

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA ASHEVILLE

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

May 2, 2019; 3:15 pm; Last Meeting of the 2018-19 Faculty Senate

Alumni Hall in Highsmith Union

Members: M. Stratton, L. Bond, K. Betsalel, J. Beck, T. Adcock, P. Bahls, K. Boyle, J. Brock,
Present: S. Clark Muntean, R. Criser, S. DiPalma, A. Dunn, P. Haschke, M. McClure,
A. Rote, N. Ruppert, A. Wray; K. Peterson.

Excused Members: C. Oakley.

Visitors: N. Cable, L. Alderson, A. Batada, E. Boyce, B. Butler, M. Cameron, J. Cone, M. Davis,
B. Felix, V. Frank, M. Gass, I. Green, B. Haggard, B. Hart, L. Hewitt, H. Holt,
L. Horgan, T. Johnson, C. Kennedy, T. King, J. Konz, A. Lanou, J. Perkins, B. Petitfils,
J. Pierce, J. Pisano, S. Reiser, T. Ruffin, A. Shope, W. Strehl, D. Traywick, D. Weldon,
J. Wilcox, C. Williams.

I. Call to Order

A moment of silence in remembrance of Reed Parlier and Riley Howell, along with others injured at UNC Charlotte earlier this week. We stand united with our faculty colleagues, the students, staff, and first responders at UNC Charlotte and offer them our most heartfelt condolences.

II. Approval of Minutes: [April 4, 2019, 3:15 p.m.](#)
Passed without dissent.

III. Executive Committee Report: Professor Micheal Stratton
Annual Athletic Report: Janet Cone and Jeffrey Wilcox

Jeffrey Wilcox thanks Faculty Senate for appointing him the liaison and representative of the faculty body to the Athletic Department. He went over his [job description](#) saying his favorite part is interacting with our student athletes. Janet Cone is completing her 15th year as Director of the Athletic Program and Senior Administrator for University Enterprises. She enjoys working with faculty, staff and especially our student athletes. Director Cone presented [the 2018-19 annual report](#), [strategic plan](#), and [quick facts sheet](#). Later today or tomorrow, six (6) of our 16 teams will be recognized nationally for Academic Progress Ratings of perfect 1000. Director Cone recognized Senate's applause by saying, "You are applauding yourselves for you are the ones teaching our students." The Faculty Senate Chair thanked both Jeffrey Wilcox and Director Janet Cone for their leadership and service to our students and our school.

Student Government: President Isaiah Green
Isaiah Green is the newly elected Student Body President for 2019-20. SGA has been working on their strategic plan. Their last meeting for the year was this past Wednesday where they worked on their standing committee appointments for the coming year.

Staff Council:

Chair Brian Hart

The Staff Council is pleased that the Faculty Assembly Executive Committee submitted a memorandum in support of paid paternal leave for staff. Staff Assembly will continue to advocate for this important issue. Staff Council has had a very successful and productive year: creation of their bylaws, work on the strategic plan, and increased visibility through activities like the staff appreciation basketball game. They are in the middle of their first election for Staff Council in the history of UNC Asheville. They look forward to continuing to build a strong relationship with Faculty Senate.

Faculty Assembly:

Associate Professor Marietta Cameron

Rep. Marietta Cameron recognized her fellow delegate Rep. Nancy Ruppert for her service the past three years. Micheal Stratton also thanked Nancy Ruppert for representing Faculty Senate in the Senate Chairs meetings he was unable to attend. Marietta Cameron also recognized the alternates Lora Holland and Robert Bowen who participated in a couple of meetings this year. Thanks were also given for the Senate Administrative Assistant's presence this year for she was invaluable at Faculty Assembly meetings by conducting on the spot research and taking notes. The official meeting notes from [April 12, 2019 Faculty Assembly Meeting](#) were briefly covered.

Registrar Lynne Horgan gave a report regarding a bill that passed the state senate whose purpose is to ease the transition of military personnel to NC community colleges or the UNC System universities. One of the bill's elements is to maintain a consistent awarding of transfer credit for courses taken in the military. In order to do that, the UNC system has developed an interface (by the same group that designed UNC Online) where a person can look up the courses on their official military transcript to see what credit each institution gives for that course. There was a meeting of faculty from over the North Carolina who met for an initial review of that interface. Susan Reiser attended that meeting. The interface is not ready to go live yet. The Registrar will stay on top of this and reach out to the department chairs as we review what credit our courses are noted. Susan Reiser is happy to answer questions from faculty about this.

Safety and Security Update:

Chief Eric Boyce and David Weldon

Chief Eric Boyce began his report by stating for several years now the UNC System Office has sponsored and required Active Shooter and Emergency Preparedness Training on each campus once every three years. Our last cycle was in July 2017 where we had a full scale active shooter exercise here on campus that involved both UNC Asheville police officers and police officers from across the UNC System as well as the Asheville Police, Buncombe County Sherriff's Office, Mission Hospital, and area Fire Departments. During the three years between these exercises, all agencies continue to train together. There is also campus training that individuals and departments can [enroll or sponsor a class](#). Public Safety also talks to students and their parents as part of the orientation to our university.

Public Safety wants to partner with faculty to emphasize the importance of this training to our campus. Chief Boyce recognized many in the room have expressed appreciation for this training and have told them how the exercises bring practical advice and ideas on what to do in the moment of an active shooter incident.

The Director of Emergency Management, David Weldon, briefly talked about the Emergency Preparedness Training where we prepare for multi-hazard incidents. Director Weldon serves on the Security Committee at the UNC System level. He emphasized a plan is only as good as what people know and have practiced the plan. If they don't know and practice the plan, the lack of preparedness shows when an incident occurs.

David Weldon works with senior staff to make sure that we not only are prepared for the response to an incident but also for the recovery from the incident. As the incident down at UNC Charlotte shoed, the response is a very quick event then you have recovery that takes longer.

Our campus does the [ALICE Active Shooting Training](#) that specifically has the action steps in its name. ALICE stands for Alert, Lockdown, Inform, Counter, and Evacuate. This training has been embraced successfully by our campus. He has two classes scheduled within the next week. Classes are scheduled by request so if any group, department, or program wants to have an active shooter program let David Weldon know. The class takes only 1-2 hours and provides practical experience.

Many Faculty Senate Members agreed that the training is worthwhile. Chief Boyce and Director Weldon were asked how can faculty help them. Director Weldon said for faculty to continue to take active interest and attend these trainings. He also asked faculty to have an understanding for the security precautions that they have to take at events to protect attendees like searching purses, keeping certain doors locked and not allowing backpacks. Chief Boyce's desire is that regardless of whether or not they have had training that faculty, staff and students remain in a heightened state of awareness on campus and all spaces: know where your exits are, pay attention to safety/emergency instructions given, and know where the safe spaces are. He also recommends utilizing the emergency alert systems provided to the community.

Prevention is our greatest asset and communicating what we see and report what looks like suspicious activities so the Behavior Assessment Team can address those to prevent unfortunate events. Chief Boyce said that the ALICE Active Shooter Training would be more beneficial if conducted within the department or group's working/teaching area. Refresher training every three years is highly recommended. The safety training associated with Study Abroad Program is training to help faculty understand their responsibility for their student's safety and they welcome all who would like to take that training as well. Faculty Senate thanked them for Public Safety's work.

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

Professor Micheal Stratton

Chancellor's Report

Chancellor Nancy J. Cable

The Board of Trustees has asked the Chancellor to oversee a complete and thorough analysis and submit a recommendation for the future awarding of honorary degrees including how they are vetted with background checks to ensure the incident of the prior year never happens again. She will start this analysis the week after graduation by working with the new Senate Executive Committee with proposals being vetted by the Senate to include comments of the current Senate Executive Committee as well. The goal is to emerge from this with greatly improved processes.

IV. Academic Policies Committee Report:

Professor Laura Bond

[Decision Summaries](#)

First Reading:

[APC 63](#)

Update the descriptions of MUSC 390 and 490
(Brian Felix, MUSC)

A motion was made to waive the Comer Rule allowing this document to be considered and voted on by Senate with the other Music documents, which was seconded. No Discussion. Waiving the Comer Rule for APC 63 passed without dissent.

Second Reading:

- [APC 42](#) Delete HWP 250 and HWP 290
- [APC 43](#) Change title and course description for HWP 153; Change title and course description for HWP 190; Change title, course description, and prerequisite for HWP 315; Change course description, credit hours, and semester offered for HWP 455
- [APC 44](#) Revise the requirements for the Major in Health and Wellness Promotion and the Minor in Health and Wellness Promotion [Appendix](#) (Amy Lanou, HWP)

A motion was made to accept APC 42, APC 43 and APC 44, which was seconded. No discussion. APC 42, APC 43, and APC 44 passed without dissent.

- [APC 54](#) UNCA Music Department - Petition for Credit Cap Exemption – 2018-2019
[Appendix 1](#) [Appendix 2](#) [Appendix 3](#)

First Vice Chair Laura Bond explained that this is the petition for an exemption from the UNC Asheville credit cap and not the UNC System credit cap. A motion was to accept APC 54, which was seconded.

Discussion: Senate Chair Micheal Stratton wanted to point out that although the Music department is still over the cap, this proposal is actually a reduction in credit hours from the currently approved curriculum. APC Chair Laura Bond and Chair Brian Felix confirmed this.

APC 54 passed without dissent.

- [APC 45](#) Increase the credit hours and change the offering pattern of MUSC 340
- [APC 46](#) Edit the course descriptions for MUSC 382 and MUSC 383
- [APC 47](#) Increase the credit hours and offering pattern of MUSC 343, 346; Increase the credit hours and edit the descriptions of MUSC 344, 345, 347, 357; Increase the credit hours and change the titles and descriptions of MUSC 348 and 349
- [APC 48](#) Add new courses: MUSC 350, 367, and 368
- [APC 49](#) Delete MUSC 293 and MUSC 294, replacing them with MUSC 263 and 264; Change the titles and descriptions of MUSC 295 and 296, increasing the credit hours
- [APC 50](#) Revise the requirements for the Bachelor of Arts in Music
- [APC 51](#) Revise the requirements for the Bachelor of Fine Arts in Jazz and Contemporary Music
- [APC 52](#) Revise the requirements for the Bachelor of Science in Music Technology
- [APC 53](#) Revise requirements for the Minor in Music
- [APC 63](#) Update the descriptions of MUSC 390 and 490 (Brian Felix, MUSC)

A motion was made to accept bundled documents APC 45 through APC 53 plus APC 63, which was seconded. No discussion. Bundled documents APC 45 through APC 53 plus APC 63 passed without dissent.

[APC 55](#) Add a new prefix, SSCI, for Social Science courses; Add new course, SSCI 300, Applied Social Science Research Workshop (Lyndi Hewitt, SSCI)

A motion was made to accept APC 55, which was seconded. No discussion. APC 55 passed without dissent and one (1) abstention.

[APC 57](#) Revise the credit awarded for Advanced Placement exams in Art, Art History, Biology, Chemistry, English, Government, History, Music Theory, and Physics; Add Advanced Placement credit for Chinese

[APC 58](#) Change the prerequisite for CHEM 145, Quantitative Chemistry Laboratory, as a result of the change in Advanced Placement Credit (Lynne Horgan, Kirk Boyle, Alicia Shope)

A motion was made to accept APC 57 and APC 58, which was seconded.

Discussion: Kirk Boyle wanted to recognize Registrar Lynne Horgan and Associate Registrar Alicia Shope's year-long hard work on this.

APC 57 and APC 58 passed without dissent.

[APC 59](#) Add new course, IST 330, Sustainability Seminar (Kevin Moorhead, Jennifer Rhode Ward, Alison Ormsby, Sonia Marcus)

A motion was made to accept APC 59, which was seconded. No discussion. APC 59 passed without dissent.

[APC 61](#) Establish policy allowing for fulfillment of EDUC 210 through successful completion of the Pathways2Teaching course at regional high schools (Nancy Ruppert)

A motion was made to accept APC 61, which was seconded. No discussion. APC 61 passed without dissent and one (1) abstention.

The following were not unanimously approved by APC and will be discussed at second reading. The dissenting vote will have an opportunity to speak before Senate.

[APC 56](#) Add an interdisciplinary certificate in Applied Social Science Research (Lyndi Hewitt, SSCI)
Passed APC 3-1. See APC Decision Summaries above for their review.
[IDC Decision Summary](#)

A motion was made to accept APC 56, which was seconded. Nancy Ruppert relayed the collective concerns of APC (See APC Decision Summary for APC 56) that led to the one dissenting vote.

Discussion: APC concluded that minors are those that support and build upon a discipline whereas certificates do not support one discipline but multiple disciplines. As such, APC had concerns about the level of rigor required of certificate offerings.

Regine Criser made a recommendation for next year's APC to clarify procedures for faculty have concerns. Second Vice Chair Ken Betsalel said that IDC had concerns and agreed a standard way to consider certificates should be addressed next year.

Although he is support of these proposals today, Kirk Boyle remembered when the certificate proposal first came before Senate that he was very supportive of certificates for he wanted to propose one himself while Marietta Cameron was opposed to them (she clarified that she spoke against them but now they have been approved she is supportive of the proposed offerings). After three years serving on APC, he says it is apparent to him that the logistics of the certificate are complicated despite the intentions being very noble and is inspiring to see his colleague's interest for curricular development in ways that innovate our curriculum, especially in interdisciplinary ways. He believes that as curriculum reform comes down the line that certificates may be a place we can innovate while cleaning up logistical issues so not to burden our staff members.

Chancellor Cable wanted to make a comment; however, she wanted to make it clear that her comment does not reflect upon any opinion about the two certificate proposals before Faculty Senate today. Relative to minors and certificates, there are accreditation standards in SACS that both relate to legitimacy of the program of study as well as faculty productivity. The new Provost will be able to help us with this for attention is needed to these concerns.

Lyndi Hewitt appreciates Nancy Ruppert and others who serve on APC for their critical thoughts. Although she is not a huge fan of the certificate concept herself; however, her group that prepared this proposal had been working together for two years were not in agreement on the whether the Applied Social Science program of study should be a minor or a certificate. They did not have consensus around that. This may become a minor if it is successful as a certificate or it may become something else.

Lyndi Hewitt continued to explain that the field of Applied Social Research or Applied Social Science Research is a recognized interdisciplinary field across this country and globally. Social Sciences, Mathematics, and other disciplines come together to help students acquire a particular diverse skill set that is applied in a variety of professional and community settings. This is what this group wanted to try to create for our students. The students who know about this as a possibility are extraordinarily excited about this. Should further deliberation happen in the coming years, Lyndi Hewitt would be pleased to work within whatever new structures that emerge to make sure that our goals align. We need this to be innovative and beneficial to the students.

This certificate was created in such a way that a student cannot "just happen" upon completing the coursework for this certificate. Through collaboration with APC, the group added the cornerstone course that all students pursuing the certificate will be required to take. So in this case, there is not a way to "accidentally" complete the requirements for this certificate. That would not happen. We intend to closely advise students so they grow their opportunities in engaged research in the field outside the university.

From the IDC perspective, Ken Betsalel said that they felt that these certificates help students structure their interdisciplinary work. They had frank discussions about the cost of this in terms of choices within the department so it is their belief that we are going into this with our eyes open although this needs revisiting next year.

Provost Peterson wanted to echo the deep hunger she hears within faculty for innovative opportunities and faculty need to be supportive of faculty experimentation. Senate Chair Stratton added that this is a perfect example of why we need to study the Academic Affairs organizational structure.

Tiece Ruffin asked whether these certificates circumvent the Interdisciplinary Studies Department. The Chair of the Interdisciplinary Studies Department wonders why certificates are outside of that realm.

Ken Betsalel relayed that this is an ongoing discussion for at least six (6) years. The ultimate outcome has evolved just as the certificates have evolved. Senators have undergone switching their views throughout their evolution. Ultimately we are a plural university – pluralism as in there are multiple ways to address structural questions being interdisciplinary. At first Ken Betsalel thought these certificates should go under Interdisciplinary Studies. However, through many conversations, he has been persuaded to see that having the flexibility of choice is a better way to go since we tout interdisciplinary here, which can manifest in many different ways.

Tiece Ruffin responded that that is great as long as it is not antagonistic against or towards Interdisciplinary Studies. She wonders is it choice or disgruntlement against Interdisciplinary Studies as it stands as a department versus faculty wanting a choice.

Ken Betsalel replied that he can only speak for himself in using the word “choice.” He believes the concern that she has expressed was also brought up in their IDC discussions around issues of race and other concerns that were discussed and vetted.

Lyndi Hewitt brought up that the first certificate was the evolution of the Food Cluster to a certificate. The idea of certificates emerged as a way to give faculty from many disciplines the opportunity to continue their good work after the dissolution of clusters. Her group who worked on the Applied Science Research Certificate have been doing so from a distinctively Social Science lens.

APC Chair Laura Bond explained that in the creation of the interdisciplinary certificates they were not required to be housed within Interdisciplinary Studies. She feels that the work of the originating group and APC strengthened the proposal. APC has in fact talked about wanting to use the first certificate documents as example for future certificate proposals. APC wants to echo that it was intentional to have this Senate discussion on certificates. APC believes these certificates have great value for students and APC is in support of these certificates. However, APC wanted to make sure Senate had the opportunity to have the discussion about certificate curriculum concerns to ensure their inclusion in the minutes for future senators. APC thanks Lyndi Hewitt for understanding and engaging in this discussion.

APC 56 passed without dissent and two (2) abstentions.

[APC 60](#) Add Interdisciplinary Certificate in Sustainability
(Kevin Moorhead, Jennifer Rhodes Ward, Alison Ormsby , Sonia Marcus)
Passed APC 3-1. See APC Decision Summaries above for their review.
[IDC Decision Summary](#)

A motion was made to accept APC 60, which was seconded.

Discussion: Concerning the dissenting voice, Kirk Boyle relayed that the logistical issues that came up with certificates also came up when discussing this proposal. The Food Cluster certificate was the first certificate and three of the courses in that certificate showed up in this Sustainability Certificate proposal. APC decided that students have to choose which certificate they want those three courses to count towards. APC has not only dealt with theoretical issues but also very practical challenges they had to resolve.

Amy Lanou who was one of the faculty members who brought the Food Certificate to Senate wanted to speak to first confirm that students really value the experience, opportunities and knowledge they are gaining from working towards these certificates. It is meaningful for the

students. Why not allow our students to engage in these cross-disciplinary and interdisciplinary ways to deepen their knowledge and experience?

Registrar Lynne Horgan raised a concern that a student who has completed their major coursework for their degree and hang on to finish a certificate. She respects that it is a great place for the development of new and innovative curriculum, but we do want students to earn their degrees and graduate in a timely fashion.

Marietta Cameron relayed that APC has thought about these concerns that the registrar has brought up and she knows they have considered limiting, but have not done so. Perhaps APC needs to revisit this in the coming year.

Trey Adcock added that these conversations need to also consider what is academic rigor and how do we gauge that in proposals. Micheal Stratton said that is a significant question that will take time to study and answer as it pertains to studying and outlining periodic program reviews.

APC 60 passed without dissent and one (1) abstention.

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

Professor Laura Bond

V. [Faculty Welfare and Development Committee Report:](#)

Senior Lecturer Judith Beck

[Decision Summaries](#)

Second Reading:

[FWDC 11:](#) Establishment of a Policy for Stipend Amounts
Faculty Handbook Section 2.9.4.1

A motion was made to accept FWDC 11, which was seconded. FWDC Chair Judy Beck said that FWDC 11 was a common issue brought up in the FWDC listening sessions during the 2017-18 academic year as well as a Provost Forum held this past February (2019). After many robust discussions, FWDC finalized FWDC 11. FWDC did not approach this lightly; this is a very serious proposal to FWDC members. FWDC does not believe FWDC 11 fixes all our problems and is not the solution to all pay issues, but FWDC 11 is a good first step towards equitable pay for equitable work.

Discussion: Peter Haschke asked how Department Chairs are currently paid and how will this change. The answer was they earn an additional month of their current salary. Although this document does not set numbers and FWDC does not want numbers in the handbook, FWDC ran calculations to determine the equitable figure would amount to between \$9,300 to \$9,500 if all the money that went to all chairs this year were redistributed equally among all the chairs.

Once this goes into effect as a "grandfathering" measure, no continuing chairs would have their pay decreased for the duration of their terms. Current contracts would be honored and the policy would go into effect for new contracts. It will take a couple of years before things flatten out since department chair contracts are in effect for four years. Some are in their first or second year of their contract while others are in their third or fourth year.

Peter Haschke asked if that would be set at \$9,000 or will there be cost of living and inflation increases to that amount. The FWDC Chair said that issue is one reason FWDC did not put actual numbers in the document and they were not sure a subcommittee of Senate should be determining details like that. FWDC would imagine this would be addressed as other pay matters are. FWDC wanted to emphasize that equitable pay is a huge issue that this document only begins to address. FWDC does understand that department chairs do not all do the same amount of

work. However, the work they do as chairs is not reflected in their base salary amount either. This document is an attempt to address equity issues. Issues like differences in work due to size of department and the number of students enrolled are addressed by reassigned time.

FWDC understands this does not address the inequity faculty note in regards to internships and other service work where some faculty are well-rewarded with stipends while others are doing their work and it counts as part of their service.

Provost Peterson wanted to thank FWDC for their listening sessions as well as those who are raising up the issues of equity around pay and the recognition of time equals money. However, Provost Peterson wanted to register her dissenting opinion about this particular solution for she believes there are a lot of potential unexamined and unanticipated consequences of moving to a flat rate structure without having looked at the structure in context of the multiple ways faculty are compensated. She does not believe it was her job as interim provost to do this. She believes this is a conversation that will require a great deal of study and attention in good faith energy with the new provost. She pointed out that one of the issues when you change from one month's salary to a stipend then you are adjusting salary annually not based on work but based upon the amount of stipend money that is available in the budget. We have a habit every time we ask faculty to do something they show up at their dean's or provost's office asking for a discretionary stipend or release time. We need a systematic way of recognizing people's good work. This document is not going to fix it, and in the provost's view, risks making the situation even more complicated. She understands the intent of wanting equity or equableness around the pay for chairs. She could get behind that, but would like to see this studied in a broader context.

Laura Bond recalls the stipend for chairs was a flat rate some years ago and then it was changed to this current policy. At the same time, the program directors remained at the flat rate so the chairs changed into that percentage with the rationale was they are working an extra month. Before the change, all had the same flat rate stipend. Program directors have consistently had a flat rate that did not change.

Provost Peterson also pointed out that it is unclear to her that Faculty Senate gets to set salary. She does not believe they can do that. Her understanding of how the department chair stipend became an extra month's salary was through dean action. Senate can request to make this a priority, and she believes this is absolutely a priority. This is on the top of the list that she is leaving the new provost. However, this has to be looked at systematically.

Dean Jeff Konz confirmed that Provost Peterson's memory is correct. It was done by administrative action and it was inserted into the faculty handbook by academic affairs.

FWDC Chair Judy Beck appreciates the provost's comments; however, many of the points made by the provost is why FWDC felt this was important to address. This document will not actually be enacted upon salary until next year meaning it will not actually go into effect until after next spring. To her, this document sends a strong signal to the incoming provost that there are issues and we want to address them and be transparent about how they are addressed. We understand that Senate cannot set salary, but it is FWDC's understanding that Senate can set policy to the degree that we put it in the faculty handbook. The Provost can make a decision about signing the document based on a broader perspective. FWDC felt that waiting what has already been two years was not listening to the faculty who spoke in those sessions. Faculty spoke strongly in those listening sessions and in the provost forum and the sense that FWDC got from faculty is they do not want to be "just listened to" anymore – they want Faculty Senate to actually take action for them.

Regine Criser also added that these are practices already in place in other institutions of higher education. FWDC did not pull this solution out of the blue. FWDC 11 was a carefully drawn,

intensely debated within FWDC. They researched the money that has been spent, worked with Dean Konz to look at the budget structure and how people would be affected. This will not resolve all faculty pay inequities, but FWDC put this forward for it does at least address some of the inequities that exist. The responsibilities that all department chairs share are clearly stated in the faculty handbook, and the differences can be addressed by faculty release time. This document moves in the direction that is actually considered a best practice by other institutions of higher education.

Ken Betsalel suggested to table the document until the new provost is here and has an opportunity to address this. Perhaps more creative solutions can be explored.

Judy Beck said that since this has been placed on the Senate agenda for first reading only one faculty member has come to her with their issues/questions and that was Provost Peterson. She thanks the Provost for doing that [Note for clarification: there is a standing note on all first readings that asks those with questions or issues to please contact the committee chair to address items before second reading and vote]. She felt FWDC has provided time for conversation and respectfully declines to ask to table this document.

Regine Criser said that she does not understand how putting this policy in place is minimizing the ability of the next Provost to move forward.

Ken Betsalel suggested that the Interim Provost has registered her objections so there must be some other side to this that we are missing.

Regine Criser suggested that if that is the case then let us talk about that now.

Judy Beck asked is it not important to have a policy in place that is more reflective of our values.

Tiece Ruffin asked whether this policy address those departments who have Associate Chairs or Assistant Chairs and does this include Program Directors. FWDC Chair said this is an excellent question. This document as written says those who are doing essentially the same job are paid the same amount.

Chancellor Cable said she appreciates the spirit and energy around these ideas very much, but she wanted to clarify the timing. Our university is on a July 1 to June 30 fiscal year. That means it will be July 1, 2020 before it takes effect since it is not built into the budget for fiscal year 2020 which ends June 30, 2020. FWDC Chair Beck clarified her meaning in that the contract that start July 1, 2020 would be written that spring for her understanding is new department chairs are usually hired at the end of an academic year for the next academic year.

Professor Bond wanted to have further clarification when talking about a flat rate that whether you are a department chair, co-chair, associate chair or program director. FWDC Chair said that this document says that a flat stipend for individuals serving the same role/doing the same job. Granted, someone has to decide who is doing the same job and that is still up for interpretation to determine the categories and which position belongs to which category.

Marietta Cameron asked how will this affect recruitment of department chairs.

Aubri Rote said that FWDC found this practice was beneficial for the vast majority of faculty across this campus. Some may find it to be a disincentive for some department chairs, but that group is in the small minority. Their goal as the Faculty Welfare and Development Committee is to support the majority of the faculty and do what is equitable for the majority of the faculty. Judy Beck said that their numbers indicate that upon implementation that well over half of the department chairs will see an increase.

Marietta Cameron wonders why we are equalizing down the amount of pay rather than equalizing all up. Also, roles are not equal in the amount of work. Some departments are growing while understaffed so release/reassigned time is not an option to be utilized by department

chairs. Some departments like Computer Science have first semester classes for freshmen with 42 students each while they have 35 Senior Projects at the same time.

The FWDC Chair reiterated that FWDC does recognize not all chairs do the same amount of work. The current system does not address the situation that Marietta Cameron described. The current system does not guarantee that those who are doing more work are paid higher salaries. Regine Criser echoed that is the very issue and why this topic has been brought up by faculty in the listening sessions for all department chairs do more work and it isn't fair that some are paid \$30,000 more and others make only \$7,000 more just based on the salary they were hired, the discipline they are in, and what an agreement that was decided on their salary before they became department chair says. There are still conversations to be heard, but inequity across position was a priority to address.

John Pierce said the reality is we do not have resources to increase upwards as Marietta Cameron suggested. Within our resources, as much equity that we can have, the better off we will be. When it comes to saying a flat dollar amount it does come back to resources. In the broader perspective, within those resources, everything we can do equitably would be the best.

Senate Chair Micheal Stratton asked for clarification on what he is hearing. His understanding of FWDC 11 is we go from a covered 10 months of salary vs. funding coming from different pots where enrollment and retention affect the size of that pot. As a result, in years of low enrollment and decreased retention, the size of that pot will be smaller while a 10-month salary is guaranteed.

John Pierce said that scenario was related to the silo culture of the past where those decisions were made by the deans, the academic budget officers, and the Provost. Regardless of method, all are managed within the resources that we have which are all affected by enrollment and the other things we talked about in the Common Ground Sessions. He deferred to Provost Peterson.

Provost Peterson replied under the current practice, everything that faculty are paid comes from the same money. The problem is items can be treated differently depending on how it is categorized. Right now if you are getting 10 months' salary, that is a salary. If we move it to a stipend, that becomes money that we have to look at in terms whether we can afford it. Every year right now we look at whether merit increases can be afforded and there are years we cannot pay merit increases because we can't afford it. Provost Peterson is trying to signal to the Senate that if you change this to a stipend and we have a bad year, it is less secure.

Judy Beck asked why do we have to call it a stipend? Why can't it be called a salary that is the same for everyone that is part of the department chairs' contract that and goes away when they are no longer chair? She understands from John Pierce that we have control over what we do with these funds. She is fine not calling it a stipend. Aubri Rote agreed and suggests calling it a salary increase that is the same for everyone in that role. Karin Peterson said we are still going to calculate the amount of that increase by the money that is coming in. Provost Peterson would love to pay equally; she is not sure that we should create something that has consequences that we did not intend to create. Also there are laws that if a salary goes up too much that we have to report it to the state and get permission. Due these multiple kinds of complications, Provost Peterson still recommends Senate consider a different proposal with the expectation that this would be a top priority next year. Let it be studied in a broader context rather than in a specific context.

Ann Dunn asked why Senate does not wait until the new Provost comes in and looks at this as a priority issue.

Judy Beck says there are two reasons why we do not wait: 1) The faculty have been listened to and they are tired of just being listened to and 2) We want to make a really strong

recommendation to the new Provost. Having something on the books, even it doesn't get implemented until the next salary round, does matter.

Provost Peterson said there is a difference where inviting in a new provost as a partner while setting a situation where a rule is put in place which he may have to undo next year. A different gesture would be to invite the provost to do this work with you next year.

Trey Adcock asked what constitutes a service assignment. Provost Peterson said a service assignment is an at-will appointment that is not the core faculty work initially hired to do. You are hired as a faculty member and that is what your appointment is. Technically, the letters you receive offering you to take on an administrative role such as department chair are not legal contracts. They are offers of additional duties that you are being asked to acquire.

Mark McClure made a motion to change the word from establishes to recommends.

Dean Konz wanted to relay how this got in the handbook is due to the system requiring we have a supplemental pay policy in the Faculty Handbook. There was a Senate document that placed this in the handbook. Senate didn't make the policy but was inserted by Senate to comply.

Provost Peterson said it is her understanding that this has to be approved by the Chancellor and Board of Trustees. Dean Konz said he would have to look that up in the policy manual to confirm.

Aubri Rote asked Provost Peterson if we put this into place, if she is saying it would be good for the new provost to go back to the current structure that is highly inequitable. Provost Peterson responded that she is not in favor of the current structure. She is simply saying we need to examine it realistically and have it procedurally run through all the right channels and not tie the hands of the new provost.

Marietta Cameron pointed out that we are going through a structural change as far as academic affairs are concerned. As a department chair, she is concerned that some of the duties currently held by a dean are going to have to be distributed up or down that means some of the responsibilities of the current deans will come upon the chairs. Why change the pay policy until we understand what the duties of the department chairs will be under the new structure.

Regarding the motion to change the word establishes to recommends, FWDC Chair Judy Beck said that FWDC conferred and are willing to accept that friendly amendment (changes highlighted in final document). One reason for accepting the friendly amendment is that it is not clear what Senate can change for it is not clearly stated in the Constitution although Senate throughout the history of its work in shared governance has written all types of documents to change policy.

FWDC 11 as amended passed 14-0 with four (4) abstentions.

FWDC 12: Proposed Revisions and Additions to the policy regarding the Faculty Committee on Hearings (FCH)
Faculty Handbook Section 10.2.4 and Section 14.2

A motion was made to accept FWDC 12, which was seconded. Judy Beck explained that in regards to changing Section 14.2 that Faculty Senate cannot change those policies without the approval of the Board of Trustees (see [Section 14.2](#)). Senate can pass it as a recommendation to forward to the Board of Trustees while editing 10.2.4 regarding training. No discussion.

FWDC 12 passed without dissent.

[Faculty Elections Conclusion Update:](#)

Senior Lecturer Judith Beck

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

Senior Lecturer Judith Beck

VI. Institutional Development Committee:

Professor Ken Betsalel

Second Reading:

[IDC Decision Summary for IDC 3](#)

[APC Decision Summaries \(See APC 62\)](#)

[IDC 3/APC 62:](#) Request to Establish New Academic Degree Program:

Master in Public Health (M.P.H.) between

University of North Carolina Asheville and University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (Gillings School of Global Public Health)

[Amended IDC 3 / APC 62 dated 5/1/2019](#)

A motion was made to accept IDC 3/APC 62 as amended (see page 12, II. A. for change) that was seconded. No Discussion.

IDC 3/APC 62 as amended passed without dissent.

Travis Johnson, Interim Director for the UNC Gillings Masters in Public Health in Asheville, addressed Faculty Senate saying it has been a privilege to be a part of this and a wonderful experience working Faculty Senate, Provost Peterson, John Pierce, and all within the room. This is going to be wonderful change for the community health of the citizens of Western North Carolina. He is very grateful and thanks UNC Asheville.

Provost Peterson thanked Dr. Johnson and the Gillings School of Global Public Health for their wonderful partnership.

[Update on Master Planning:](#)

Associate Professor Sonya DiPalma

[Master Planning Website](#)

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

Professor Ken Betsalel

VII. Administration/Academic Affairs:

Provost Karin Peterson

Reflections of the Interim Provost as she will shortly take her leave:

- UNC Asheville has had a two-year period of what we might call unsettled times.
- From the Interim Provost's seat, it certainly felt like we are on an unsettled ocean that is very turbulent, very uncertain and very changing.
- It has been a privilege, but it has been very difficult work. She is grateful to this body (Faculty Senate) for their diligence. Having sat on the faculty for twenty (20) years, she believes in our resilience and that we are not in uncharted, unsettled waters forever.
- Sociologist Ann Swidler talks about unsettled lives and the ways in unsettled periods certain kinds of culture become more evident and new possibilities emerge. And so let us use the possibilities moving forward.
- Provost Peterson wanted to especially thank the Senate Executive Committee. They have been true colleagues. They have debated, talked on the phone, and texted. She wanted to also acknowledge this year how very hard the Academic Affairs Staff worked.
- If Provost Peterson could leave one request to the Faculty Senate, it would be for faculty as a body to continue to identify ways in which we create unrecognized privilege in

regards to our highly educated professional staff who work beside us every day without the same privilege of going home when their children are ill nor the same opportunity to receive a stipend for extra work. She asks faculty to continue to think about ways in which faculty privilege dominates that is unhelpful in the ways we do business here.

- She believes there are multiple opportunities that we have in front of us to collaborate with the new Provost and she asks that this body let the university move forward. By that she means she believes that sometimes faculty get in our own way by creating policies that limit possible actions and limit creativity, opportunities, and make more work for ourselves.
- She also believes there is an opportunity for a different understanding of how we move issues forward. She thinks many of the issues (that were touched on today) that faculty and this body need to think about immediately are salaries, evaluation processes, curriculum processes, and budget. She believes if we get the kind of administrative structure that the new Chancellor would like for us to have would be better for there is a different way we can work together that has been acknowledged multiple times this year. She believes that we could have people doing some of the work that Senate currently takes on. For example, the information gathering that FWDC had to do regarding faculty salaries when there is expertise available so a committee does not have to become an expert.
- Same thing with curriculum. There are people who understand SACS, accreditation, and process. Provost Peterson believes we have an opportunity moving forward to create more transparent shared processes that by being shared differently actually unburden this body from some of the work they currently do. That is Provost Peterson's opinion and she is happy to talk about that more.
- Provost Peterson has had the privilege the past six months to collaborate with University Advancement. Knowing what faculty have said about their frustrations with fundraising on this campus, she feels obligated to share she now understands at least half of the problem that we have around getting our act together concerning fundraising has nothing to do with Advancement, but has everything to do with a lack of clear process within Academic Affairs. This is an opportunity for us to clear a path so that we can be a part of the comprehensive campaign which is coming up. Her work with Advancement leaves her with great hope for they are ready to collaborate with faculty.
- Her parting message is to let us try this and carry on. Thank you.

VIII. Old Business/New Business

Faculty Senate Executive Committee presented gifts of appreciation to Senate Chair Micheal Stratton and Provost Karin Peterson for their hard work during these two transitive years.

IX. The first meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT ASHEVILLE
FACULTY SENATE AGENDA
May 2, 2018; First Meeting of 2019-2020 Faculty Senate
Alumni Hall in Highsmith Union

Members: M. Stratton, L. Bond, M. Cameron, P. Bahls, A. Rote, J. Brock, S. Clark Muntean, R. Criser, S. DiPalma, V. Frank, C. Kennedy, T. King, M. McClure, C. Oakley, J. Pisano, T. Ruffin, A. Wray; K. Peterson.

Excused Members: A. Moraguez.

Visitors: N. Cable, T. Adcock, A. Dunn, J. Perkins.

I. Call to Order, Introductions and Announcements Professor Micheal Stratton

II. Election of Faculty Senate Officers
a. Chair of the Senate and Chair of the Executive Committee (EC)
Laura Bond was elected for term 2019-20.

Election of Faculty Senate Vice Chairs by new elected Senate Chair

b. First Vice Chair and Chair of the Academic Policies Committee (APC)
Marietta Cameron was elected for term 2019-20.

c. Second Vice Chair and Chair of the Institutional Development Committee (IDC)
Patrick Bahls was elected for term 2019-20.

d. Third Vice Chair and Chair of the Faculty Welfare and Development Committee (FWDC)
Aubri Rote was elected for term 2019-20.

III. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee Report
a. Committee Work-in-Progress (Nominees to Standing Committees)
Faculty Senate passed [the slate of nominees](#) without dissent.

IV. [Committee Assignment Preferences](#)

Senators submitted their annual preferences for service on one of the Senate Subcommittees: Academic Policies Committee (APC), Institutional Development Committee (IDC), Faculty Welfare and Development Committee (FWDC).

The Senate Executive Committee will confer and announce the committee membership after their retreat.

V. Adjournment
The New Senate Chair, Laura Bond, adjourned the meeting at 6:37 p.m.