

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA ASHEVILLE
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
December 5, 2019; 3:15 pm
Highsmith Union, Blue Ridge Ballroom

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

Excused Members: V. Frank.

Visitors: N. Cable, C. Asbill, L. Augspurger, J. Beck, E. Becker, S. Broberg, M. Burchard,
J. Butera, B. Butler, D. Clarke, A. Dunn, S. Earle, M. Galloway, I. Green,
B. Haggard, B. Hart, M. Himelein, J. Konz, M.L. Manns, S. Miller, E. Morrison,
M. Neelon, S. Newman, L. Newton, H. Parlier, A. Shope, E. Spence, W. Strehl,
S. Ungert, G. Voos.

I. Call to Order / Approval of Minutes: [November 7, 2019 3:15 p.m.](#)
November 7, 2019 minutes were approved without dissent.

II. Executive Committee: Faculty Senate Chair Laura Bond

Student Government Association: President Isaiah Green

SGA recently helped Asheville Middle School with their student government elections. There were so many students wanting to run and be a part of the student government that they are working on ways to participate through team building activities to help them keep their momentum going.

Student body presidents across the UNC system recently met with the system office regarding the Presidential Search Committee's work to understand what the collective student body wants in their UNC President. SGA President Green said he was glad that we actually agreed with them more than we disagreed.

The Association of Student Governments recently passed two pieces of legislation. The first piece is the UNC management company to divest from fossil fuels by 2030. We will see where that goes and President Green will keep Faculty Senate informed. The second legislation was an initiative to improve and promote best practices of SGAs in the UNC System.

SGA brought in a new student organization called Occupy the Quad. SGA is working on discussing student issues on this campus with them and ways in which they can move forward together for the next semester.

They are also planning a system-wide student rights group with the UNC System associated with Student governments. The topics include freedom of speech, Title 9, and rights and activities.

President Green finished his report and introduced Sophomore Senator London Newton and Freshman Sean Miller to present about an upcoming event.

London Newton is the Chair of the Diversity and Inclusion Committee and Sean Miller is the Co-Director of the Student Environmental Center. They want to start an event called the Asheville Environmental Collective. Their hope is to encourage not only our campus community but to empower students in the Asheville area, particularly high school and middle school students in Asheville to get involved in politics and sustainable food systems.

The one-day event is planned for the entire campus. Their hope is that there are presentations planned all over campus. For example, there might be students presenting their environmental research and community leaders sharing their platform or sustainable plans for Asheville.

Sean Miller helped the past few years with the Youth Food Movement Summit. She is inspired by the work there. She wished to incorporate some of their ideas into this event. Essentially, they brought in students from all local high schools and middle schools. They spent an entire day with the students, taking them through the holistic view of sustainability. They met with their local organic farmers, local politicians, business owners such as restaurant owners and professional chefs. They learn from these professionals in the field and then at the end of the day, they brainstormed ideas about how they could incorporate their learning into their communities, enacting change in their schools and on their campuses. This is their hope for our event for this would be an amazing opportunity for all involved students on our campus and from the Asheville area. They are not trying to reinvent Greenfest and feel like this is different.

Right now, they are looking for a faculty advisor to help them. They have already met with Events and Conferences who have been very supportive, but they really need a faculty advisor for the event. If there are any interested faculty, please let them know. They would spend the Spring 2020 semester planning in hopes of holding the event during the Fall 2020 semester.

Staff Council:

Chair Erin Spence

Currently, the Staff Council is working on the State Employees Combined Campaign. The campus community should have received their email regarding this. The drive will continue until December 15, 2019. Staff Council decided not to distribute the paper forms as in the past since that is a lot of wasted paper and booklets. The campaign is by email and online.

They are also working on a staff forum related to the survey that we sent out. They will set up working groups for brainstorming about the five topics that they spoke of earlier in the year.

They have also worked with members of the Senior Staff to communicate out where we are with the state budget and implications it has on staff raises. There is concern because the budget still has not been decided on or approved that we do not know whether we will receive raises. Our senior staff worked with us to help get [that information](#) in the Weekly Wag and some other places.

Chair Erin Spence will read Staff Council's statement regarding the MLAS program at the appropriate time later in the meeting.

[Faculty Assembly Delegate Report:](#)
[Faculty Assembly Executive Summary](#)

Professor Melodie Galloway

III. Academic Policies Committee: First Vice Chair Marietta Cameron
[Decision Summaries](#)

First Reading

- [APC 5:](#) Add an entry for the Academic Success Program and update the requirements for students on Academic Warning
- [APC 6:](#) Add new course, LA 150, as a permanent course for the Academic Success Program
(Brad Petitfils, Anne Marie Roberts, LA)
- [APC 7:](#) Rename the Department of Chemistry to the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry; Edit the departmental narrative
- [APC 9:](#) Remove (General Chemistry II) from the title of CHEM 233
(Sally Wasileski, CHEM)
- [APC 10:](#) Petition for Exemption: Department of Atmospheric Sciences (ATMS)
- [APC 11:](#) Delete ATMS 205, 241, 251, and 261, replacing with ATMS 203 and 204
- [APC 12:](#) Change prerequisites for ATMS 305, 315, 316, 325, 328, 345, 350, 405, 410, and 411
- [APC 13:](#) Change requirements for major in Atmospheric Sciences
- [APC 14:](#) Change requirements for minor in Atmospheric Sciences
- [APC 15:](#) Change narrative description for Atmospheric Sciences
(Christopher Hennon, ATMS)

The Decision Summaries are forthcoming and will be available after the holidays.

Second Reading

- [APC 3:](#) Change IST 200 for 2 credits, to IST 310 for 3 credits
(Mary Lynn Manns, IST)
- [APC 4:](#) Change course requirements in the Arts Management and Entrepreneurship (AME) major concentration and minor within Interdisciplinary Studies
(Laura Bond, IST/AME)

APC 3 and APC 4 are up for second reading. No one asked that either document be separated for discussion so these were bundled together in one motion. A motion was made to accept APC 3 and APC 4, which was seconded. APC 3 and APC 4 passed without dissent with 1 abstention.

IV. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee: Third Vice Chair Aubri Rote
Regarding the status of FWDC 11 and FWDC 12 that passed Faculty Senate in May 2019, FWDC Chair Aubri Rote explained that Provost Campbell is not against them but wants to change the flat rate to add a size of department component.

Provost Campbell explained that the document he was presented with early on proposed a flat fee for all of the chairs. He thinks there should be some accommodation for the size and complexity of a department. He and FWDC have some ideas about what that might look like, but they have not had time to lay out their ideas and talk about them.

New FWDC documents will come back to the Faculty Senate once they go back through FWDC. The original FWDC 11 and FWDC 12 documents will not be signed by the Provost. However, that is not indicating a lack of wanting to look at this.

FWDC Chair Aubri Rote dispelled confusion regarding the proposed Faculty Handbook changes that Provost Campbell will talk about in his report today regarding administrative changes. FWDC did review those changes, and everyone on FWDC is in full support of those changes.

V. Institutional Development Committee / UPC: Second Vice Chair Patrick Bahls
Patrick Bahls gave a brief update on the work of IDC. In the last month, IDC has reviewed two proposals for establishment of some new minors. One was the proposal to establish a minor in Professional Writing and Rhetoric and the second was the establishment of a minor in Leadership and Innovation. Both of those documents will be reviewed by APC before coming to Faculty Senate for a vote.

The committee has also had a number of wide-ranging conversations on a number of issues related to the large-scale delivery of our curriculum and our hiring practices. Specifically, they have had conversations regarding cluster hiring, opportunity hiring and promotions, as well as other strategies and tactics for recruiting and retaining talented faculty. They have had further exploratory conversations on joint faculty appointments, appointments across disciplines, as well as across departments and programs. Those conversations touched on team teaching and structural and procedural adjustments that are necessary to enable those more effectively. IDC also started conversations on developing philosophies that would guide the establishment of new minors and certificate programs. They are also looking into developing guidelines for reviewing such programs, and also developing philosophies for the delivery of courses online and developing guidelines for review of those courses. Their goal is to come up with some concrete recommendations, guidelines and practices.

IDC has discussed the development of an Institutional Biosafety Committee. They had conversations with the Provost's Office, which is where the matter currently resides.

VI. Executive Committee: Faculty Senate Chair Laura Bond
Second Reading
[EC 1](#): MLAS Program Review
[Addendum 1](#): MLAS Response to Faculty Senate's Program Review

A motion was made to allow guests to address Faculty Senate with a suggested time limit of 1 to 2 minutes. The motion was seconded and there was no discussion. The motion passed without dissent.

Laura Bond proposed a process for conducting this business:

- A motion to accept EC 1 will be handled first

- Once the document has been seconded, discussion will open first to Faculty Senators for questions
- Then the discussion will open up to guests, with Staff Council being allowed to go first to present their statement

Laura Bond asked if there were any objections to this process. No objections were made.

A motion was made to accept EC 1, which was seconded.

Discussion:

John Brock spoke first by presenting his prepared notes. He said he has deep respect for Dr. Gerard Voos, Director of the MLAS Program. He has followed his work for over 20 years with great admiration. In addition, three years ago, John Brock taught a course in the MLAS program and enjoyed the process immensely. He found the students, staff and faculty within the MLAS program to be professional and highly qualified.

For historical content, five years ago prior to Dr. Voos taking over the MLAS program, John Brock was offered the position of Director. From his point of view, the MLAS program looked a cobbled together collection of different graduate degrees without any overarching theme without certain and clear learning outcomes. Without clear faculty and institutional support, John Brock declined the offer and suggested an external review of the program, which was not done.

Now there appears to be consensus that something should be done. However, the most recent review by the Senate did not use our own evaluation criteria developed last year prior to the approval of the new MPH program. John Brock contends that if those criteria had been used the MLAS program would not meet the criteria and it would not be approved today.

In any event, the choices come down to discontinue the program or revising it. He urges his fellow senators to vote to recommend that the program be discontinued for the following reasons.

- We need a completely blank slate to envision the broader possibilities instead of patching the current degree. We need to start over. If we do, John Brock believes we will end up with at least two much stronger master's degrees – one possibly regarding writing and the other related to sustainability, climate change, and resilience. This blank slate will promote broader innovation, deeper thinking and collaborations. New global local collaborations with strategic partners must be part of any graduate program at UNCA.
- We have new talented leadership here at UNCA in Drs. Cable and Campbell. If we are fortunate to have these fine leaders here, we must provide them real flexibility to provide new and create new viable programming. We can provide that plasticity by discontinuing the current program, now allowing new ideas to come forth.
- His final reason for voting to discontinue the MLAS program comes from his many years of management experience at CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention) and in industry. When starting a new venture, one must start with new and fresh ideas and current thought leaders. This guarantees a deeper change in the approach that ultimately leads to greater innovation. With all due respect, he believes the current leadership of the MLAS program, while talented in many ways, is not the proper one for that particular effort.

In summary, John Brock believes we need several transitional graduate programs in collaboration with major strategic global partners. These programs must be integrated with a focus on current issues and opportunities. We must be honest with ourselves and admit that the MLAS program is not one of those programs and most likely will never be.

One last note. John Brock does not have any interest in any role at UNCA other than his current role as teacher and researcher. He made these statements because he thinks it is in the best interest of our students and this institution in the future.

Marietta Cameron pointed out that a review has been conducted and that strengths and weaknesses have been discovered. She noted that while there were instances of colleagues who sponsored projects and programs in the MLAS program, the subcommittees conducting the review found that insufficient support was given. She stated that we have staff colleagues who are current students, who speak highly of the program, and who see this program as a way for advancing their careers.

In Marietta Cameron's view, the MLAS program follows our liberal arts mission. To her it seems counterproductive for our institution to discontinue our first master's program especially since it embraces our mission. She pointed out that the review offers revision suggestions such as modeling an experience similar to our undergraduate curriculum with its LAC core. Since we already offer various concentrations and certificates, she envisions that departments would be invited to sponsor and support graduate level concentrations and certificates in the flagship program. She asserts that increased concentrations would mean increased enrollments. She notes that the MLAS program is not considered "under productive" according to the standards the UNC System has given.

She further noted that the program requested an external review, but did not receive support for this request. In her perception, denying the review request appeared as if the program was set up to fail. She stated, "The program is blamed for our lack of care and concern, but in actuality we as an institution failed to support it." Marietta Cameron asked the senators to consider what colleagues coming forth say on behalf of the program and consider some of their recommendations or revisions.

Marietta Cameron stated that she does trust that our leadership is quite capable of taking this program and helping us as a faculty group in our role of shared governance of determining the redesign for this program. Other institutions, including members of COPLAC, using different implementations, have done just this.

Marietta Cameron urged senators to consider revising the MLAS program and give our local colleagues in Western North Carolina a quality program. She then thanked her senate colleagues.

Tiece Ruffin stated if UNC Asheville is this state's designated undergraduate liberal arts institution, she believes it behooves us to have a master's in liberal arts program. For her, that is an imperative for our region and imperative to our mission and our identity. We should never be afraid to revise and re-imagine without throwing something away totally as useless. If we adapt to the perspective that nothing can be revised or reimagined, our debt is to build only from scratch. Revising does not mean that you cannot be innovative, because revisiting and reimagining causes innovation. From the perspective or view as the state's designated liberal arts institution, we should consider the master liberal arts program as imperative to our vision and our mission.

[Staff Council's Statement](#) read by Chair Erin Spence is entered into the minutes. After reading the statement, the Staff Council Chair welcomed any questions for herself, or her colleague, Sophia Unger, who is a current MLAS student and serves as a UNC Asheville Staff Assembly representative.

Laura Bond stated that Faculty Senate received 34 notes and letters including a sixty-page thesis. Those were indexed and stored in a Google Shared Drive that were available to all senators. Laura Bond opened the floor to those guests who wished to speak concerning EC1.

[Stagg Newman](#) thanked Faculty Senate for the opportunity to provide input for their deliberations. He graduated from the MLAS program in 2018. After completing a forty year career in telecom and another a couple of decades in a different public service career, he was privileged the past 15 years to work with one of the top management consulting firms in the world in over 50 countries.

He hopes that Senate has read his prepared remarks. If not, he has copies. He agrees in part and disagrees in part with what John Brock said. John Brock and Stagg Newman have had a very good dialogue with different views.

Stagg Newman believes the program should be continued. He strongly believes that the program needs to be strengthened and expanded. The marketing of the MLAS program needs to be much stronger. Current graduates can be a strong part of this work within the community.

The program needs much greater support integration with the faculty where it should not just be an ancillary operation. There needs to be increased recruitment efforts of lifelong learners because most people like himself are going to go through major changes and inflection points given the chaos in the next four decades, which is going to make the last four decades look like cake walk. People will want to come back and get the fundamental liberal arts education, which provides the following a moral and ethical basis, as well as unstructured problem solving and communication skills.

That is what the MLAS program did for Stagg Newman. He was second in his class at Davidson so he had a good undergraduate education, but the MLAS program changed his perspective. He thinks a combined 4 plus 1 program would benefit UNC Asheville students earning both undergraduate and a MLAS degree in five years, giving them a competitive advantage in the market.

Stagg Newman believes it is better to keep this program going. Based on his experience, it is easy to kill something. It is hard to get a new start in this market since most new projects fail due to not knowing the competition and the unforeseen obstacles. The MLAS program does not have competitors and would be a help while new degrees are being created instead of gambling on all new programs. Stagg Newman urges senators to think long and hard before stopping a program that has major benefits.

The part that Stagg Newman agrees with John Brock is that new programs should be started by new people. The effort to start a strong masters program will take several years to get up and running.

In summary, Stagg Newman believes the university needs to continue the MLAS program, which captures the following benefits: the ongoing support of the MLAS alumni and current students and the prospect of a sizable new entering class because there are over 25 people that expressed interest in the MLAS program that are currently on hold. The existing program that helps enrollment numbers and meets the state's basic standards according to the

senate's own analysis. He believes terminating the MLAS program risks several losses: the current revenue stream, the professional opportunity for the staff, and three instructors who are not undergraduate faculty members. These faculty members are terrific - and they were Gerard Voos, Bill Spellman, and Tommy Hayes. He urges the Faculty Senate to think long and hard before stopping the MLAS program. Thank you.

Melissa Burchard, Chair of the Philosophy Department, thanked Faculty Senate for the opportunity for guests to speak on this matter. She agrees on many points that Stagg Newman made. She thinks the MLAS program is a valuable program that has contributed to the life of the university over the last 30 years. One of benefits that has not been mentioned so far in the discussions and the review documents is MLAS program has been important in providing an opportunity for the intellectual growth and development for faculty.

Melissa Burchard developed the feminist theory course that is now required for WGSS majors and minors in part through the MLA program. She first started teaching that course as a joint MLA and upper level philosophy class. That was a fantastic opportunity. She developed a number of course ideas and possibilities for different courses through the opportunities to teach in the MLA program. Working with students at that higher level is a tremendous benefit. Our undergraduates can work at a higher level but a graduate course is a different kind of engagement. Melissa Burchard believes it is important to recognize the benefits to faculty as well as to students, and presumably to the community.

She also wanted to say that another good benefit is the MLAS program's flexibility since it is a liberal arts program; it can cover a tremendous amount of ground offering courses from many disciplines attracting all kinds of students. We can teach a great amount of material that can be worked in new directions. Sustainability is a flexible program, flexible enough that we can work into new directions that might spin off into a program on its own although the breeding ground for these new ideas has been the MLA programming. These benefits to the program Melissa Burchard would be sorry to see UNC Asheville lose. She also agrees with Tiece Ruffin's statement that because we are a liberal arts college, a liberal arts university, this program makes sense. The liberal arts masters program really makes sense for us. The MLAS program works with who we are and what we do and she would hate to see us lose it. Thank you.

Regine Criser asked that Senate put on its agenda for Senate to discuss the process with which feedback was solicited. In reading through the comments, she is alarmed about some of the things that were said. For example to quote, "I would like to communicate my deep concern about how the university administration has disregarded and mischaracterized this program." She would like Senate to have a conversation about how feedback has been solicited, and where we have sent the message that this is Senate's intention. She is concerned about the antagonistic situation we have set up with this entire process, but especially seemingly in our solicitation of feedback.

Along with Regine Criser's comment, Jessica Pisano stated she is interested in voices that are not represented in the comments that have been made available to us. Especially since anecdotally, a number of people have come to her, who wish to remain anonymous, have had some major complaints, especially along the lines of equity inclusion in this program. While she tends to agree with many of the things that her colleagues have said in support of the program, she is also concerned that the lack of clear mission, student learning outcomes assessment, and

accountability that this program has led to the point where there is simply unequitable outcomes. She is concerned about that, and she is concerned about the voices that Senate is not hearing. Thank you.

Regine Criser wanted to stress voting on this is one thing and reviewing at some point and discussing what the process was is another thing. She thinks it is important to remind ourselves that Senate is giving a recommendation. Senate is not closing the program. We are not shutting down or keeping anything alive. Senate is making a recommendation

Laura Bond replied it is clearly stated on the ballot.

Patrick Bahls believes these kinds of questions are much in line with IDC's report earlier where they are hoping to have some conversations in the spring semester regarding establishing philosophies and concrete guidelines for programmatic review.

Regarding the critique of the MLAS program, Marietta Cameron pointed out that she is a firm believer in applying the same measuring stick that is being used to judge the MLAS program to our undergraduate programs. Some of the complaints, for example, were diversity, inclusion and equity complaints that are the same complaints she has heard regarding our own undergraduate programs. If our recommendation is to discontinue the MLAS program, then we need to think about our own programs. This applies as well to the critique concerning student outcomes and learning. Some departments that are not presenting nor providing that information to the Academic Policies Committee (APC). Before discontinuing a program, we need to take a long, hard look at what we are doing in our own worlds.

Tiece Ruffin reemphasized the importance of revision and being able to reimagine. All have to do that on a daily basis when we want to strengthen our capacity. If we do not, then what we have stays the same. We are always working on how to revise and be more innovative, and then we assess. If we fail, we continue until we are successful. We do not say, "Great job" in this area or that area and stop. We believe that innovation can still happen through re-envisioning and reimagining.

Jessica Pisano does not disagree with her colleagues. She is pointing out was that there is perhaps a skewing of information that Senate has been presented with that only certain voices are represented. That was that was her point.

Marietta Cameron wanted to address concerns in terms of process that there was some type of influence as far as getting certain voices to be heard. People found out from reading our documents and decided what they wanted to say.

Laura Bond concurred with Marietta Cameron's statement. She said that everyone was welcomed to contact Senators with questions and comments, as is always our practice with Senate. However, Laura Bond wanted to confirm with Jessica Pisano if she meant, "some people did not feel comfortable coming forward." Laura Bond asked Jessica Pisano if that was an accurate recollection of her statement.

Jessica Pisano replied that was an accurate recollection.

Laura Bond expressed that sometimes those voices have to be sought out because they ~~are~~ may not be willing to come forward even though we welcomed everybody who gave information.

Hearing no other comments for the discussion, Senate prepared to vote.

Micheal Stratton asked a procedural question. He wanted to know why the vote is to be by secret ballot.

Marietta Cameron said in terms of that decision she is making motion that we vote by secret ballot. Micheal Stratton interrupted before a second was given and said just he wanted to understand why the vote is being conducted by secret ball. Marietta Cameron withdrew her motion in order to answer his question.

Laura Bond responded that there was a concern raised to the Executive Committee so there was a discussion amongst the Executive Committee members and they decided to have this be a private ballot so the senators would not feel any pressure. This is a highly sensitive topic where there has been a narrative for many years around this program. We wanted to make sure that all senators felt that they could vote privately and not feel pressured by anybody around them. It is not to hide anything; it is to give senators a little privacy in their voting process. No objections were made at this time to alter that method of voting from secret ballot to another method of voting and the vote commenced.

Upon completing the tally of the votes, Laura Bond explained that the final tally includes the emailed votes of the two excused senators. Let Laura Bond know if you wish to see these final votes verified. No one came forward. This is the tally of the votes:

Total votes: 17 votes and 1 abstention:

"I recommend that the MLAS program be discontinued", received nine (9) votes

"I recommend that the MLAS program continue with the adoption of a revitalization plan considering some of the changes and modification listed for this its continuation" received eight (8) votes

"I choose to abstain" had one (1) vote.

The Faculty Senate vote 9-8 and 1 abstention for recommending the MLAS program be discontinued. Laura Bond thanked everybody who was involved in doing the work of the review and answering the call of our faculty. Faculty asked Senate to step up to do a review of the MLAS program, and that is what the Faculty Senate did. We are proud of the work Senate did and we thank everyone for their dedication to seeing that the MLAS had the opportunity for due process. She asked if anyone had questions or comments.

Although it would have been uncomfortable, Toby King said he regrets the anonymous vote. He feels Senate should be able to express ourselves clearly and confidently without fear of intimidation or reprisal. He would hope that that would not happen again or that we would be told in advance and be able to discuss it.

Laura Bond clarified the ballot was emailed out to all the senators in advance of the plans. She did appreciate his first comment.

Regine Criser thinks this goes back to her earlier comment that at some point that she would like us to have a conversation of where we are as a Senate because she does not think Senate is in a good place. This was a very tense conversation and process. She did not feel comfortable voting publicly on this because there were so many voices, pressures and tensions that as an untenured faculty member, she was glad the vote was by secret ballot. She believes Senate needs to have a frank conversation of what is going on because she thinks things are going in ways that are not conducive to a productive Senate.

Laura Bond thanked her for her suggestion and expressed willingness to have this if Senate wishes to have a conversation.

Tiece Ruffin asked if there could be a roll call vote.

Marietta Cameron pointed out that in her understanding of Robert's Rules any Senator at any point can call for a secret ballot to be honored. If the secret ballot had not already been advertised, she would have called for a secret ballot due to this very thing about pressure. It is not just a matter of protection for nontenured faculty, but it is also about protecting each other as far as feeling pressures from each other and respecting a difference in opinion.

Marietta Cameron also pointed out that this review is an example of the Senate at work. This was a difficult decision, but this is part of Senate's responsibility. Marietta Cameron has had a previous experience similar to where her MLAS program colleagues are currently sitting. At least her colleagues in this instance have the comfort stepped up and answered a call to review the program. Whereas, her colleagues in the previous institution did nothing, and did not answer the call at all. Not answering the call may have been comfortable and looked collegial, but in essence, it was an abdication and relinquishment of privilege and responsibility.

Laura Bond added that when Senate first started this process, there was the question about the German program. Upon research, we found we might have lost the German program if Faculty Senate had not stepped up and said, "We will review this." Senate was asked early on to review that process and it was interesting to see that past history, and we imagine it was not very comfortable then either. The minutes then also reveal an uncomfortable process, but the faculty then also said, "We want to have this discussion, and we want to discuss what was important to us on this campus." This was another one of those times. Sometimes Faculty Senate has to handle things that are uncomfortable, sensitive matters.

Regine Criser asked what the next steps would be after this vote.

Laura Bond replied that this vote is our recommendation that goes back to the administration - to the Chancellor and the Provost to determine what they want to do.

Mark McClure stated he honestly does not have the sense as to whether something passed or not. Nine voted to dissolve and eight to revise. His question is whether something passed or not.

Laura Bond responded that Senate's voting historically passes with just one (1) vote over. In regards of the meaning of this vote, the recommendation to discontinue received the most votes but only by one vote – essentially, we were almost tied. Voting is information; it is feedback. We also provided information in the form of a review – that is also helpful information for the Senior Leadership to consider. This meeting and all the feedback we received over the months provided information. Our job serving on Faculty Senate is to have these conversations with faculty, Deans, Provost, and Chancellor to help advise and decide what to do regarding curriculum.

Aubri Rote asked since many people know this is going on today she wanted to know whether a document would go out to the campus that Senate recommends that the program be discontinued.

Laura Bond expressed that our minutes are historically the space where we report out the results of the meeting to the campus community. Our minutes are public. Everybody who is present may also spread the word to those who ask for them.

Micheal Stratton pointed out that Senate sent out prior announcements regarding this topic. The campus community deserves to hear from the Executive Committee before the minutes go out to dispel rumor mills from churning. He recommends that the Executive

Committee email one or two sentences to the campus community. He thinks that the staff, faculty and students deserve to know the fact that we clearly by simple majority voted to discontinue.

Mark McClure disagreed that the simple majority is sufficient to say we made a recommendation. He does not believe that Senate has made a recommendation.

Aubri Rote stated she believes that something needs to be sent since Senate spent the entire semester on this.

Laura Bond asked for clarification that she is asking for something to be done sooner rather than later since there will be a reporting out to the campus community.

Aubri Rote replied that she is asking for something to be sent sooner rather than later and that something be concrete since we have spent the entire semester doing this.

Laura Bond expressed concern about sending out a singular statement that does not encompass everything that happened. When the minutes are sent out, the votes along with the discussions, comments and statements are sent also. How do we wrap up all this in a statement when the vote was so close?

Tiece Ruffin made a motion that Faculty Senate Executive Committee send out one paragraph stating the results of the vote: the nine to discontinue, the eight to continue and the one abstention tomorrow. The motion was seconded.

Discussion:

Jessica Pisano asked for a friendly amendment to include a statement that more information will be forthcoming in the minutes. Friendly amendment was accepted.

Micheal Stratton had a question for Mark since he brought it up. Were there any rules (Standing Rules or Robert's) stating there needs to be two-thirds majority or anything to that affect for the recommendation?

Mark McClure replied his reading states a simple majority – one more than half. He thinks we do not have that.

Laura Bond said Lisa Sellers is looking into it, but research thus far shows historically Senate has passed documents where the difference has been as small as one vote more and not always one vote over half. The vote stood as long as quorum was met to conduct business.

Marietta Cameron asked what is the threshold to determine when we send out an announcement the day after Faculty Senate meets.

Patrick Bahls replied that this document is highly exceptional in terms of the amount of attention that was given to it. As indicated, there is substantial interest campus wide of this. Since this was of interest to many in the campus community including alumni, he believes they deserve an immediate notification, even if it is a brief one, with an indication that further details will be available.

Marietta Cameron asked if the vote had been the other way, would there still be a push to inform the campus community.

Many senators answered affirmatively. Marietta then concurred.

Laura Bond said she was not opposed to a statement going out. She just did not want to misrepresent what happened here. That was her only pause.

Ashley Moraguez expressed her understanding on Robert's Rules of Order that we need a majority. What is less clear is whether an abstention counts as a vote. Her understanding is abstentions do not count.

Laura Bond concurred that her understanding is abstentions do not count.

Marietta Cameron stated for the record that the vote stands the way it is and yes, she believes she will vote yes for sending a statement.

Laura Bond concluded that Lisa Sellers just told her that she has not found any evidence to the contrary so far. We will look further into Robert's Rules on voting but she thinks it is most fair practice to go with what Senate has done historically. No further discussion.

The motion to send out a statement tomorrow to the campus community passed without dissent.

VII. Administration/Academic Affairs:

Provost Garikai Campbell

Provost Campbell started his report by acknowledging that there has been a lot of discussion around the potential changes that he has suggested for the handbook. He wanted to give broader context. He thinks it is pertinent to the discussion that we just had. His idea of shared governance is not that everything comes through for a vote and that without everything coming for a vote through the senate process there is a violation of share governance.

He wants to make it clear that he really believes in shared governance. His notion of shared governance is that there is absolute transparency, and that there is an opportunity to engage, to discuss and to work together. His feeling is if the only mechanism around is voting, then you actually lose something - the opportunity to engage and work together for something that might be a lot stronger, something that you did not consider. He is not saying that there should never be a vote and everything should be through discussion. He is not saying the other flip side of that either.

He is going to speak at length because he knows there has been an email exchange about this. In this context in the suggestions for edits here, his argument is the handbook has points where the authority rests in the Provost and Chancellor offices. There are things in the handbook like the Preface says something about what is voted on by the Faculty Senate, those being hiring, hiring, practices, compensation, maybe some other things. His point is that is not true that those are votable by the Faculty Senate. His hope is to get the language of the handbook in line with what is accurate and in line with where the authority, responsibility, and accountability rests.

His general objective is if the authority rests with the Provost, let us get the language to be in alignment with that. His idea is to present these edits for the discussion, to him, is as important as a vote. What he means in terms of shared governance, a discussion has the same force as a vote. His hope is that there will be time for a discussion of the edits.

He welcomes critique, feedback, thoughts. This is not an attempt to sidestep or to remove the opportunity for engagement or involvement, but he does think that these edits fall within his authority and it feels awkward to ask for a vote for something that is, in fact, not in the authority of the Faculty Senate.

The critical point regarding these edits is that the term of a contract of a particular class of faculty. For example, our handbook says visiting professors can only receive a one-year contract. Does this mean that the Provost cannot hire someone with a three-year contract? If you feel this body could say you cannot then he thinks we disagree in terms of where that authority lies. He believes that we could say we recommend only one-year contract, but he would still have the authority to hire someone into a visiting professor position for a three-year

term. He checked with our own Human Resources regarding our own rules and regulations around that, and he believes that is within his authority. Therefore, given that, he thought it was appropriate and right to be able to offer up these edits without a vote because it is within his authority. That concludes the context for where these edits come, why they are coming and why they are presented to Senate in this ways as opposed to as a vote.

Mark McClure thanked the Provost for sharing his view of shared governance. He believes it reasonable, but he is a little concerned about the specific edits he saw. In particular, the reality is that we are in a tight financial situation here. His understanding is that one of the ways that we, as a university, can manage our financial resources is by holding certain positions open and controlling how many people are hired. His question is asking if this in part because of our financial situation and the only possibility to operate is that way.

Provost Campbell was not sure if he fully understood the question, but if the concern is in regards to the authority to hire, the authority to hire or not hire is within the Provost's authority.

Mark McClure agreed with that 100%. Going through the MLA review process, he felt that there was not a solid understanding amongst Faculty Senators how power flows and how the decisions flow. Ultimately, for any institution, there is not a question whether the bottom line aligns with the Board of Trustees to make the final decisions. Typically, the Board of Trustees has empowered the top-level administration to make exactly those decisions. Had we understood that, he believes that our MLA discussion might have gone quite differently. Mark McClure respects that authority. He is simply saying that as faculty, we do need to be aware of exactly what is going on. His questions are, "How is this going to impact us?" "Are we looking at having longer visiting term positions for specific reasons?" "Now that you have articulated these authorities that you do indeed have, is there a specific way that you are planning on using them?" He is wondering, what the impact might be.

Provost Campbell replied that is a great question. How this came up is through small discussions with faculty, one of which was with non-tenured track faculty including faculty who are lecturers. He learned that, perhaps not intentionally, that we have informed faculty very, very late, maybe even as late as June, whether or not they have a contract for the following year. The Provost thinks though he has been reluctant to use the word inhumane, but the practice is problematic, at least. That is a very difficult situation. One of the things that he proposes is that we think about rethinking our 111335 (whatever the number) framework consider, when appropriate, a two or three year position. When trying to get the most talented faculty, one has to have some freedom and flexibility. One year contracts are, in his opinion, among the most difficult to ask someone to take. We have had great success and we have gotten great people within those contracts. However, he believes our interests are better served to have flexibility without being in violation of the handbook. This is not out of the bounds of his authority, and he is asking for the handbook to be in alignment with the reality.

Laura Bond stated that when talking about lecturer positions, this corresponds with what is happening nationally so this concern is not anything personal about our current leadership at all. There are national and statewide concerns about the growing number of lecturer positions and the diminishing number of tenure track positions. In budget concerns, we know that people are looking at how lecture positions cost less, tenured positions cost more. This possibility of lengthening terms and putting it in writing could open up fears amongst

faculty: fears about possibly losing tenure track positions, losing the ability to advocate for our lecturers to raise their salaries and raise the importance of their impact that they make on the campus. Once again, this is not personal regarding our leadership and what they would do. When we see something like this in writing, it could raise those kinds of fears that what would happen with anybody who has that authority, a word that the Provost has used many times. Our community has had a lot of change of leadership over the years. We may trust people who are managing this now that they would not do this, but in the hands of somebody else, we might have concerns. Laura Bond asked the Provost to speak to that.

Provost Campbell appreciates and understands that the context in which we are operating is in the context of lots of recent change. The most important thing he needs to say is he is not trying to seize more authority. The edits are about articulating accurately the authority that is already present. This is not a power grab. This is about articulating in the handbook so that there is alignment with what the reality is. That is fundamentally the reason for these particular changes.

In the context of what is happening with contingent faculty - the increase of adjuncts and the decrease of tenured track faculty. He has used the word authority quite a bit. The other side of that same coin is accountability. He is the one that has to be held accountable for that balance. As many may know, Provost Campbell has presented an extensive dive into the data about faculty across disciplines - where our adjuncts, tenured track and nontenured track faculty are teaching across the curriculum. He wants to share that data annually so everyone has that information and then it is up to us collectively to essentially hold the Provost accountable. The Provost jokes sometimes that he is an "At will" employee. He says the Chancellor can get rid of him at any time. If faculty feel like he is not doing a good job of managing the balance between the fiscal realities that we have to balance and the excellence of teaching and curriculum, the faculty can hold him accountable. Authority and accountability really go hand in hand together.

To the Provost, if he all of a sudden stops being transparent, stops sharing this kind of information, stops having discussions about this kind of balance, then that is a cause for alarm. The Provost is trying to put this on the floor so that we can work together to decide where the boundary is. "How do we talk about this?" "How do we understand that balance?" "What kinds of flexibility should we go after?" "What are the principles about which the Provost might be operating?" Let us have those discussions in conjunction with each other, as opposed to here is a document to vote up or down and then end the discussion. That is what he is hoping that we can get to.

Tiece Ruffin stated that she understands that it is in your authority. Her only question of this is something she wondered in her head, "How does this impact diversity in terms of a three-year visiting with a terminal degree?" As a black woman, she would never come to UNC Asheville under that. That is not attractive, and she does not think it will help UNC Asheville. She is not even talk about equity, just diversity. Diversity is just about the numbers of who shows up in the room. She believes as we seek to attract diverse faculty, it is not enticing to see a three-year visiting over a tenured track position with a terminal degree.

Provost Campbell relayed that he has already written to two groups, Consortium for Faculty Diversity and LADO. They have relationships. They have three-year and two-year positions that they have leveraged extensively well in small and large places to increase the

diversity of faculty. They have been incredibly successful and the hope is that we would be positioned to bring things like that to this campus to help build and increase our diversity. He agrees there should be careful attention, but he thinks this can be used for the good of increasing diversity.

Ashley Moraguez wanted to note for the record that she feels like some of the faculty conversations on this issue has been modeling two conversations. The first one is procedural and the second is about the substance of the changes to be made. From her standpoint, the issue of negotiating contracts rests in the power of the administration. She would agree the Provost has this authority and that faculty do not have control over the negotiation of contracts, which is a separate issue from the recommendations that she sees are made. If we could separate those conversations, there would be a more productive conversation. She is not nontenured track faculty, and she does not speak on the behalf of lecturers and visiting professors. The intent of these policies seem to help those who are most vulnerable on campus to get them more notice. Of course, she would want to hear the voices of lecturers and visiting professors on this issue. To her, faculty do not get to negotiate contracts for other faculty members and she wanted to put that on the record.

Caroline Kennedy stated that she is a lecturer at the university. As a Senator, she sent around this document to other lecturers on campus today asking for their comments. She heard from six or seven different faculty members, all of whom are in support of these changes, and that is information that is important to you. She also agrees and it has been very clear that from her time here that the Provost has the authority to make these changes, whether it is stated or not, and she appreciates the transparency to make that clear in the handbook.

Aubri Rote commented that this is all helpful, and she wanted to put a motion on the floor to actually get an official vote on who is in favor of these kinds of changes happening in this process.

Regine Criser asked whether we are voting on the process and the changes.

Jessica Pisano asked whether she could ask a question before entertaining the motion.

Provost Kai Campbell stated he believes once the motion is on the floor-

Laura Bond reminded that the motion has not been seconded.

The motion was then seconded.

Discussion:

Jessica Pisano appreciates the prior notice and agrees that this is his purview. She was a little surprised that there was not more concern in recommending appointments of longer than one year because that is something she thought she heard him speak on before. Obviously, the goal of these changes is to offer flexibility so that the Provost can do what he needs to do in specific situations. However, she wondered about the decision to prefer longer contracts to shorter contracts.

Provost Kai Campbell explained that one-year contracts are the most difficult kinds of decisions to offer because a person in a one-year contract has to be on the market immediately upon arrival. In September, they have to be on the search. What the Provost was doing in the writing was to maintain the sentiment that was there before that the faculty recommended initial appointments be for one year. If the Provost scratch that completely, there would not be a record of what was there before. This was his way of trying to honor what faculty before had

already expressed so that thread would not be lost. He is happy to hear responses to that as we think about how to edit these further.

Laura Bond asked Provost Campbell if it was okay to let everybody else outside of the table to engage in the discussion because we had already made the motion about people being able to add commentary.

Provost Campbell said he was opened to that.

Marietta Cameron agreed with her colleague Ashley Moraguez that there are two discussions going on here and there is a motion on the table. In terms of the edits that are here and in terms of the intent and the goodwill, she is supportive of the edits, the goodwill and the intent. She is extremely concerned about the process on this and what people are saying. She disagrees with her colleague about the interpretation and feels that she can have disagreement and still be respected and not be accused of attacking anyone. She gets the feeling that some people think that just because someone has disagreement somehow they are not a team player. Many know that she has never been a "yes" person nor would she automatically bow her head in agreement.

In terms of the process, she thinks that when we vote it is not only a matter of approval. We are wholeheartedly clear where the power ultimately lies. She believes that when the vote comes, it is a matter of what we are clearly saying as a group, what we are recommending, and we are not saying, "No, you can't do this or you can't do that." We are collectively saying, "We have read this, we have thoroughly investigated this, took the time to digest this and do our due diligence, and we support" so that there is a clear account as far as that support is concerned that can be used in ultimate decisions. The very fact that her colleague, Caroline Kennedy, took this document on very short notice to other colleagues and received their feedback is an example of how the process works well.

Marietta Cameron supports the current Senate process that we have where handbook edits documents go through FWDC before coming to Faculty Senate process of two readings so the Senators and the faculty at large can see the proposal.

Marietta Cameron respects the authority of our Provost. Today, we have people who are of goodwill and good intent that are not trying to grab power just for the sake of grabbing power. That is today. The past has already showed that changing the process and accepting it because of the quickness and expediency sets precedents that forgoes their voice in future matters. In terms of the motion, she is considering abstaining simply because she cannot vote against for she agrees with the changes, but she cannot vote for the motion because she is concerned about the process of how this is coming through Faculty Senate.

Micheal Stratton thanked Laura Bond for asking the Provost about the trend in higher education. He is fully supportive of the document. His question is for FWDC. From an earlier comment, his interpretation is that this did go through FWDC; it is just not an FWDC document. The chair of FWDC has made the motion so that suggests there has been conversation amongst the Provost and FWDC.

Aubri Rote answered that this was sent to FWDC, and they had a number of conversations with the Provost. She also wanted to clarify her motion. Her motion is not whether or not to support the changes themselves. The motion is to support the preface (Faculty Handbook Preface 0.0) that states, "Changes in administrative procedures proposed by Academic Affairs to implement academic policies which appear in the Faculty Handbook, such

as those for annual evaluation, hiring of faculty, and application for professional leaves, should be reported to FWDC and, if they wish, to Faculty Senate before submission to the Editor of the Faculty Handbook. The same protocol is followed for changes in policy which are not under the purview of Academic Affairs but which appear in the Faculty Handbook, such as those originating in the General Assembly, UNC General Administration, or other divisions of the university.” It is already in the handbook, but she wants to know how many of our senators of the full body support that or not.

Marietta Cameron asked for further clarification that they were only voting on the Preface.

Regine Criser disagreed that Aubri Rote is not talking about preface that was in the document from the Provost. Aubri Rote is reminding all of us of the practice that is already in the handbook that is separate from the paragraph that the Provost would like to amend. It lays out the process in which changes are made to the handbook - the changes that the Provost is sharing here with us. We want to make everybody aware that this is the process and let us all agree that this should be the process. Regine Criser asked Aubri Rote if she is relaying her motion correctly.

Aubri Rote answered yes, in the affirmative.

Tiece Ruffin asked if Senate was going to vote for she needs to be excused.

Provost Campbell asked to call it. Patrick Bahls asked to make a point.

Patrick Bahls stated he has to go as well in a few minutes to a prior engagement. He wanted to express his support of flexible interpretation of shared governance as well.

Provost Campbell asked for any other points regarding Aubri Rote’s motion.

Marietta Cameron asked if we have the motion in writing.

The Senate Secretary shakes her head no. [Senate Secretary’s note: Motions regarding matters of policy are defined in [Standing Rules “Requirement for Two Readings of All Matters of Policy.”](#) Motions she receives in writing are placed on the agenda for each meeting as instructed by the Executive Committee].

Marietta Cameron asked what the motion was.

Provost Campbell stated that he understands the motion to be are we as a Senate affirming the process already outlined in the Preface.

Marietta Cameron replied we have a problem with the interpretation of that language where this is almost like discussing biblical things now.

Aubri Rote replied that she wants to know if we interpret as it is literally written.

Marietta Cameron answered that again there is still the same problem with the interpretation that is going on there.

Provost Campbell called the vote of the affirmation of the Preface.

Regine Criser inserted that we are specifically talking about Preface 00.2.

Provost Campbell stated that Preface 00.2 is affirmed with the vote 11-1 and 4 abstentions (Note: Since this motion was made in reference to a discussion, and not associated with an official senate document, this is considered a Straw Vote, or an unofficial ballot conducted as a test of opinion). He said that he understands there are still issues about how we interpret that. Although we are out of time today, he hopes there will be opportunities for us to talk together about how we understand the boundaries to get at the interpretation. He would very much enjoy that conversation.

[Senate Secretary's note: On December 6, 2019, Aubri Rote, as FWDC Chair, officially submitted [these administrative changes to the Faculty Handbook](#). Faculty Senate Chair instructed the Senate Secretary to make [the changes](#).]

VIII. Election from among Senate Alternates for Senate Vacancy during Spring 2020

There is a vacancy on Faculty Senate due to Micheal Stratton going on PDL. His remaining term is just Spring 2020, so that is only as long as the alternate who will be elected will server. A notice was sent to the six alternates inviting them to come to this meeting to address Faculty Senate or they could email a statement to be read by the Senate Chair in their absence.

Our six alternates are Jake Butera, David Clarke, James Perkins, Ann Dunn, Trey Adcock, and Deena Burris. Faculty Senate heard comments from Jake, David, James and Ann and then went into closed session for discussion and vote.

Upon coming out of closed session, Laura Bond announced the results that Jake Butera was elected to fill Micheal Stratton's final semester. He will serve on Senate, IDC and UPC for the Spring 2020 semester.

IX. Old Business. FWDC Chair Aubri Rote asked out of respect to requests by Micheal Stratton in an email and Regine Criser during the meeting that Senate ~~has~~ have a discussion, perhaps in a closed meeting about what is going on with Senate. Senate agreed that the Executive Committee would look at scheduling this early in the Spring semester. Amanda Wray stated her support of what was being said here and feels Senators need to have a conversation.

X. New Business. No new business.

XI. Adjournment. Laura Bond adjourned the Faculty Senate meeting at 5:55 p.m.