded.

**Discussion:**

Dr. Walters said he understood the rationale which reflect current realities. However, at the last Faculty Senate meeting, Dr. Urgo really surprised Dr. Walters. After hearing for many years that sabbaticals and professional development leaves were a dead letter, Dr. Walters was very surprised to hear our Provost say that it was unacceptable not to have sabbaticals and professional development leaves. As a result of that and other events like receiving raises, Dr. Walters is concerned about institutionalizing policies based off current situations and history which could easily change. Policy should be about what ought to be and not based off of what people tells us is the current projected idea. Dr. Walters objects to having so much taken out of consideration for faculty reassigned time with the idea that we did not give it for the last four or five years because things can change. He suggested that the Faculty Senate does not consider this until the new chancellor has relayed her orientation.

Pat Catterfeld asked to make a point of clarification regarding the raises. Before this year, the state did not allow UNC Asheville to give raises in the past. Dr. Urgo was in the right place at the right time to announce those raises.

Dr. Ray wondered if we eliminate the possibility to use reassigned time to alleviate faculty teaching loads by eliminating the language from the Faculty Handbook. Could we eliminate the language here as in FWDC 6 and recreate the language to allow the possibility for future reassigned time?

Dr. Eggers wondered if the timing for this change may not be right and FWDC may wish to withdraw this document. She believes it is harder to open a door once it has been closed. By leaving the wording alone, the faculty is making a statement of what they would like.

Dr. Stratton asked FWDC to address the removal of the second paragraph under "Requesting and Allocating Reassigned Time" that starts, "Chairs are also teacher-scholar members of the faculty..." Dr. Stratton finds this disconcerting to see that paragraph removed. If this policy was to pass, he is concerned the message this would send about the role of department chairs on this campus. The current policy affords the chair the opportunity to go to the Provost to request additional reassigned time. Does the omission of the paragraph prevent a chair from making a request? Or is it the intention of FWDC to say any faculty regardless of whether they are a chair or not, may request reassigned time?

Dr. Konz said a FWDC document passed at the last Faculty Senate meeting does provide department chairs a provision to make a request. The paragraph was removed in this policy since it seemed redundant.

Dr. Diefenbach asked FWDC if there was a reason to bring this document before the Faculty Senate now.

Dr. Patch said the reason FWDC brought this document before the Faculty Senate now is the statement "Each academic year, the Provost and VCAA will normally allot each academic program amount of reassigned time equivalent to three credit-hours" cannot be allowed to stand since it is absolutely false. That is the main change.

Dr. Walters said he has the impression that nothing is pressing where the Faculty Senate has to pass this document at this meeting.

Professor Bond asked FWDC the motivation for reducing the list of opportunities for reassigned time.

Dr. Konz authored the document as part of his assignment to go through the handbook and find what needs to be fixed. Both the discretionary reassigned time and the list of things do not reflect reality. We have not granted reassigned time purely for scholarship unless it is granted-funded scholarship. It has been six years. FWDC 6 brings the handbook up to date with what we are able to do. He understands the aspiration that we would love to have discretionary reassigned time; however, we don't have it and this policy change reflects what we grant reassigned time for.

Professor Bond said as we continue to look at this that we should state what we believe we should have and not base our policies on lack and the fact that we have lack where the only reason we haven't received reassigned time for these things is due to budget cuts. Do we want to base our campus policy on lack or do we want to keep these doors open and say we believe in this as faculty that we should have this opportunity when it is available.

Dr. Clarke said he feels this is a waste of time since faculty do not control the state budget. His experience with reassigned time is the process is a negotiation. Some people get reassigned time and some people don't. Sometimes it is fair and sometimes it is not. The reality is UNC Asheville does not have the money so he is not sure how he is going to vote on this document.

Dr. Stratton said to eliminate or shrink the list puts faculty at a disadvantage when it comes to negotiating for reassigned time.

Professor Bond agreed and said rather than withdraw this document and wait for what the new Chancellor thinks that the faculty should come from a place of power and the Faculty Senate put a document through that says this is what the faculty thinks is important to let her know we would like to find ways to get this back and why we are keeping it on the books.

Dr. Walters said he feels it is one thing to say this is how it has been for the last six years. However, we guarantee it will continue to be that way if the Faculty Senate votes yes to accept FWDC 6.

Dr. Eggers said it would be a shame to vote not to accept FWDC 6 and lose the new language giving release time to the Faculty Senate chairs. She believes faculty would support the chairs of the Faculty Senate committees receiving release time.

A motion was made to restore the full list of reassigned time opportunities which was seconded. The question was called.

Motion to restore the list of opportunities for reassigned time to FWDC 6 and the Faculty Handbook passed without dissent.

Dr. Stratton made a friendly amendment to restore the paragraph that starts, "Chairs are also teacher-scholar members of the faculty..." is also restored to FWDC 6 and the Faculty Handbook. The motion was seconded.

FWDC accepted the motion as a friendly amendment and the paragraph is restored to FWDC 6 and will reside in the Faculty Handbook in the place it currently resides.

Dr. Cameron had concerns about the undergraduate research reassigned time. She definitely wants that to happen. However, there is a problem for departments where multiple students conduct undergraduate research. For example, Computer Science has two groups who are well above 7 advisees and the department is small enough that it would hurt the department if any of the faculty took reassigned time. It is like a gift that they can't accept.

Professor Bond said the policy says "may request" and advised the Computer Science Department to make their requests for that establishes the need and tells the administration the need for adjuncts to teach some courses.

**\*\***Dr. Katz asked to give the Provost's report first which may give the Faculty Senate more understanding of this topic.

Dr. Katz said the Deans have been talking to the Provost about the challenges of not being able to offer these opportunities of Professional Development Leave (PDL) to the faculty. Provost Urgo's view is that it is not healthy for a faculty, no matter what the teaching load is, to not have the opportunity to have a semester to do an extended project and be revitalized. After their discussion at the Conference of Administrative Officers (CAO) Meeting last month, Provost Urgo talked to Warwick Arden, Interim Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs for the UNC System, about the constraints UNC Asheville has a faculty here, specifically: small growth which limits the number of faculty positions that we can have using state funds, the Delaware course sections constraint, and maintaining curriculum size without non-faculty resources that other schools have where department chairs are full FTE since they are paid out of instructional funds. Warwick Arden encouraged Provost Urgo to come back and look how UNC Asheville can reinstate PDLs for 2015-2016. They are going to try to work on this throughout the rest of this school year. They do not know how many, what the departments would have to do, nor when in the academic year these would be available. Dr. Katz wanted to let Faculty Senate know they are working on this piece which is a good thing. PDLs are fundamentally different from reassigned time. However, this is happening by engaging the budget and the Delaware count fundamentally.\*\*

Dr. Katz said looking at FWDC 6, he does not see they are changing much structurally. This might be a good state for this to be. He thanked the Faculty Senate for letting him speak to add context to the situation.

In regards to Dr. Cameron's concerns, Dr. Patch said by formalizing undergraduate research reassigned time, the whole university can take this into account as PAC decides what positions departments need. If departments can't give undergraduate research reassigned time to their faculty, it is the responsibility of the university to help departments have the resources to do so.

The question was called.

FWDC 6 as amended was passed 15-1 and becomes [SD2114F](#).

## **VII. Administrative Reports:**

**Associate Provost Ed Katz**

See report above between the two **\*\*** markings under the discussion for FWDC 6.

### **Further Questions:**

Dr. Katz said he could take the Faculty Senate questions back to Provost Urgo regarding PDLs for them.

Dr. Eggers suggests, given the information relayed regarding PDLs, to add PDLs as a topic of discussion at the next Faculty Senate meeting. In the interim, she encourages faculty to discuss this among themselves and at their subcommittee meetings. She wonders about the tradeoff between PDLs, especially competitive sabbaticals, versus more fairly distributed reassigned time.

Dr. Bell asked Dr. Katz how realistic is it to believe these PDLs will happen.

Dr. Katz said Provost Urgo really believes, course load aside, the value of a PDL is high. He believes in a liberal arts school it is important for faculty to have this extended time. A course off is fundamentally different from a PDL. Reassigned time gets used up with additional advising and other activities where workload is not fundamentally changed, just different. Dr. Katz's sense of the Provost's value for PDL is it gives faculty an opportunity to do an extended project which not only revitalizes faculty members but brings back to the university and its students also. At many universities, this is a common thing. However, at a liberal arts university, it is especially important to the university and its faculty to have these opportunities to spend a substantial amount of time doing this revitalizing work.

Dr. Ray wonders in order to provide these if departments and the university could be proactive going after non-state grants.

Dr. Katz said they have not gotten to that level of conversation yet. He imagines it will be a lot of things, some will involve the budget and some will not. He believes this will be multidimensional since we have many restraints.

Dr. Eggers said she believes faculty applaud every effort made in this direction.

#### **VIII. Old Business**

Student Government President Jame Whalen came to Faculty Senate meeting after completing his finals. He announced SGA has disbanded until the beginning of next semester. They have had a very powerful and emotional talk at the forum by the Diversity Action Council and the Cultural Center's focus on the Ferguson Case. They had many students, faculty and staff members come and express their response to the case and their experiences. Mr. Whalen said that we need to remind ourselves our underrepresented students, especially our African American students, have a distinct experience here at our university that is very different from their peers. We need to be mindful to ensure all students remain comfortable when things happen outside our university.

SGA is also working along side several student groups on a proposal to show how they prefer their money be invested in this university. When they have completed their research, they will bring the proposal to the Faculty Senate.

Mr. Whalen will be meeting tomorrow with all involved with our Student Affairs system that deal with students who are accused of sexual misconduct to reevaluate the way the university handles these cases.

Mr. Whalen concluded that he and fellow students are very supportive of the initiatives that make it easier to graduate in four years. He gave an example of a transfer student who will graduate with 147 credit hours with only one UNCA course that does not directly count towards their major. It is very difficult to take extra electives, and there isn't any opportunity to explore majors to gradually discern a major to complete. If a student needs exploration time, they have to tack on a semester at the end of their studies to graduate which is more expensive. While we have to make sure students are competent when they graduate and have the time invested in a discipline in order to be competitive, we also have to make sure students are able to take extra minors that also makes them more competitive. Any initiatives that help with this, the students support faculty efforts.

#### **IX. New Business**

No new business.

#### **X. Election to Fill the Vacant Faculty Senate Seat**

Dr. Jason Wingert is taking Family Leave this Spring Semester. The Faculty Senate acknowledged Dr. Wingert's excellent service to the Faculty Senate over the past one and half years.

Dr. Eggers contacted the candidates regarding their interest in serving. The candidates are the three elected alternates for 2014-2015: Kevin Moorhead, Mark Sidelnick and Wiebke Strehl. She said Dr. Sidelnick relayed his interest in serving and Dr. Strehl expressed a preference not to serve at the present time, and Dr. Moorhead said he was not going to campaign for the seat and did not express a preference.

Ms. Sellers, the Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant, distributed a typed ballot with the three candidates' names.

The secret ballot vote was taken where the Faculty Senate members chose a replacement from the three alternates.

The Administrative Assistant counted the votes, and the Chair of Faculty Senate, Dr. Eggers verified the vote.

Dr. Mark Sidelnick was elected to complete Dr. Wingert's 2013-2016 term.

#### **XI. Adjourn**

Dr. Eggers adjourned the meeting at 5:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted by: Lisa Sellers  
The Executive Committee