

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA ASHEVILLE
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
April 9, 2020; 3:15 pm
Virtual Meeting

Members Present: M. Cameron, S. DiPalma, P. Bahls, A. Rote, J. Brock, J. Butera, S. Clark, D. Clarke, R. Criser, V. Frank, C. Kennedy, T. King, M. McClure, A. Moraguez, C. Oakley, J. Pisano, T. Ruffin, A. Wray; G. Campbell.

Visitors: N. Cable, C. Anderson, J. Beck, L. Bond, B. Butler, R. Chess, K. Cole, A. Dunn, S. Earle, M. Galloway, B. Graves, I. Green, B. Haggard, B. Hart, G. Heard, P. Hester, L. Hewitt, M. Himelein, H. Holt, L. Horgan, L. Johnson, L. Kloeppe, J. Konz, A. Lanou, L. Linton, J. McHargue, C. Mallon, M.L. Manns, R. Mapp, B. Petitfils, J. Rhode Ward, A.M. Roberts, N. Ruppert, A. Shope, S. Smith, E. Spence, W. Strehl, L. Ward, C. Whitlock, K. Zubko.

I. Call to Order

Marietta Cameron called the first virtual regularly held Faculty Senate Meeting to order. If a person wishes to speak, they say so in the chat box and wait for the Senate Chair or Vice Chair over that part of the meeting to recognize them. Voting will be done via Google Forms that Lisa Sellers created and sent an email with all the voting and viewing links included for easy access.

Regine Criser asked if the Vice Chairs would help the Senate Chair monitor the chat window.

Marietta Cameron relayed that Lisa Sellers, as Administrative Assistant to the Faculty Senate, is also monitoring the chat and privately sending her messages, but she does not have any problems with EC members also monitoring the chat window and relaying privately when she misses someone. Marietta Cameron does ask for patience while conducting the meeting. She has experienced many virtual meetings and even the ones held downstate have hiccups. She asks for understanding while we become accustomed to this new way. At the present time, there are 54 participants in this meeting so using the chat window and Google Forms is a better way to monitor the order of questions as opposed to raising hands or using Google Forms to only the senators as opposed to polling for votes. That said, it is important that all voices are heard so she asks all to please be very understanding with each other.

II. Chancellor Nancy Cable / Provost Garikai Campbell

Chancellor Cable began by saying she is grateful for all the work faculty are doing day in and day out. She believes the next 30 to 45 days will be spent on two tasks, both of them very complicated. The first is calculating the financial losses and the marginal financial gain from things that were not happening on campus and negotiating on our behalf with the Department of Education, the UNC system, and even with our legislators, both state and federal. We want to be exact to the penny about the losses that we have experienced as well as project losses we will experience in refunding dining and housing expenses to students, which is the right thing to do. They are also calculating the projected loss through the summer that we will experience from not having in person instruction and those camps and conferences that will be canceled or postponed. They are amending our budget preserving what they believe is most important, which is to keep everyone employed and paid throughout this period, so that all can be safe. Provost Campbell and Vice Chancellor John Pierce

have provided very good leadership and she feels the institution is well-supported in the existing budgetary requests that have been made.

Second, in the next 30 to 45 days, they will be predicting and planning. There is a small nationwide discussion among leaders in higher education that classes may need to stay on online and away from in person instruction into the fall. Although she is hearing that as a minority view, she thinks that as well as news regarding the status of what the virus will do needs to be monitored. Whether it will attenuate over the summer and then perhaps resurge in the fall, the experts in both epidemiology and public health are doing very good modeling. She has been told it will be May 2 before they will determine whether in person experiences will be possible in July. At this stage, planning is being made incrementally. She feels great support from faculty and staff when we return to in person instruction to get our culture and our academic community rebooted, hopefully by late summer or the fall. She opened the floor for questions.

Marietta Cameron thanked Chancellor Cable for her leadership and her tireless efforts on our behalf locally as well as state and system wide leadership.

Provost Kai Campbell hoped that everyone received the email he sent just prior to the town hall. It went through a few things, including whether or not faculty would have the option to assign pass/fail grading. They are asking all faculty to actually supply grades and leave the decision on the side of the students to do that conversion for each course as they so choose. Regarding UNC System Human Resources policies, hiring can be in roughly three categories - either they are ongoing searches, those searches are being brought to conclusion, and hires like lecturers contingent upon appropriations. There are no changes to existing contracts that we are making. New hires have to be scrutinized carefully for there is a hiring freeze where hiring is limited to those critical to the operation of the institution.

He wanted to give a heads up that at some point he will send a letter on academic leadership - the structure and how he wants to move forward, including the processes for various roles and positions. For the next year, he is moving forward with the dean structure.

Regarding the annual faculty record, FWDC has done some work on that he would like to start sharing more widely, figuring out a good process for how we begin to get some feedback on that tool and collect information from faculty on that. He still needs to reconnect with FWDC on details.

Finally, he sent an email probably at the start of this meeting about the chair's compensation. It is not the full proposal that he was hoping to share by today, but it gives some context to the way that he is thinking about this. There is a proposal coming from FWDC today and he does not have details yet regarding the particulars of the chairs compensation that he would want to see like compensation for every chair in every department, but that is coming soon. What he sent today is context about where we stand right now and what the objectives and goals of the compensation scheme will be. His expectation is that he will publish the chairs compensation table associated with each of the departments so that everyone will be fully aware of what one is compensated for by being chair in any given role.

Marietta Cameron asked whether the four-year contracts of current chairs will be honored and these changes will be applied to new contracts.

Provost Campbell replied that the changes will certainly happen as new contracts come through. His hope is to release the information and have a discussion with the current chairs and program directors at their next meeting on April 20. His hope is that faculty would agree to moving forward with the change and the potential migration. Particularly if there is a big jump to the new scheme, we will probably have to look at that more carefully. One thing that cannot happen is we

cannot spend more money and keep the total cost cannot be more than the current expenditure.

Questions:

Jake Butera relayed that a number of universities have started to freeze salaries and a few have even looked into salary reductions. He was wondering if those discussions are happening now either here at UNCA or at the state and system level. If so, what impact would that have on people currently going up for things like reappointment and tenure.

Chancellor Cable replied there has not been any discussion of that at this time and they have not heard in any quarter downstate about a furlough or a freezing of salaries. If they hear anything of that even being considered, they will make sure to report to faculty. At this point in time, there has not been any discussion.

Regine Criser appreciates the conversation regarding compensation that has already started. She just wanted to point out a general reminder that this document is up for first reading and that second reading is when the document will be up for discussion and vote on the Senate Floor and we need to attend to this meeting's Second Reading documents.

Marietta Cameron thanked Regina Criser for the reminder. However, since the Provost raised the issue, she does not have a problem with faculty raising questions and hearing answers. Thank you very much for the reminder and we will try to stay on the agenda. She had one more question for the Provost concerning departmental budgets for next year coming through.

Provost Campbell that is very difficult for him to predict at this time. As we all know, we had to operate this year without a state budget. We will need to wait until we know a little more about what our next year's state budget will be.

Chancellor Cable agreed completely with Provost Campbell of his assessment of this situation. They would hope to know within the next 30 to 45 days but with this current situation she is not optimistic about that possibility. Their focus right now is to make sure that we can preserve our workforce and continue to compensate properly.

Marietta Cameron thanked Chancellor Cable and Provost Campbell for their leadership and for all the work they are doing that starts very early in the morning and goes very late at night.

III. Approval of Minutes: March 5, 2019 3:15 p.m.

A motion was made to accept the minutes of March 5 2020, which was seconded. Marietta Cameron relayed since this is a virtual meeting and there are over 50 people listed that as opposed to asking Senators to raise their hands, she is going to ask if there is any objection to the approval of the minutes. No objection was brought forward so Senate Chair Marietta Cameron announced that the minutes are approved.

IV. Executive Committee:

Senate Chair Marietta Cameron

A. Updates from EC

B. Senate Chair's report from Faculty Assembly

Marietta Cameron asked everyone to extend congratulations to our colleague and fellow senator Dr. Tiece Ruffin, who has been named the 2020 Board of Governors Excellence in Teaching Award winner from the University of North Carolina Asheville. We greatly appreciate Tiece Ruffin's work and congratulate her on this statewide recognition and look forward to the speech she will give to us.

Marietta Cameron relayed that the Executive Committee has met regularly throughout the

pandemic. The results of those discussions were presented in our special session that was held on March 27. The Executive Committee as well as Faculty Senate has been working very hard representing the faculty voice. We appreciate the Chancellor and the Provost as well as other members of Senior Leadership for contacting and consulting with the EC members and Senate regularly as issues arise.

Progress Report from Faculty Assembly Senate Chairs Meeting. Last week, the Faculty Assembly and the Senate Chairs met virtually. On April 2, 2020, from 5pm to 7pm, the Senate Chairs met. Committee chairperson, Barbara Howard from Appalachian State, welcomed the group and gave a quick orientation of zoom meeting etiquette. Each chair gave a three-minute presentation of their institutional responses to issues, concerns and other ideas stemming from the COVID-19 pandemic. From their presentations and discussion, the institutions are responding similarly to our response adopted on March 27. However, there was great variation and uncertainty in terms of commencement plans. UNC Asheville was the only institution at the time that mentioned efforts towards contingency plans on a departmental level. A few institutions raised concerns about financial exigency that our Chancellor has directly addressed today. Also, when this institution raised those concerns to the Faculty Assembly Chair and Chair-elect, they both adamantly confirmed that the system had not even raised that spectrum at all. The next day at the Faculty Assembly meeting, again, the Interim UNC System President, Dr. Roper also confirmed that financial exigency has not been raised at a system nor state level.

The Senate Chairs also shared ideas about managing virtual meetings while trying to abide by Open Meeting Law, and there was a debate on which platforms to use. The committee has a spreadsheet in which we can all compare our institutional responses. The chairs discussed the collegiality document that you will see later in the Faculty Assembly report. There was an emphasis that the document addresses collegiality and not stability. Due to the subjective nature of the definition of stability, it was suggested that the term not be used in terms of faculty evaluations. There was also an acknowledgement of microaggressions and over talking based on race, gender, rank, and institution type. There was a recognition that this happens within all types of groups and bodies within the Academy. There was a discussion on how to address such actions regardless of intentionality and how to allow the inclusion and respect of all voices. The pandemic has the effect of delaying their work on the shared governance document so that work will continue when the committee meets next fall.

V. [Student Government Association:](#) President Isaiah Green

Marietta Cameron congratulated our SGA President, Isaiah Green, on his election as ASG President which means he is President of the system wide student association and will be a student member of the Board of Governors next year.

Marietta Cameron also thanked Isaiah Green for his representation of students as President of SGA and student representation on UNCA's Board of Trustees. She noted that she wanted the senators to know that a request was given for his report to be attached to the agenda on Monday and he delivered it quickly and she thanked him for honoring our request on that.

Provost Campbell wanted to add his own congratulations and to point out the incredible diligence with which Isaiah has done his job. Isaiah drove to every single Board of Governors meeting and would participate in those meetings, which is an extraordinary thing to do as a student. The Provost looks forward to seeing what he will do in his new role moving ahead.

Many Senators relayed personal congratulatory sentiments in the chat window to Isaiah

Green.

Isaiah Green thanked everyone. He really has appreciated all the kind words.

Volker Frank asked Isaiah Green to give a brief review about how students are doing that you observe in your classes. We observe from the faculty's view but he would like to hear the student's view of online instruction.

Isaiah Green relayed online learning is definitely interesting. From his perspective, when he typically goes home for break, he takes naps and tries to be as unproductive as possible. Suddenly trying to be productive in places that we often go to relax has definitely been a shift. Students meet up with friends through FaceTime and through Zoom to have some semblance of normalcy. Meeting through online conferencing and small discussion groups has been helpful though definitely weird and abnormal. Students are all definitely glad that every professor has been more lenient and are working with us throughout this transition.

VI. [Staff Council:](#)

Chair Erin Spence

Erin Spence said that Staff Council has been concentrating on uplifting ways to support staff and faculty through this pandemic. She mentioned several ways in her linked report. One observation they have made is video conferencing in some arenas like open meetings and activities such as Mary Lynn Manns' Joy n Movement allows staff and faculty to join in when normally they would not. They are going to start hosting happy hours that are open to everyone who might want to come. Hosts may give small lessons like cooking. They are exploring the potential of these forums. Another idea is to have a site to share whether it is a picture of your garden or a picture that you thought was funny that we could just kind of go and look at separately to take an uplifting break. If anyone has an idea, email it to staffcouncil@unca.edu. They would love to help promote that to everyone to try to unite the campus.

Marietta Cameron encourages faculty to reach out and contact their administrative assistants for they appreciate faculty reaching out and touching base with them especially at this time.

Erin Spence also received the request on Monday for a printed report and she was very quick in giving a report that has been attached to our agenda. The Senate Chair thanked her for honoring that request and for her leadership of the Staff Council.

VII. [Faculty Assembly Delegate Report:](#)

Professor Melodie Galloway

Marietta Cameron announced that Melodie Galloway has been elected by Faculty Assembly to serve as an at-large member on Faculty Assembly's Executive Committee. Marietta Cameron also recognized that Melodie Galloway and Lora Holland both have been very vocal and represent UNC Asheville well at Faculty Assembly.

VIII. Institutional Development Committee / UPC:
Decision Summaries

Second Vice Chair Patrick Bahls

*First Reading

*[IDC 4](#)

Guidelines for Proposals for New or Substantially Revised

Undergraduate Majors, Minors, and/or Certificate Programs

Patrick Bahls relayed that IDC has one document up for first reading that has been in the works for some time. He will entertain and invite any questions or comments that people have about this by email so please feel free to raise any concerns by email (pbahl@unca.edu). These are the guidelines

for proposals for new or substantially revised undergraduate majors, minor, and certificate programs. He wants to emphasize that these are not meant to supplant any of the existing guidelines for either APC or IDC, but rather to extend the review work that is done by IDC. This document was crafted with an eye toward some of the questions that have come up recently in IDC when they have been reading and reviewing proposals for new programs. Some of the language in this document echoes existing language currently used for APC guidelines, which is intentional to ensure consistency with existing policy. Regarding IDC guidelines for existing programs, due to the pandemic, IDC does not believe they will have a document ready for first reading by the end of this year. They have begun the process of cobbling together some ideas and looking at models of other institutions. They do believe they will have an IDC first and second subcommittee reading for a new major in an existing department. They will report that letter of intent to the full Senate at their final meeting of the year.

IX. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee: Third Vice Chair Aubri Rote

[Decision Summaries](#)

*First Reading

- [FWDC 4](#) Revise Chair, Program Director, and Academic Affairs Compensation
Faculty Handbook Sections [2.9.4](#), [3.1.2](#), [3.1.4.1.5](#)
- [FWDC 5](#) Revise Expectations in Faculty Evaluations
Faculty Handbook Sections [3.3.2.2](#), [3.3.3.2](#), [3.3.3.3](#), [3.5.4.3](#), [3.5.4.4](#)
- [FWDC 6](#) Revise Merit Evaluation Categories
Faculty Handbook Section [3.4.3](#)
- [FWDC 7](#) Revise Governance of Committee and Service Appointments
Faculty Handbook Section [10.1](#)

Second Reading

- [FWDC 3](#) Revise (SD5019S) Faculty Ombuds
Faculty Handbook Section [10.5.13](#)

If you have questions to be addressed regarding these first reading documents, please email Aubri Rote (arote@unca.edu). They have four documents up for first reading. These are heavily based on our last discussion at the Senate meeting on March 5. She wanted to emphasize that all four of these documents passed FWDC unanimously, which Aubri Rote is especially proud of given that people were able to put aside some of their own interests. Most people in this room have a stake in the chair and program director compensation, but they were able to vote in the spirit of the university as a whole over individual interests.

There is one document up for second reading, FWDC 3, that adjusts the terms for the Ombuds team. There is not a change in reporting for they already report to the Chancellor, just an edit to the handbook. Aubri Rote asked for a motion to accept FWDC 3, which was seconded.

No Discussion. [FWDC 3 passed without dissent.](#)

Faculty Election Update/Senate Ballot Approval Associate Professor John Brock

John Brock presented the following slate of Academic Appeals nominees
for Faculty Senate approval:

Bares, William Kirk
Boone, Christine E
Kapur, Sonia
Laughlin, Andrew J
Powell, Megan O
Richmond, Matthew Emmett
Rossell, Irene Mackun

A motion was made for the Faculty Senate to approve this ballot for the Academic Appeals Board faculty election. The motion was seconded. The ballot was approved without dissent.

[FWDC Proposed Sense of the Senate Resolution 2](#)

Proposed Sense of the Senate surrounding the wide range of faculty experiences in the midst of this move to online teaching and how it may result in some subtle, long-term differences in measurable "productivity."

Aubri Rote turned the floor over the Regine Criser to present a Sense of the Senate that is co-authored by Regine Criser, Susan Clark and John Brock and sponsored by FWDC.

Regine Criser asked for a motion to accept FWDC 2 Sense of the Senate. The motion was made and seconded.

Discussion:

Regine Criser explained that the authors wanted to address in a Sense of the Senate some of the immediate short term issues that require more flexibility from chairs, supervisors and from each other on the record. They believe this Sense of the Senate goes beyond the Sense of the Senate that was passed at the Faculty Senate Special on March 27. While they appreciate the changes that Academic Affairs put forward in extending the tenure and time for promotion clock, they wanted to ensure ongoing conversations about what fair evaluations of faculty in the future will look like in light of the impact of this pandemic as well as the year beyond this. They thought there should be a strong, important signal sent to faculty, many of whom are struggling with some of the issues mentioned in the resolution.

Susan Clark agreed that she believes the long term was sufficiently addressed. However, she felt that the immediate challenges should be named and acknowledged. For example parents of school-aged kids are also being asked to full time teach their kids at home. These are challenges not only for faculty but for students and staff as well.

Regine Criser relayed that although the challenges were much more explicitly mentioned in the first draft of this document, FWDC changed the document to a more inclusive language to include as many people as possible on this campus with varied caregiving responsibilities. They also wanted this included in the Senate minutes.

Provost Campbell said he is in favor of any kind of acknowledgement that really shares a sense of understanding of how broadly and how unprecedented this is impacting our community. Anything we can do to be truly inclusive as possible about all of the various ways people are working hard to do both their job and to struggle through their unique circumstances.

Regine Criser agreed with the Provost and was happy to amend the resolution in any way that the Senate feels is necessary. It is not clear to her how far the Faculty Senate can speak about support staff and students. They are focused on the faculty here even though they fully understand that there are a lot more people on this campus who are impacted by this. They are open to the Senate and Provost's view of how the language should be.

John Brock relayed the reason he was in favor of this resolution is they need to start thinking through what Senate Committees responsibilities are going forward, especially from FWDC's perspective of making sure that there is equitable treatment that we really do understand what everyone's going through at a deeper level - to use the Faculty Senate Committee structure to start to understand and actually make things better.

Marietta Cameron thanked Regine, John, Susan, Christopher, and Aubri for bringing this resolution forward. Regarding Staff, Marietta said that the Faculty Senate represents the faculty voice and part of that has been traditionally but to speak out regarding the well-being of staff and students. In this Sense of the Senate, she believes it to be quite appropriate to include support for our staff colleagues and for our students.

Erin Spence relayed what she is reading does include staff. She has just been able to read this and the Staff Council just found out about this resolution yesterday. Staff Council may be interested in making a similar kind of statement. She thinks that including the staff in this resolution would be helpful. They have noticed statements phrased as "faculty and students." It may not be intentional to leave out staff, but some staff really perceive that in bad ways. It would be good to include Staff as appropriate in Senate Resolutions.

Patrick Bahls agreed with Erin Spence's substance and his reading he believes that staff are included in this resolution. Patrick Bahls also appreciated the way that last paragraph helps us remain open to unforeseen issues in the future.

In response to Erin Spence and Patrick Bahls observations, Regine Criser acknowledged that she was editing the document as amendments are brought forth.

Regine Criser noticed in the chat window that Volker Frank wonders about the last paragraph of the document. She would like to keep the last paragraph because she feels that we need to protect any faculty member from being compared against other faculty in their annual evaluation and the tenure and promotion. She is strongly in favor of keeping this paragraph to make sure that those faculty, who cannot continue with business as usual and whose scholarly productivity in particular will be impacted long term by this, are better protected than the one year extension. Delaying a year has an impact over long term in regards to earnings and retirement. Although these policies are intended to be inclusive and protective, they still work better for some than for others. There are those in our communities on our campus that are already vulnerable for various reasons, will be even more vulnerable now and need more protection than just the one year extension of the tenure clock.

Amanda Wray relayed that this epidemic and being trapped at home has WIDE ranging effects on faculty whether or not they have caregiving responsibilities.

Tiece Ruffin thanked Regine and FWDC for their work for no one should be privileged or penalized.

Regine Criser wanted to acknowledge Tiece Ruffin's comment about language where she wondered whether equitable is the same as fair and impartial while considering that perhaps redundancy was needed for emphasis and then she relayed she was glad the word equity was used so people realize that standards have not been lowered or lessened, but appropriate to productivity in light of the pandemic's disruption and demands. She also believes as others should not be penalized

those with less demands and responsibilities should not be privileged either due to high productivity due to less demands. Regine Criser wanted this noted for the minutes.

FWDC Resolution 2 passed without dissent.

X. Academic Policies Committee: First Vice Chair Sonya DiPalma

[Decision Summaries](#)

***First Reading**

- [APC 37](#) Remove Remaining a Chemistry Major for the B.S. and B.A. Chemistry degrees;
Update graduation requirements to include a grade of C or better in foundational Chemistry classes for the B.S. Chemistry degree
(Sally Wasileski, CHEM)
- [APC 38](#) Academic Alert Name Change and Expansion to all Courses
(Brad Petitfils, Anne Marie Roberts)
- [APC 39](#) Revise the policy on limiting double majors to the receipt of a single degree;
Remove the Limitation on the number of baccalaureate degrees
UNC Asheville will award
- [APC 40](#) Change description and prerequisite for MGMT 428
[APC 41](#) Change the title of MGMT 489
(Mary Lynn Manns, Deena Burris, Patrick Hester, MGMT)
- [APC 42](#) Delete ECON 101 and 102, replacing with ECON 103, Introductory Economic Analysis;
Add new course, ECON 104, Microeconomic Principles for Engineers
- [APC 43](#) Change the Economics Curriculum from 3 credit hours to 4, revising course descriptions as necessary
- [APC 44](#) Change the requirements for the Major in Economics;
Change the requirements for Economics with Teacher Licensure;
Change the requirements for the Minor in Economics
- [APC 45](#) Revise the Economics Credit for Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate Exams;
Add Economics credit for Cambridge International Exams
(Kathleen Lawlor, Melissa Mahoney, and Don Diefenbach, ECON)
- [APC 46](#) Department of Art & Art History Petition for Exemption to SD2015F
[Appendix 1](#) [Appendix 2](#) [Appendix 3](#)
- [APC 47](#) Revise the course descriptions for ART 264, 364, 366, 367, and 464
[APC 48](#) Add new courses to the Art History curriculum:
ARTH 313, Art and Archaeology of Ancient Italy;
ARTH 314, Art and Archaeology of Early Christianity;
ARTH 315, Egyptian Art and Architecture;

ARTH 382, Contemporary Art in Latin America;
ARTH 387, Islamic Art and Architecture

[APC 49](#)

Delete ARTH 330, 340, and 350, replacing with ARTH 335 and 345

[APC 50](#)

Change prerequisites for ARTH 410 and 460

(Tamie Beldue, Cynthia Canejo, Eric Tomberlin, and Carrie Tomberlin,
ART//ARTH)

[APC 51](#)

Change the title of MATH 155

(Sam Kaplan, Cathy Whitlock, MATH)

[APC 52](#)

Establish Hardship Withdrawal Policy

(Jackie McHargue, Lynne Horgan, Student Affairs)

Second Reading

[APC 25](#)

Revise Program Requirements for Special Education Licensure

(Karen Cole, EDUC)

[APC 26](#)

Add a minor in Professional Writing and Rhetoric to be administered by
the English Department

(Brian Graves, ENGL/PWR)

[APC 27](#)

Add prerequisite to MATH 191

[APC 28](#)

Adjust the required hours in majors that require MATH 191 due to adding
MATH 167 or placement as a Prerequisite

(Sam Kaplan, Cathy Whitlock, MATH)

[APC 29](#)

Delete LANG 120 as pre or co-requisite for HUM 124

(Katherine Zubko, HUM)

[APC 30](#)

Change course title, description and credit hours for HWP 223;

Change course description, credit hours, and when offered for HWP 224;

Change course title, course description and credit hours for HWP 225;

Change course title and description for HWP 253;

Change course description for HWP 310;

Change course title, description, credit hours, and prerequisite for
HWP 315;

Change course description and credit hours for HWP 335;

Change prerequisites for HWP 420;

Change prerequisites for HWP 455;

Change course title, description, prerequisites and credit hours for
HWP 459;

Change credit hour range and prerequisites for HWP 499

- [APC 31](#) Delete HWP 294, Human Physiology, replacing with HWP 234, Anatomy and Physiology I;
Delete HWP 295, Functional Anatomy, replacing with HWP 235, Anatomy and Physiology II;
Add new course: HWP 342, Advancing Health Equity: Domestic and Global Contexts;
Delete HWP 345, Research Methods in Health and Wellness Promotion, replacing with HWP 245, Research Methods in Health and Wellness Promotion;
Delete HWP 350, Service Learning in Health Promotion;
Delete HWP 355, Exercise Prescription, Fitness and Lifestyle Assessment replacing with HWP 425, Exercise Prescription, Fitness and Lifestyle Assessment Reinstatement previously deleted HWP 401, Nutrition and Metabolism;
Add new course: HWP 440, Epidemiology and the Environment
- [APC 32](#) Revise the requirements for the Major in Health and Wellness, adding three concentrations:
General, Health Sciences, and Public Health;
Revise the requirements for the Minor in Health and Wellness Promotion
[Appendix 1](#) [Appendix 2](#) [Appendix 3](#)
(Amy Lanou, Aubri Rote, Jason Wingert)
- [APC 33](#) Add new course: DRAM 492, Senior Seminar
- [APC 34](#) Change the requirements for the Major in Drama and the major with Theatre Arts Teacher Licensure
- [APC 35](#) Allow DRAM 201, 202, 203, and 204 to be repeated for credit (Lise Kloeppel, DRAM)

Regarding the first reading documents, Sonya DiPalma referred faculty to the Decision Summaries that APC tried to keep as complete as possible. If there are questions or concerns, please contact Sony DiPalma at sdipalma@unca.edu.

There are eleven documents up for second reading. Jake Butera asked for APC 30 through APC 32 to be pulled from the bundle to be discussed and voted on separately since he had questions about two of the Health and Wellness Program documents.

Sonya DiPalma pulled those documents and then asked for APC 25 through APC 29 and APC 33 through APC 35 to be bundled and accepted in one motion. The motion was made and seconded without objection. APC 25 through APC 29 and APC 33 through APC 35 passed without dissent.

_____ Sonya DiPalma asked for a motion to accept APC 30 through APC 32. The motion was made and seconded.

Discussion:

Regarding APC 30, Jake Butera noted that most of these courses have been switched from three credit hours to four credit hours, but HWP 253 remains at three credit hours. We have talked in earlier senate meetings about the fact that the university as a whole has taken a mixed approach to

three versus four credit hour curriculum. He was wondering the reason why HWP 253 remains at 3 credit hours. He wonders about the potential problems and whether there should be more moving towards consistency.

Amy Lanou relayed that they changed over all of the key required courses to four credit hours while leaving some flexible in elective courses for students. Elective courses with a range of 1, 2, or 3 credit hours give students more flexibility in fulfilling their 9 elective credit hours. If they were all 4 credit hours, students would have to take 12 credit hours of elective courses to meet their 9 hour requirement. With the way they have designed this, students take only 9 credit hours while having more flexibility in choosing electives.

Jake Butera said this makes sense, but he wonders whether there should be a broader discussion campus wide consistency in the numbers of hours of our courses where the solution would be not necessarily having varied numbers of hours per course, but rather, instead of having to get nine hours, you have eight because it fits a four hour model better.

Amy Lanou replied she did not think she could answer that, but she added they will keep an eye on this as we move forward, and as the students who are finishing the degree program with the mostly three credit hour courses get through, a review will of the courses and professors teaching schedules will help them determine whether they need to transition to more four credit hour elective courses.

Sonya DiPalma emphasized that APC did take into consideration that HWP was looking towards starting with their core courses in the transition to the four credit hour model.

Aubri Rote added that since many faculty were having to modify their classes quite a bit in the transition that they left it to the faculty member to decide whether they wanted to transition the elective courses they teach. As Amy Lanou said, they will keep an eye on this regarding a full transition.

There were no questions asked about APC 31, which were the course deletions.

Regarding APC 32, Jake Butera wanted to ask a question mostly in the context of APC's request for discussion about a C as a passing grade within an individual major. In APC 32, one of the continuing requirements for a degree in Health and Wellness is a C in the senior capstone. Since there is a question of that policy in regards to other courses, it might be worthwhile having the discussion about this one before a vote is taken on APC 32. He felt this is a reasonable time for that discussion since we would essentially be approving and re-establishing that policy in this context.

Aubri Rote explained that the C grade for the capstone is not a change to the catalog nor a change requested for that was there before.

Alicia Shope pointed out that most capstones courses on campus require a C or better.

Sonya DiPalma replied that APC was not looking to make retroactive changes. They are gathering feedback to help them consider future proposals that could have institution wide implications. Aubri Rote agreed that a broad University change that would apply all courses would be a separate proposal.

Jessica Pisano clarified that APC was not looking at a one class requirement of a C or more. They are specifically looking at departments that are wanting to have that C-wall in multiple courses in the major or a GPA average - the discussion is about when they are receiving requests for all required courses in a major or a GPA requirement. No further discussion nor questions.

APC 30 through APC 32 passed without dissent and 1 abstention.

APC Matter for Discussion:

The Academic Policies Committee sometimes receives policies for review that require a grade of C or better as a prerequisite for courses within a major, to progress within a major, or a GPA higher than 2.0 for granting a specific degree. Thus far, the current APC only has approved requirements that instead shifts students towards another track within the major if they do not meet the requirements and when the requirements are needed for accreditation purposes. The goal of this discussion is to gather a sense of the senate to consistently and fairly review any policies requesting these requirements.

APC's concerns with adopting a grade of C or higher to progress within a major or a GPA higher than 2.0 include:

- Creating a bandwagon effect – Meaning all departments will want to adopt this
- Perception of superior and inferior degrees within the institution
- Increased time to graduation
- Cost-prohibitive for students
- Remedial support for students not making a C
- Resources to provide remedial support for students
- Equity

Sonya DiPalma read the above discussion item into the minutes.

John Brock expressed that the Chemistry Department sat down and thought a lot about what is best for the students. Students who are marginally getting by in the first two years end up not getting by in their Junior and Senior years. Having progress through their major with at least a C in every class, actually sets them up to succeed. The only problem he has is when it sounds like departments are doing this at the detriment of students. Our department tries to help the students sort out whether they are willing to put in the required time and whether they have the ability to actually be successful. For us, it is important to have this discussion. He does not know he would recommend this for all departments. He believes departments should be given the power and we should be very careful about not taking away departments power to decide what is really best for their students since students may be very different in one department than another department.

Susan Clark relayed that she thinks it should be up to the Department's faculty to decide minimum grade requirements for all courses. Although, she wished we did not have grades. Grades are not the goal. Grades are the outcome. The result. This is what she teaches her Management students. Similarly, Profits are not, and should not, be the goal. It is the result. Focus on the higher purpose all the time: making the world a better place, learning for learning's sake, and becoming a more creative and critical thinker. She has had this discussion with her faculty in Management and Accountancy. Every department, every program, every major and every profession is a little bit different. She thinks we should honor a department's knowledge about the subject matter and about the career trajectory, including graduate school. This is really important as well for accreditation and any kind of licensing that happens or does not happen. She believes we should collectively as a body primarily honor at the department level their wisdom and their knowledge about the grades, what should be minimums and how we want that to be portrayed, and in how we are evaluating students as well as graduating students and what is on their transcripts going forward.

David Clarke wanted to briefly say the Biology Department has several students per year that cannot graduate because they cannot make a 2.0 in the major. This is in spite of doing a lot in recent

years to implement tutoring programs with high impact practices in our core courses. They work hard to get their freshmen off on the right foot in their introductory courses, which some are remedial courses. Still the average GPAs over the last several years have been in the low twos. He believes what we are dealing with really is an admissions problem. We are letting the problem persist as they persist in nature. Some drift away and some go on to other things, but some refuse to see the light and stay. It seems like we are exploiting students if we allow them to stay in that department under those conditions. As a chair, David Clarke encounters several students per year that cannot graduate because they cannot reach a 2.0 GPA in the major.

John Brock relayed that they have been told in Chemistry that we can not offer remedial courses. He asked his colleagues if that was true.

Patrick Bahls replied that courses are not the only way to remediate. There are other support structures. He has concerns about "tiers" of majors based on departmentally-mandated standards for retention in a huge way could be negatively impacted by this.

John Brock thanked Patrick for his comments. He replied that they have a full spectrum in place such as peer tutoring and required work sessions. Struggling students who get it together can retake the courses that they struggled with early on. He would like another tool to use perhaps a remedial course in math is provided as a summer course for incoming first years.

Regine Criser asked who will be able to afford remedial courses.

Patrick Bahls replied instead of more courses, let us think about how our existing courses are taught.

Regine Criser thinks it might be helpful for the Senate to have the discussion about our "admissions" problem. She is in full support of the departments making decisions of what is best for their students. Part of these conversations is we also need to think through how we can make sure that students are able to succeed in our majors. She is currently teaching a class with a good number of students who are repeating classes for grade replacement because they need a certain GPA in order to continue in their major. She has students with a whole semester of courses just to replace grades. These were classes that were not necessarily failing grades needing to be replaced for getting a C in a four credit hour class can throw off a GPA quite significantly. Some students are paying a full semester of tuition in order to continue with their major. She would encourage a larger conversation to see how faculty can be better prepared for the students that we have and not just for the ones that we want to teach.

Jessica Pisano agreed with Regine Criser that we have to teach the students we have. Period.

Jake Butera agreed with what Regine Criser said he believes is true. He wanted to caution not to conflate the 2.0 GPA requirement to graduate from the University with a 2.0 requirement within a major and getting a C in a course in order to pass on to the next level. He has serious concerns with those being at odds with one another. Telling a student that the requirement to graduate with a degree from UNCA is 2.0, then individual departments decide that is not the case for individual students. This seems problematic. While he understands that departments may know best for their students, what students will do over a four year trajectory in their programs is not predictable. He knows many students who struggle in their first year or two before getting on course by the time they are done. Faculty and departments have other recourses to make sure that when sending students into the field they are aware of the trajectory they are on such as University transcripts and letters of recommendations. There are other outlets for these kinds of discussions outside of a blanket statement about a single individual grade in either individual courses or over the course of a major. He also has the same concerns that Regine Criser nicely touched on regarding retention, and he does

worry about departments making these sorts of requirements and the bandwagon effect that APC pointed out may happen. He understands John Brock's comment about struggling students who get it together can retake the courses that they struggled with early on. That is true, but the time and resources should also be considered. It is not always so simple to ask students to take an entire additional semester to enroll over a summer. There are other factors that play into that more than simply being able to do a grade replacement. He thinks some thought should be given to these very complicated matters.

Provost Campbell appreciates the comments that Regine Criser and Jake Butera just made and wants to echo those as well. This is very complicated and has been at the heart of some of the work that he has been most passionate about throughout his time as an academic. The nature of the conversations about this often put the onus on the students. They do not often talk about the impact of pedagogical practices, and the willingness to be radical in our rethinking of curricula. One example of a faculty member out at Arizona State whom he believes has produced more PhD mathematicians in bio-mathematics and more Latino PhDs than the rest of the country combined. He did this by taking an extraordinarily radical approach to the way that he has taught the course. Even faced with that kind of data, the ability to get math departments to change the way they teach is almost impossible. The conversation continues to return to the students not being ready to reach a particular goal of a 2.0 or what have you. He would welcome a conversation in a very broad and deep way about what we as faculty are willing to do in terms of structuring the entire curriculum. Regarding pedagogical practices, how radical are we willing to be? This has to come with support from the administration and the Provost's Office to support piloting and activating those practices as well as rewarding tenure and promotion. It is challenging to me to think about this solely as a student performance issue, which he is not saying that is where we were, but generally how this conversation has drifted in many of the national conversations. He welcomes a bigger conversation about the teaching aspect of a very wide array of students and learning practices.

Sonya DiPalma thanked the Provost for his comments.

John Brock wanted to clarify that Chemistry is not being elitist. They have been caught in between having students who walk in, unable to do algebra, and then expecting to pass on chemistry. He is tired of being the buzzsaw that shatters unrealistic expectations. We need to put our heads together and work really hard. Chemistry has tried to reach students and meet them where they are, but we need more tools. In part, he agrees that we need to think about this differently. He agrees with the Provost that we need a broader discussion. He wants to be clear that Chemistry is tired watching students crash and burn. They are exhausted by it.

Sonya DiPalma thanked John for his comments and she shared that her understanding is that some of the GPA requirements have to do with accreditation above and beyond our university.

Like Patrick Bahls, Marietta Cameron has concerns about building tiers of majors where certain majors are "rigorous majors" that students try to shy away from and other majors that are less restrictive. She believes this becomes problematic in terms of inclusion, equity and diversity. When she says diversity, she is not necessarily only talking about race. She is not saying we are intentionally biased, but there are things we do that unintentionally deters student learning and motivation. And she wants to echo what the Provost was saying as well as bring up what besides student performance that is going into the grade such as how well the student learns is due to how well their learning style and faculty teaching style matches. Journals say a demographic prefers engaged learning while another demographic prefers lectures. Thus if faculty are only using one teaching style they are biasing the other demographic.

Tiece Ruffin explained when she heard the tiering system she thought of inferior or superior degrees. Tiece Ruffin wanted to clarify when talking about equity in terms of the C or better grade criteria. Equity does not mean lesser, lower, or no standards at all. When talking about equity, we are not talking about lowering standards. She asked what our stance on grades was. She pondered whether we should move to no letter grades like Evergreen State College, New College of Florida, Sarah Lawrence, or Brown. Brown has an optional grading system of two options (letter or no letter grade). Some Professional areas, like teacher licensure, require a certain GPA and/or letter grade in courses. James Baldwin said teaching is revolutionary, why don't we be revolutionary in our thinking in terms of grades? She knew a couple of students that came to us without GPAs that we had to set it up for them to get teacher licensure. If they graduated from universities without grades, they had to spend a semester with us to establish a GPA in order to pursue a license from the state.

Jessica Pisano asked whether we can move towards narrative evaluation.

Toby King said that he did that for years at Sarah Lawrence.

Patrick Bahls asked whether we might use this current moment, with W/S* grading about to go into place, as a time to move in the direction of narrative evals. Can we pilot this in certain areas (HUM, HON, etc.), where accreditation might not be impacted?

Susan Clark said she would love that. She applied to UC Santa Cruz when they had only narrative feedback. At the time, they had the highest PreMed accepted students of all the UCs. However, they have dropped that.

Provost Campbell jumped in to say that he would love to rethink our notion of grades. The thinker, Kathy Davidson, whose new book New Education talks about the fact that grades were instituted only about 100 years ago, which is fairly new in the scheme of things and so it is not the case that we have to think about grades as having been this constant. However, in the current political climate, we would not be allowed to do that particularly given the nature of the discussions at the Board of Governors. We do need a discussion about which radical ideas operate within the confines/constraints of state and UNC system level.

Tiece Ruffin relayed that Brown University is a top notch Ivy League school. Maybe this is too revolutionary to have two different systems. However, for this semester, looks like we are doing that this semester with W/S*, though.

Sonya DiPalma agreed with Tiece Ruffin though she wonders what it would look like to change her courses to narrative evaluation. The Provost has mentioned having a larger discussion and she wonders what that would look like. How should we proceed from this point?

Jake Butera said with the established campus requirement of a 2.0 for graduation brings up the question of what about D as a measure of competency is. It is unclear why we would mark a D 2.0 as a measure of competency in some places, but then not consider it competent in others.

John Brock said it is practical experience in Chemistry. It is looking at what our students are doing, how they are progressing, and then trying to identify students that are not going to progress on in our current system. Can we come up with a better system? He hopes so because the current system is leading some students to waste time trying to be a chemistry major, when they really need not progress on that path right now. This comes back to his main point here is we have to let departments decide for themselves right now until there is a broader consensus. We need to deal with this to protect our students.

In response to John Brock questions and comments, Jessica Pisano wanted clarification about why Chemistry needs a C or better is for she serves on APC and they were told that Chemistry needed that for accreditation reasons, which made sense to APC that you would not want to progress a

student who was not going to succeed in that particular track because of certification or accreditation issues. She appreciates what Chemistry has done where they provide another option for students who are not meeting that requirement so there is not a situation where they do not go anywhere. They can still continue on with a BA degree rather than, than a BS. That is what APC has been working under that is acceptable. She wonders what the rest of the Senate thinks about that.

In regards to comments about letting the departments decide for they know best, Marietta Cameron pointed out that we all are under the umbrella of an institution. One of the duties of Senate and APC is to make sure that whatever decisions are being made are still within the umbrella of institutional guidelines and requirements. The institution has to follow rules from the UNC System and SACS who have an expectation of consistency across departments. She believes since we have an institutional policy of 2.0 to graduate from the university that we should not have some departments with policies that say that is not rigorous enough. Departmental desires should not rule over the institution. Philosophically, that is a problem, and technically, guidelines at the system level may not allow that. She suggests that faculty read up on the principles of accreditation.

Sonya DiPalma said that is one of the complications where departments are trying to help students meet accreditation standards in their discipline - standards that require higher GPAs. They are trying to find a way that would not be prohibitive for departments to go after accreditation.

Marietta Cameron agreed that there are things to worry about with the outside accreditations. Outside agencies for whatever reasons have their own agenda, requiring certain things that are not necessarily best to teach students or how to best help students reach their goals. Do we really want these outside accreditations dictating what is best for learning or not?

Provost Campbell said we are talking as if 2.3 in a particular course is a standard that is objective in a way that is unmovable. He would like to have a broader discussion because he thinks this goes beyond just APC and Faculty Senate. He would like to think along with some others about how we have a good, thorough discussion about some of the issues that have been raised here.

Marietta Cameron relayed that there are documents coming forward before APC right now. That is why APC was asking for this discussion.

Sonya DiPalma added and why we are trying to get the focus on accreditation, because that will be coming up for vote at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

Mark McClure asked how many departments currently require Cs in a major track. As a Mathematics Professor, he understands the issues for they probably have one of the highest DFW rates on campus. It is frustrating working with some majors who struggle in a way that is challenging to see. He has been on the Budget Committee for a couple years now. He has learned a couple of things. One is the reality that our students are not the same students that we had even just a few years ago. The student body is changing in terms of their preparedness. Two, we need those students. We need them. It is a fact it is potentially an existential issue. He felt a responsibility representing faculty on the Budget Committee to share those points.

Caroline Kennedy wanted to clarify that a student can graduate with a Chemistry major (BA degree). The BS degree in Chemistry requires a C or better in all required classes. The accreditation is external.

Susan Clark relayed that the Department of Management and Accounting is accredited. They are proposing requesting a minimum of "C" in the core be considered at APC. Especially given grade inflation (well-documented at a broad, systemic level), we do a disservice for our students when we graduate them with low GPA/performance evaluations. In this professional field, this would eliminate many graduating from achieving success in acceptance at graduate school, accounting firms, many

business firms and other professional organizations. That being said, she has had several students with learning disabilities and relatively low grades do phenomenally well, particularly as entrepreneurs who have learned to hustle and magnify other talents. Thus she is torn between what to do.

Ashley Moraguez asked to circle back to some points that Jessica Pisano made for the documents that APC has that makes this more than a theoretical problem. They do not know whether to pass these documents, not pass them, or to table them until next year. APC is very respectful of the needs of departments while trying not to put more requirements on students. They understand that a broader discussion is needed but they have not maintained a strict stance that classes should not have a C requirement like a capstone or a gateway course. The bigger question for APC at this time is whether majors may have the C requirement on all their required courses or a handful of courses. They do not know where to come down on these issues. After listening to this discussion, she thinks tabling some of these documents moving forward is the right call.

Sonya DiPalma agreed with Ashley although she believes those documents are already tabled. She thanked everyone for participating in this and appreciate everyone's time on this. APC will take this information back and decide how to move forward.

Marietta Cameron thanked Sonya DiPalma and APC members. APC has had a marathon year. In past years, there have been more documents, however this year there has been more in terms of substance this year that has been really a heavy workload for APC. She thanks them for all that they tackled this year.

XI. Old Business/New Business - none.

XII. Announcements

Marietta Cameron reminded everyone that the next Senate meeting is the last meeting of the academic year. There are two meetings: the first meeting is the last meeting of the 2019-20 academic year and the second meeting is the first meeting of the 2020-21 academic year. She will send out an email regarding Faculty Senate Officer Elections.

XIII. Adjourn

Marietta Cameron adjourned the meeting at 5:58 p.m.