

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA ASHEVILLE
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
March 5, 2020; 3:15 pm
Highsmith Union, Blue Ridge Ballroom North

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, J. Beck, L. Bond, E. Boyce, S. Broberg, B. Butler, A. Cosette, J. Cutspec, M. Galloway, I. Green, B. Haggard, M. Harvey, H. Holt, M. Himelein, L. Horgan, L. Johnson, J. Konz, P. Laughon, M. Neelon, L. Newton, H. Parlier, A. Shope, W. Sorrell, E. Spence, W. Strehl, S. Ungert, D. Weldon.

I. Call to Order

II. Chancellor Nancy Cable / Provost Garikai Campbell

COVID-19 virus update. Chancellor Cable asked if there were questions about the current state of affairs with COVID-19 virus.

Caroline Kennedy asked if there was anything new since the update last month

Chancellor Nancy Cable clarified a point regarding summer travel. During the Master Plan Common Grounds Meeting, some people heard her as saying that the institution was cancelling summer travel, which was not what she said nor intended. She wanted to clarify that while UNCA does not have any policy for summer travel at this time, she was expressing that faculty should wisely think through their plans in light of this current uncertainty.

Provost Kai Campbell relayed the call between all of the UNC System Provosts where they learned about many things to think over and plan like perhaps transitioning in person classes to an online venue. He advises those departments holding events that gathers large numbers to prepare alternate plans. He hopes to email next steps soon.

Chancellor Cable said they will be monitoring the situation over the break and will keep faculty and staff informed of the latest news.

Enrollment matters. Chancellor Cable briefly mentioned that she continues to be extremely concerned about enrollment, not just the incoming class of 2024 and our transfer students, but overall retention and attrition. At the Enrollment Strategy Meeting this morning, she asked Jeff Konz to give her a couple of data points to share with the Faculty Senate. She asks that all faculty take very seriously our responsibility to keep every student retained and continuing with their education at UNCA particularly as we start the advising process.

While we may assume that students who leave are those having academic difficulty, the data suggests that roughly 30% of those students who withdraw from the institution have a cumulative GPA over 3.0 and nearly half are in good academic standing. While 50% of those who leave are first year students, 25% have attained Junior status. More than half of the respondents of the exit survey indicated that they had difficulty making connections between their academic experiences at UNCA and the lives and careers that they were envisioning for themselves. The Chancellor encourages faculty to reach out to students they notice who are concerned about the

relevance of their coursework, declared major, or undergraduate research.

As always, Chancellor Cable is grateful to have an opportunity to engage during the Senate meetings and thanked them for their work.

Volker Frank asked about current retention work. Provost Campbell relayed the curricular changes to the first year programming by the First Year Experience Committee (Chaired by Regine Criser), the academic indicators work by the Academic Policies Committee and changes to enhance students' campus experience by Bill Haggard and Student Affairs and the First Year Experience Committee. Provost Campbell invites ideas about this work.

Regine Criser added that in the end, this work comes down to every single person on this campus. There needs to be a certain sense of urgency that recruitment/retention of students starts the day they arrive to the day that they graduate. She believes the campus does not have that mindset yet and will take a paradigm shift in priorities without compromising rigor nor our identity. Every student who comes through our doors should have a path towards the graduation stage and more staff and faculty are needed towards these goals.

To conclude, Chancellor Cable explained that her comments were prompted by two realities. One is our current enrollment and retention that needs to be addressed. The Strategic Enrollment Group met this morning, and a suggestion from the team is to host a common grounds session regarding retention and enrollment. The second was while Vice President Kim Van Noort was here they tried to make the case for why the institution is strong and deserving of more attention and more funding. One of the issues that Chief Academic Officer Van Noort repeatedly mentioned was the retention issue and what can they do to help in this area. The Chancellor thanked the Faculty Senate for their time and attention to these important matters.

III. Approval of Minutes: February 6, 2019 3:15 p.m.

Faculty Senate Chair Marietta Cameron asked if there were questions or a motion for approval of the minutes February 6, 2020.

Regine Criser said looking at the minutes and it seemed as if they were more reviewed in the past that some discussions were not captured. She was wondering whether there was a change in approach to minutes.

Marietta Cameron said the Executive Committee had not asked for the Senate minutes to be condensed nor did senators submit any edits/additions to these minutes.

The Senate Chair asked for a motion to approve the minutes of February 6, 2020. The motion was made and seconded. The minutes passed without dissent.

IV. Executive Committee: Senate Chair Marietta Cameron

The Senate Chair offered a Statement from the Faculty Senate Chair that she had shared with her students saying faculty may want to share the statement with their students. She first encouraged her students to read their email during this time in order to stay current with the latest news from the Chancellor's Office for they are more inclined to read social media. Then she read her statement to them:

"In my opinion, we all have two choices before us. Number one, we can live in fear or number two, we can embrace our faith and our compassion. If we choose to live in fear, then we will destroy each other much quicker than a disease could ever want. But if we embrace our faith and compassion, then we can have compassion for ourselves, to allow accurate information to inform our actions, compassion to ourselves and to our community to be aware of where we are as

we travel internationally and domestically. compassion to ourselves and to our community to practice hygiene should always practice and compassion to ourselves to build up our immune systems, compassionate enough to others and to our community - enough to self isolate, should we become ill and compassion to others to avoid stigmatizing those who had the unfortunate thing to become ill.”

Marietta Cameron did this because she thought it was important to emphasize that we can and need to talk with our students and with each other about the pandemic we are facing.

Updates from the Executive Committee Marietta Cameron congratulated fellow Senator, Dr. Regine Criser who is the co-editor of the newly published volume of Diversity and Decolonization in German Studies. She also recognized colleague Sonya DiPalma, who stepped up as the new Senate First Vice Chair and Chair of the Academic Policies Committee (APC). She also recognized Volker Frank, who agreed to move from the Institutional Development Committee (IDC) to serve on APC and she thanked David Clarke who was elected to the vacancy on the Faculty Senate and agreed to serve as a member of IDC. Marietta Cameron also announced Laura Holland, who presented the Faculty Assembly Report at the last meeting is now a Faculty Assembly delegate completing Dr. Cameron’s term through the end of Spring 2021. She also thanked Melodie Galloway, also a Faculty Assembly Delegate. She also thanked FWDC Chair Aubri Rote and John Brock who are working with faculty elections and Lisa Sellers who is a constant help especially through this time of transition.

She also recognized the newly elected Faculty Senate members and alternates.

Senators for 2020-2023:

Jinhua Li (Social Sciences)
Michelle Bettencourt (Humanities)
George Heard (Natural Sciences)
Jeremias Zunguze (at large)
Brian Hook (at large)
David Clarke (at large)

Faculty Senate Alternates (2020-2022)

Nicole Cosette
Ann Dunn
Marcus Harvey

As Senate Chair, Marietta Cameron presented on February 13 the initiatives that were discussed last week to the Academic Committee of the Board of Trustees. The presentation was very well received. Senate also Co-sponsored with Staff Council the Employee Recognition Day held on February 14. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee as well as the entire Senate met with UNC System Representatives on February 25.

Senate Chair’s report from Faculty Assembly. The Senate Chairs’ Meeting was held on February 27. As usual, this meeting is held the evening before the Faculty Assembly convenes. At this meeting, they discussed at length faculty salary compression issues for they were extremely concerned. Marietta Cameron noted that our senate and other faculty committees have discussed this issue similarly with our counterparts at other UNC institutions. They are also working on an

update to the shared governance document. The Shared Governance document is what they hope will replace the 2005 Shared Governance document that now resides on our UNCA Faculty Senate website. The Senate Chairs also discussed the budget process that was similar to our campus' Common Grounds Sessions.

V. Student Government Association: President Isaiah Green

Big things that are happening in SGA. They recently held elections and the SGA President-elect is London Newton and the Vice President-elect is Olivia Barnes. They will both be inducted on April 15. Regarding voter turnout, they are on an upward trend for there were 200 more votes cast this year over last year. A couple of weeks ago, Isaiah Green, along with several others, went downstate to advocate and discuss with several state legislators and the Board of Governors the fact that the state still does not have a 2019-20 budget. Isaiah Green spoke with the Board of Trustees and the Board of Governors that we cannot move on items such as mental health services that are important to students because of the lack of a budget. SGA is coordinating trips next year to continue to advocate for items that affect students. The last item is there are now free hygiene products in Highsmith Student Union men, women and gender-neutral restrooms. They are really excited to see how that program goes.

Questions:

Volker Frank asked to hear from the SGA President about insights and wisdom that he and other students have regarding retention. How heavy it is on students' minds?

Isaiah Grene said he is a management major and their department chair, Dr. Stratton, recently left. Questions like whether the department will keep their accreditation have been asked. Students are very concerned about faculty retention that has an impact on students because faculty are their mentors and who they look to for guidance. There are parallels between faculty and student retention issues. However, he believes students notice, are directly affected, and are more concerned about faculty retention.

VI. Staff Council: Chair Erin Spence

Erin Spence said the Staff Council has been working with the feedback they received from their forums. There were good, creative solutions proposed that they look forward to discussing with the senior staff and will share with the Faculty Senate in the future.

Regarding the Employee Appreciation Event, if faculty missed it, they missed a big show where she and Marietta Cameron "killed it" when presenting the prizes for the drawings.

Last night, Staff Council sponsored a Staff Appreciation Event at the women's basketball game. About 100 people attended, including a few faculty members. She and Staff Council hope to work more jointly with the Faculty Senate on employee appreciation events.

The Staff Council member appointed to the University Budget Committee came back from a meeting a few months ago mentioning potentially creating a Joint Committee to hold discussions on morale. Erin Spence has been discussing that with executives over the last few weeks and believes there has been good progress on that. As always, Staff Council is willing to work with the Faculty Senate on important matters that concern both groups.

- VII. [Faculty Assembly Delegate Report:](#) Professor Melodie Galloway
[Professor Galloway's accompanying slides](#)
[Faculty Assembly Executive Summary and accompanying meeting slides](#)

After Melodie Galloway's presentation, Aubri Rote asked to clarify in regards to turnover rates is we have higher turnover of faculty, but we do not necessarily retain more. Melodie Galloway answered affirmatively. Melodie Galloway explained it was disheartening and interesting to see the data concerning turnover of female faculty/staff positions. She asked Lisa to contact Faculty Assembly for their slides to see their data sources. Those have not been received yet.

- VIII. Academic Policies Committee: First Vice Chair Sonya DiPalma
[Decision Summaries](#)

****First 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 (Amy Lanou, Aubri Rote, Jason Wingert)

[Appendix 1](#)

[Appendix 2](#)

[Appendix 3](#)

[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)

*[APC 36](#)

Add new prefix, FYS First-Year Studies and new course, FYS 178, First-Year Seminar;
Edit the First-Year Seminar entry under Liberal Arts Core;
Delete DEPT 178 from all Departmental Course Listings
[The Impact of Changing 178 Prefixes on SCH by Department](#) (Jeff Konz)
(Regine Criser, First Year Colloquium Coordinator, Lynne Hogan, Registrar)

Sonya DiPalma, new APC Chair, thanked everyone for their patience especially the members of her committee for this has been akin to being put in the deep end of the pool. Regarding the first reading documents, note that Sonya and the other APC members are available to answer any question faculty may have. From these first readings, APC requested to waive the Cromer role for APC 36, a document that proposes adding the new prefix of FYS for first year studies courses. APC unanimously supported the new prefix and the new course, FYS 178. As a short rationale, neither the Total nor Instructional FTE would change as this is based on the instructor and not the prefix. SCHs would also be the same as for courses taught outside of the

faculty member's department. APC took those things into consideration and also listened to colleagues' rationale on how the prefix will bring clarity to first year studies catalog entry. A motion was made to accept the waiver of the Comer Rule for APC 36, which was seconded.

Discussion of Waiving the Comer Rule for APC 36:

Mark McClure believes there are some things worth talking and thinking about closely, so it was not clear to him whether it was appropriate to waive the Comer Rule for APC 36.

Regine Criser relayed that waving the Comer Rule does not prevent the Faculty Senate from having a discussion that we need to be having. She thinks the Comer Rule could be waived and we still have the discussion. Waiving the Comer Rule would put this up for discussion at this meeting.

Marietta Cameron asked whether Mark McClure means that we need a month of consideration before having the discussion.

Mark McClure replied that there are some issues surrounding this that might require a bit of thought. In particular, his understanding is that the original purpose behind the different names, for example, MATH 178 versus LA 178 is that different disciplines and different codes involve potential equity in lines. He is not so sure about what the funding study is, but for example, if the Chemistry Department did four chemistry classes, we would get more positions. There are other issues that warrant further consideration and thought before entering into discussion.

Marietta Cameron asked that discussion of the document to wait until Senate votes to waive the Comer Rule and then the discussion about the document itself will happen.

Provost Campbell said he hears Mark's question and there may be work that might need to be done that would take a longer time to answer in this room. However, one of the reasons they propose this change is there used to be a single destination and then went to multiple destinations. It is true that each prefix has a CIP code, each of those CIP codes is in one of four categories. Each of those four categories come with a particular set of student credit hours per average faculty salary in terms of the state appropriation. For example, MATH is level one and ENGR is level four. Thus it takes a lot more student credit hours earned in MATH to equal ENGR credit. The analysis was done on where we are with respect to that. We have one, two and three first year seminars that are at level two. And so there are some that are level one that will come up and some of them are level three that will come down. On average, if we look over the last three years, the analysis shows that we have been up or down on average by magnitude of 10,000 plus or minus dollars in terms of where we might have been in terms of making this move so he does not believe there needs to be further time for analysis and the reason for waiving the Comer Rule.

Regine Criser added that putting the document on the agenda with the request to waive the Comer Rule might look like this was a rushed decision. The fact is that this has been a conversation that has been happening since November about whether to move to the prefix or not. Those connected with the proposal have had time to look into logical implications, FTE implications, and credit hours in vacations and the benefits of moving to a shared prefix. Just because the document landed on the agenda relatively late should not imply that the conversations to make this happen were equally rushed. The reason APC 36 is on here with the request to waive the Comer Rule is because it would be ideal if we could publish the schedule that goes out on March 9 with the correct prefixes. At the same time, these courses will not be relevant until the first year students actually register for classes, which is not going to happen until April. If the Senate feels strongly that about having a month of conversation (though she has not had any phone conversations on any first read documents), the document will have time to go through two readings.

Marietta Cameron clarified why we have the Comer Rule. The Comer Rule not only provides

a month-long opportunity for discussion and consideration by Senators. The Comer Rule provides a month-long opportunity for our colleagues in the broader community to read the documents and have their concerns and questions addressed. The Comer Rule is a month-long opportunity for faculty at-large as well as Senators, if they so choose, to read the documents, come up with questions, and then seek out Senate members to have those concerns addressed. There have been documents in the past that were passed by the Senate after waiving the Comer Rule and then later, issues would be found and the Senate would have to go back and address those issues.

John Brock asked for clarification of the urgency or advantage to getting APC 36 passed today.

Sonya DiPalma replied that the urgency, as APC understood it, is so the prefix could be in place for registration.

Lynne Horgan further explained that they would like the prefixes to be in place for the schedule that will be published on Monday, March 9, 2020. If the prefixes are in place for that publication, there will be less confusion for the students.

Provost Campbell further added that there is value for a student who is trying to make a decision about UNCA to see consistency.

Mark McClure stated that, although he is not particularly a big fan of the Comer Rule, he has other objections to APC 36 as it stands prevents him from voting yes for the document.

The Faculty Senate passed waiving the Comer Rule for APC 36 by 13-2 and 2 abstentions. A motion was made to accept APC 36, which was seconded.

Discussion of APC 36:

Mark McClure explained that he sees the value of having the different prefixes from his experience of having taught MATH 178 several times. Apparently, it is a very general class that appeals to students who are more interested in the technical. He thinks it has worked well for students to come in having that understanding and not objecting to doing a little bit of algebra in the class. He would imagine that there is that same potential for the other first year experience classes. People coming in with different language skills, for example, or with a little bit of a programming background, would be able to have a little bit more discipline-specific opportunities. He is afraid that we might miss that a bit with the new prefixes.

Regine Criser believes those opportunities still exist.

Caroline Kennedy explained that APC discussed that at great length and one of the points brought up was the fact that we will still have different titles to relay the content since the title is not going to be First Year Seminar for all the courses with that prefix. The titles and the course descriptions will still be there so there will not be a surprise about the content of that course.

Provost Campbell agrees that it is an extremely important thing that we find ways to make the student's experience better by providing clarity. It is understood that there is confusion with the First Year Experience courses with the prefix of the discipline in that some students are thinking those courses are introductions to the discipline. The confusion for them is when they find out that these courses are not counted toward that major in some way. The FYS prefix solves that problem.

Regine Criser explained that we have a communication problem in certain areas with our incoming students where the prefix is misleading. The disciplinary prefix is misleading in various ways. On the one hand, students think that it might be an introduction to a discipline or to a major, which it is not. Sometimes students avoid classes because they think they need to have a specific skill set. Moving to the FYS prefix will make the course catalog more legible for the incoming students that this is an introduction to UNCA with specific content to a specific instructor and not

all instructors are teaching the same content. Another issue is we really need to do a better job also with our course descriptions. Our course descriptions need to be very specific about what we are doing, what we are offering students, who might this particularly appeal, etc. So the next step will be keeping the course titles and working on course descriptions for the descriptions will be much more effective in communicating what we want students to understand than adhering to disciplinary prefixes.

Tiece Ruffin explained that these courses used to have the ILS or Liberal arts core prefix. We also have had Liberal Arts 178 and Liberal Studies 179. She is grateful for this discussion. Her question is why now First Year Studies versus the previous destinations where she has taught LA 178, LS 179, and there was a transfer course with a different prefix. She is curious why the distinction of First Year Studies over the prior prefixes.

Provost Campbell replied all we are trying to do is to figure out what works best in terms of communicating to students. This felt more fitting to the whole. And there are still other LA courses still on the books so he understands the question of asking why not be in the same bucket. The committee thought these courses are different and this prefix would be a way to make it as clear as possible to students, especially incoming students..

Tiece Ruffin said she asked this question because LA 178 is part of the Liberal Arts Core and 179, whatever it is going to be now, is still part of the liberal arts core. She is not sure what the wider UNCA community feels about changing the prefix to First Year Studies because, although the First Year Experience Committee has been working on this, this is the first time Dr. Ruffin has heard about the prefix change.

Regine Criser relayed that they have received only one response from the campus community about this document and the faculty member's concern was in regards to student credit hours and FTEs.

Jake Butera sees the benefit of the FYS prefix as part of the first year experience and he thinks that clarity in communication is really important. The idea is that in the first year, students are getting some sort of unified connected experience. These courses having the same designator prefix would emphasize that connection clearly. The marketing and advertising would clearly show this deliberate first year emphasis.

Jessica Pisano replied that the committee has not talked about doing that yet, but she thinks Jake Butera's point is a good suggestion. Her understanding for FYS over LA is there are students who do not know that LA represents "liberal arts" and what liberal arts means.

Regine Criser replied that the first year studies prefix was set up to distinguish those courses that are a first year studies 178 course that is the first year seminar. If we decide down the road to expand, we will have the ability to create a prefix to address those that Jake Butera presented.

Tiece Ruffin had a followup question. Is this the norm? Or are we thinking outside the box and thinking seriously creative?

Regine Criser replied we are thinking inside the box of other universities, many of whom have a first year seminar and courses part of a common first year studies have a specific prefix designation for the first year experience..

Amanda Wray asked whether only first year students take these classes. Will transfer students, students who started college at a different university, or returning students required to take these courses - students who are not first year students take these courses and then are incorrectly labeled a first year student.

Regine Criser believes UNCA has always used this term for students in their first year at this

university who have less than 35 hours.

Lynne Horgan explained as long as all the college credit is taken during high school before their high school graduation date, then they are coded as a first-year student. The 178s are restricted for registration purposes so no other students can add them other than first-year students.

Marietta Cameron relayed a question from a colleague. What does the prefix FYS stand for - First Year Studies or First Year Seminar. Her understanding is FYS stands for First Year Studies.

Regine Criser explained that we will still list the individual course titles that come from the instructor. FYS 178 will always be the First Year Seminar. FYS is First Year Studies. These listings will be on the registration list and not in the course catalog since these first-year courses change every semester.

Sonya DiPalma relayed a question she has from a colleague. The first-year experience, a pilot project was presented to chairs and program directors as just that - a pilot program. But now these suggested changes are implying something that might be irreversible. What if the pilot does not go as well as expected? Why make these changes before the pilot is tested? Should not making a permanent change in our Liberal Arts Core Curriculum deserve much more time and careful discussion about impacts before passing the document?

Regine Criser wanted to remind everybody that we are talking about changing a prefix of a class. While she appreciates everyone taking this very seriously, but then again, we are talking about a prefix to a class. There are two things happening. The first thing is that we want to change the prefix for all first year seminars in order to communicate more effectively the purpose of the seminars to our incoming students. The second thing is we got to have a great pilot that involves five sections of 178, five sections of Humanities 124, and five sections of LANG 120. While changing the First Year Seminar prefix and beginning the pilot program will both happen in the fall, they are not connected to each other. If we vote to keep the prefix, and the pilot is a disaster, then we will still keep the FYS prefix because those two things are not related.

Jake Butera added that since he has been here (past 8 years) we have had three different prefixes and so none of these are permanent.

Jessica Pisano reiterated the point that Regine Criser made to say that they do not know how the pilot program will go, but they will be assessing and reporting back to the faculty.

Regine Criser wanted to stress that there has been a lot of careful thinking and planning into all the decisions that have been made. She wanted to further stress what she said earlier that there still needs to be a sense of urgency and recognition that we are making decisions about our incoming first year students not on a monthly basis rather on a daily basis. If we can do something relatively small like changing the prefix to signal to our students more clearly who we are, what we do and why we do it - this is beneficial to students.

Patrick Bahls wanted to add that communicating to our students he believes is of prime importance. He also thinks it is important to communicate to our faculty what the First Year Seminars mean. He believes there is a lot of confusion among faculty as to what they mean and how they are taught, precipitating from their philosophy or presumed philosophy about those courses. Changing the prefix will not only clearly communicate to students but will also signal to our colleagues that the First Year Seminars are meant to be first year experiences and not introductions to a major.

Sonya DiPalma presented another question from a colleague (these are questions she received from the campus community). Who would oversee all the sections of FYS 178 if they are

no longer being solicited by department chairs and sent to an FYS coordinator. Has there been a discussion about the creation of a program director and would this person need extra time and compensation for the extra work it would take?

Regine Criser introduced herself as the current coordinator of the existing First Year Seminars. She works with department chairs to solicit First Year Seminars and coordinates by working with faculty about what they should teach so all first year seminars are on the same page about what these seminars offer. She does this for a stipend. She does not receive a course release.

Sonya DiPalma presented the second part of the colleague's question. If this document passes, will the position require more collaborative work outside of the classroom for the coordinator as well as for the faculty teaching the seminars? Has this been discussed as to how to support this and how to sustain this?

Regine Criser thinks the coordination or collaboration currently is at an appropriate level necessary for the pilot program. She is working with 15 faculty and they are in conversation with the Provost about what kind of resources and support those faculty will get for that extra work. Regine Criser works with Jessica Pisano and Kate Zubko setting up the structure of faculty support for the pilot program. She does not perceive any additional workload.

Jessica Pisano explained that all of the fifteen faculty members who are participating in this pilot have agreed to do this. This is work that they are excited about doing because they are excited about helping first-year students make connections between the things that they are learning in these classes, and how the work that they will be doing in the world and their life in general is benefited by liberal arts. Nobody is being strong armed into this. Faculty are happy to do this work.

Regine Criser emphasized that we are facing a communication barrier probably and that we might want to address this before the minutes come out a month from now. She suggests that we need to think about how we can share more of the work that has been happening with regard to the first year experience with the majority of faculty faster and possibly not just in an email because those do not seem to reach everyone.

Marietta Cameron wanted to point out a couple of things. Faculty who have taught in previous incarnations of the First Year Seminar have been just as dedicated and just as committed as those who are currently participating. A prefix change or not, does not change that at all. Second, those that have taught the seminar and want to do it, but for whatever reason cannot teach it this year, are no less committed to the first year experience. Also the questions people are asking might be challenging, but they come from past experiences that deserve answers, and the questions deserve not to be seen as some type of attack. The First Year Colloquium has not only been just about introducing the liberal arts philosophy. Many of the disciplines have seen this as a way to introduce students to their discipline for students may not have thought about that discipline before. It is not a fulfillment of the discipline, but an invitation to explore the discipline.

Jessica Pisano responded that these questions are definitely important, and she did not mean to suggest in her passionate response that they were not. She was just trying to address the question brought to our attention to say that everyone participating in the pilot program is willing and excited about this work. That was her only point and she was not suggesting others are not.

Tiece Ruffin asked since the word "studies" implies - like African Studies implies - that you can continue to study or is first year studies only one course. The word "studies" has the implication beyond the prefix change that implies that there could be something additional.

Regine Criser thinks there may at some point options to add other first year studies. At the same time, right now it is an introduction to their studies on this campus. Studies in this sense is

not a match to the meaning of studies in Africana Studies. Her idea is to have the flexibility to add other first year studies courses later.

Volker Frank said he has taught this course a long time ago. He believes it cuts both ways in terms of trying to be fair and represent the discipline while representing the institution, which is complex. However, he believes this is beginning to be a little bit of a Kafka conversation where we can look at this many different ways to the point that negates the benefit to the students. This proposal creates a group called First Year Studies for all the students who are new here. That can be helpful.

APC 36 passed 14-2 and 2 abstentions. Sonya DiPalma thanked everyone for the discussion.

Second Reading

- [APC 16](#) Addition of new course, PSYC 206, Cultural Psychology
- [APC 17](#) Delete PSYC 345, Child Clinical Psychology and PSYC 355, Psychology of Family Violence
- [APC 18](#) Change the Major and Minor Requirements in Psychology (Pam Laughon, Mark Harvey, Michael Neelon, PSYC)

- [APC 19](#) Add new course, HIST 392, Global Revolutions
- [APC 20](#) Delete HIST 388, Introduction to Islam replacing it with HIST 385, Islam in Historical Perspective; Delete RELS 388
- [APC 21](#) Increase the possible credit hours for HIST 395, and allow for it to be repeated
- [APC 22](#) Allow Special Topics Classes to count toward Category I History requirements (Daniel Pierce, HIST)

- [APC 23](#) Amend the prerequisite listing in the following course descriptions: POLS 320, 321, 325, 326, 327, 351, 354, 359, 363, 365, 368, 383, 387, and 389
- [APC 24](#) Updating course descriptions for POLS 290, 320, and 490 (Linda Cornett and Ashley Moraguez, POLS)

APC 16 through APC 24 was passed unanimously by APC and will be bundled together unless a senator would like to pull a document for discussion. No documents were pulled for discussion. Sonya DiPalma asked for a motion to accept APC 16 through APC 24, which was seconded. No discussion. APC 16 through APC 24 passed without dissent. APC 23 and APC 24 had 1 abstention.

- IX. Institutional Development Committee / UPC: Second Vice Chair Patrick Bahls
 - A. Update on a proposal under review by IDC (a new minor in Leadership & Innovation)
 - B. Update on ongoing work on developing new policies and processes for establishment of new minor and certificate programs and review and evaluation of existing programs (minors, majors, and certificates)

IDC 3 Proposal of a dual-degree program between our Political Science Department and the University of Essex

Patrick Bahls gave a short update on the work IDC has been doing. There were discussions over the past couple of months on a proposed new interdisciplinary minor, Leadership and Innovation. After some discussion, the proposers have withdrawn their proposal for the present time.

IDC also has worked on guidelines for the establishment of new disciplinary minor and certificate programs. That work is twofold where they drafted guidelines for establishing not only interdisciplinary minors and certificates but also potentially new majors. This was inspired by the work of the previous IDC last year where Senate passed the criteria for a framework for new master's programs. The documents IDC drafted are not meant to be an exhaustive checklist. The guidelines help proposers of new programs to anticipate particular questions that might come up in terms of resource implications and impact on the institution at large as well as promote best practices while providing regular review and evaluation of existing programs. They have been helped by Amanda Bell in Institutional Research who has helped identify a number of other institutions who are doing this work and doing it quite well. IDC is looking at those as models right now with the hopes of extracting from those UNCA-specific ideas that will work well in our particular institutional context.

Recently, APC was sent a parallel document that has come to IDC from our colleagues in Political Science. They are proposing a dual degree program with the University of Essex. This is in its infancy and IDC will be having a first reading on that document at their next meeting, which will be the second week following spring break.

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

[Decision Summaries](#)

***First Reading**

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

Second Reading

[FWDC 1](#) Revise (SD 2282) Policy on Academic Misconduct
Faculty Handbook Section 8.3.2

[FWDC 2](#) Revise (SD 2981) Student Grievance Procedure
Faculty Handbook Section 8.3.4

FWDC had one document for First Reading. Regarding the Second Reading Documents, Aubri Rote asked for a motion to accept FWDC 1 for discussion, which was seconded. No discussion. FWDC 1 passed without dissent. A motion was made to accept FWDC 2, which was seconded. No discussion. FWDC 2 passed without dissent.

Faculty Senate Items of Discussion:

A. **Faculty Evaluation:**

FWDC is pursuing changes to the Handbook on how faculty are evaluated, both annually and for tenure and promotion. Using data from several other institutions, they are developing a

structure that accounts for faculty teaching workload in relation to expectations for service and scholarship. For example, in this model, faculty teaching 24 credits would have fewer expectations surrounding service and scholarship compared to faculty teaching 20 credits. Faculty teaching 20 credits would have fewer expectations surrounding service and scholarship compared to faculty teaching 16 credits and so on. They will also work with Provost Campbell to update the Annual Faculty Record and Faculty Performance Appraisal to align these with language changes to the Handbook.

At the March 5 Faculty Senate meeting, they sought input on this model with the intention of bringing proposed Handbook changes for first reading to the April 9 Faculty Senate meeting.

Aubri Rote started the discussions saying FWDC brought these topics for discussion purposely without documents to gather Senate's feedback.

Provost Campbell explained the current annual faculty record makes it is very difficult to understand the various service levels for various faculty are. One thing in the works is a change of the annual faculty record to capture better what faculty are doing. For example regarding teaching, faculty may be teaching 3 courses, but some faculty like junior faculty are doing more work in their three courses due to the higher number of preps than other faculty. This is an example of the invisible work that needs to be captured. This is not exactly what this discussion is particularly about, but Provost Campbell wanted to relay that he does wish to change our teaching load. The current expectation of teaching 24 credit hours makes for a very challenging environment for faculty to do anything else. Field service and research can take a big hit in that kind of environment. How can we develop a system that helps make this equitable as well as clear that everybody who has a service and/or research obligations can have their teaching load calibrated to a reasonable level. He wanted Faculty Senate to talk about this beforehand so they can incorporate faculty ideas into their proposal.

Jake Butera brought up a few points. One was how difficult it was for junior faculty to say no and feel obligated to service. The second is the need for clear expectations regarding tenure. There is a lack of clarity of what exactly is expected, what exactly is looked for especially depending on division, discipline, and so on. The last point he made was faculty compensation has a huge amount of subjectivity involved that there are equity concerns.

Volker Frank cautioned about putting things in the Faculty Handbook that appear rigid because in five years or ten years the wording will need to be reworked. He suggests having some form of consistency that speaks to the identity of who we are as an institution. He recommends light wording in the handbook rather than heavy wording.

Aubri Rote replied if things change then we can change the handbook.

Jake Butera clarified that he was not asking for a rigid checklist for rigidity and clarity are not equivalent.

Caroline Kennedy brought up that vagueness is helpful in some ways but leaves the possibility open for things to build up and get out of control. For example, every new faculty member in the Biology Department was told one paper a year is required, which is absurd, especially if you're teaching a full load.

Tiece Ruffin felt the Faculty Handbook is a dynamic document, not a static one. We have changed a prefix three times for the first year experience and so we keep adding to the handbook. She believes that should be expected. She does have a clarification question for she noticed no mention of the core values: diversity, inclusion, sustainability and innovation. She is curious

whether that will be taken into consideration beyond service and scholarship? How do we embed those core values? Of course, she is particularly interested in the diversity and inclusion core value.

Provost Campbell replied as the new annual faculty record is rolled out, faculty will see that those values are explicitly included. The annual faculty record and this effort are two sides of the same coin that should be speaking to each other. He has worked more on the annual record than this part thus far. He hopes they will have pilot users this year to assess and then next year roll it completely out in full. They hope by having this discussion they can propose a policy balanced with the right amount of flexibility and openness while being concrete enough to give real guidance so faculty do not think they have to say yes to everything, produce out of their mind, and sacrifice family time. We hope to move away from that and yet maintain our values.

Tiece Ruffin asked whether there will be a change in the categories. She has been here ten years. When she started in 2010, the categories were not “below standard”, “standard”, “accomplished”, “superior”, and “exceptional.” They were “outstanding” and other rankings.

Aubri Rote replied FWDC is also considering changing those categories. Actually, that is where FWDC started and quickly realized that they could not change those that without addressing how faculty are actually evaluated.

Ashley Moraguez stated she is very supportive of this for all the reasons that have been articulated. Her perception as a junior faculty member is expectations have increasingly ballooned every year she has been here that she admits might be partially due to her putting those expectations upon herself. Her concern is in regards to clarifications of teaching, service, and research expectations and how the balancing between those will look. For example, how will the balance look between those who have a 24 credit hour teaching load and those who have course release for service and research.

Aubri Rote explained that some university models have clear language regarding teaching load of 20 credit hours. They start with that and then for service or research, you go down to 16 credit hours. This is also more equitable for we do have faculty on campus who teach half loads and do research. This is the proposed intentional way of writing that down so for faculty who have halftime teaching loads there are higher expectations for producing scholarship and service.

Caroline Kennedy asked how lecturers are considered in this because in her opinion this has been really unclear. In terms of faculty performance appraisals, there is a need for clarity about how lecturers are appraised and who they are compared to on campus. Oftentimes there is only one lecturer in a department. She wonders if FWDC has discussed specifically how lecturers and senior lecturers are to be compared.

Provost Campbell agreed that he has come to understand better how widely varied the expectations for lecturers can be. Also, as mentioned, the difficulty of making this uniform across areas. Uniformity is one of the most difficult things to determine especially since faculty in the arts and humanities are different from the sciences and the sciences are different within disciplines. Defining a norm in a way that works across many disciplines is something that is always hard, but as Aubri Rote said, there are lots of models out there so we do not have to reinvent the wheel. The lecturer issue has come up for when there is a lecturer search, we realize in the ads from different disciplines there are different expectations of lecturers. While uniformity is needed, there needs to be the right amount of flexibility for the disciplines. We have not gotten to that yet, but it is on the docket.

John Brock asked whether the Provost was working towards moving from a 24 credit hour model to a 20 credit hour model.

Provost Campbell would like to go to an 18 credit hour model. He would love for the UNC System to allow and fund UNCA at that level. He would like us to consider what we could do now to prepare for that.

John Brock felt we are at 20 credit hour level now with all the reassigned time and papers.

Provost Campbell said he would not characterize our current situation that way. He would say that there are some faculty members at 24 and some at a lower level since the balance for each category of teaching, service and research has not been determined and the numbers associated with those known. It is known that there is a lot of reassigned time on the books and have to understand who is getting what, what the expectations are, and the changes needed to bring balance where all faculty share responsibility to their departments and disciplines for its teaching loads as well as research and service to the institution.

David Clarke stated, as a soon to be former chair, he used the department's value statement in evaluations and found that to be rock solid. He has talked about the one paper per year model and most of his department's faculty exceed that. When faculty do not perform to that level, there are other ways like some have multi-dimensional research or writing grants that would be the equivalent of one paper. When you get a letter of intent, you write that down so his department is pretty successful. He has to say for lecturers there are problems because they fill out the same faculty records but do not receive the same compensation.

Aubri Rote said that the value statement may provide success in getting tenure but wonders if that helps new faculty balancing work life expectations.

Provost Campbell asked whether the departmental value statements have ever been put on the table and compared to each other. His understanding is they have not. Value statements are great, but something institutionally has to be done with those as well.

Volker Frank expressed that part of this conversation is the reactive dimension where we are trying to fix things that we have neglected or ignored and perhaps we could think in a more proactive way. He is glad we are having this conversation within the context of FWDC, because FWDC's view is in terms of a welfare issue for faculty. Perhaps IDC or UPC should look at this from an institutional perspective having conversations with the Chancellor and the Provost about where they see our institution in five to ten years.

Amanda Wray agreed things are definitely changing, and that is good. She also wanted to state that internships and service learning has not ever been equitable across this campus nor valued. It has been difficult for her to have community engagement be considered at the same level as scholarship on the annual faculty record.

Marietta Cameron wanted to address the clarity versus rigor issue. People have said she is overbearing regarding process at one point and then another point says she is overbearing on rigor. There have been times when she has expressed concern over bias in a situation where people point to a rule as why we do something and say it has nothing to do with bias. Then when she abides by the rule then she is told the rule is too rigorous by upholding the rule. As a result, certain people and demographics get an exception and understanding while others do not. In regards to junior faculty feeling unable to say no, she knows senior faculty also feel obligated to say yes and are unable to say no. The magic tenure wand does not alleviate this problem and it needs to be addressed across the board for all faculty.

Provost Campbell hopes the new annual faculty record will produce data so we can address issues that Amanda Wray and Marietta Cameron speak about where we can hold a mirror to ourselves that is accurate so we can see if we are who we think we are. For example, regarding the

issue of service, Is service going to a certain group? Is it going to newer faculty within the first year? Is it going to tenured faculty? Is it going to women? Is it going to men? Is it going to those that are of a particular race? We can ask those questions. The intent of the new faculty record is to collect the data in a way that we can then turn back around to the community and say, "This is who we are." and "Are we happy with this? Are we okay with this? What are we doing?" The new faculty record lets us begin to truly address these issues.

Tiece Ruffin said that she was told at the Social Sciences Chairs Meeting work that if they are being paid it is not considered service, so we need clarity on service. In her opinion regardless of whether some directors and coordinators receive a stipend, their work should be considered service.

Provost Campbell said that another purpose of the faculty record is to see what faculty are paid for and whether the categorization and compensation is comparable to other faculty members who are doing the same service in the whole context so to understand differences in compensation.

Jessica Pisano said that in understanding the full context, she thinks it is also important to take into consideration those faculty who are doing their job for under market value that is not equitable across disciplines.

Aubri Rote understands what Jessica Pisano is saying. However, she has not seen in the models she has reviewed, but she agrees this is problematic that needs to be accounted for in our evaluations especially since, at the moment, we have an R1 expectation for research and a 24 credit hour teaching load. That is inhumane.

Provost Campbell stated that although he and Aubri Rote have different opinions about expectation levels for faculty, he does agree that it is inhumane to have an R1 expectation with a 24 credit hour teaching load. That is absolutely crazy. The question around whether faculty with higher teaching loads may not be expected to have a research component to their workload. The perspective he has articulated is it is too dangerous for us to have a possibility of zero research as an expectation. Tenured track faculty should absolutely have a research expectation to get tenure. Impediments should be removed to make it possible to do the work. Whether that means reducing service or to lighten the teaching load, resources are needed to make the change.

Marietta Cameron said she has an imperfect analogy of her department where she is trying to come up with a semester schedule while maximizing her colleagues happiness and satisfaction. She has some colleagues who despise 8 o'clock classes and others who despise evening classes. Being able to come up with a working schedule while accommodating her colleagues preferences is the desired outcome. Moving on from that analogy to looking at this where not every faculty member has equal talents and preferences in terms of teaching, research and service - from her viewpoint and experience, this is very unrealistic that faculty should excel in all three components. There are some things each faculty member is better at and there are some things that faculty are a little bit weaker. Her wonders why not let those who excel and enjoy research do that while a balancing colleague who enjoys the service element and teaching. She believes the department as a whole should be strong in all three areas of teaching, service and research as opposed to all faculty members being strong in all three areas.

Provost Campbell agreed that faculty should have some flexibility. However, in this conversation, we are talking about minimum expectations. That is different from allowing some balance, but we have to be able to articulate both. In this context, he is talking about minimum

expectations. Can a faculty member get tenure with a minimum expectation of no research? He would argue that we should find a way for the answer to that question to be no.

Marietta Cameron expressed concern regarding policies saying there is a research expectation for tenure track and there is not a research expectation for lecturers. She is afraid policies like these would bring us back to a class/tier system where tenured faculty have a higher value over lecturers and research is valued over service.

Provost Campbell agreed that there are some challenges in this where we have to figure out a way to not create a class system in the sense that one is valued more than another.

Volker Frank asked where this conversation originated from.

Aubri Rote replied that this started last year but originated from the listening sessions that FWDC conducted three years ago.

Volker Frank asked whether they have seen a document from ten years ago regarding multiple modes of scholarship.

Provost Campbell said he had not seen the document here.

Volker Frank said when he was chair of his department, Karin Peterson chaired a committee charged to look at that. They worked very hard and long and came up with multiple modes of scholarship in order to strike a fair balance between teaching, scholarship, and service.

Jeff Konz understood that the document went through FWDC and there were changes regarding the language of scholarship, teaching and learning from that in the form of the Community engaged scholarship as well as an ethical statement that other forms are valid forms.

Tiece Ruffin was glad that was mentioned because she was looking for other words beyond research.

Mark McClure was struck by use of the word research whereas this campus uses the term scholarship to convey that.

Provost Campbell admitted he was using a shorthand term. The way that he has typically and historically thought about this is research and creative production because all of those things are slightly different and important.

Mark McClure said since he became a full professor, his creativity has changed, but he feels as creative as ever. He writes a lot and contributes to open educational resources that do not carry the same gravity that writing to a professional journal has and he understands that but wonders how that fits and how do we value these types of scholarship.

Provost Campbell agreed that is a great point. Creative production should be valued but where is the line in distinguishing creative production and writing a blog post. There has to be a line somewhere in terms of what counts and what does not as well as the extent and level of rigor. His point is there has to be a way those things can be critiqued and vetted.

Mark McClure pointed out that one of the challenges with the many new modes of communication is figuring out how to potentially value these like blog posts because often his blog post is cited by Scientific American. There is not a definitive way to judge that kind of work.

Provost Campbell expressed that while he understands Mark McClure's point there has to be a mechanism to help us have good judgment about these things and we do not have to reinvent the wheel. There are models out there.

B. Chair Compensation

FWDC continues its work on creating a more equitable structure for Department Chair compensation, both for reassigned time during the year and for stipends. The creation of an

algorithm based on the number of full-time faculty, adjuncts, and number of students in the department is currently underway.

At the March 5 Faculty Senate meeting, FWDC sought input on this model with the intention of bringing proposed Handbook changes for first reading to the April 9 Faculty Senate meeting.

Aubri Rote began by saying this issue has been discussed for several years. FWDC is currently working with the Provost and some others to create a more equitable structure for Chair compensation. Currently, a chair receives an additional month of salary as compensation. FWDC is seeking to change that to be aligned with what the work actually is and be more equitable by not basing it on base salary.

Provost Campbell added when he arrived, there was a document passed by the Faculty Senate that said we should move to a flat rate for all chairs. He does not feel quite right with that change for it seems like the flat rate does not take into account the size of the department in terms of student enrollment and other factors. They seek to take into account the differences in the complexity and the size of the departments. It is an imperfect measurement, but he hopes to find a way for a flat rate plus a bit.

Jake Butera asked whether these same questions are being asked about compensation for program directors.

Aubri Rote replied that it is really hard to combine these two discussions because there are so many more chairs and an easier place to start since the department chair position is technically the same job. She knows people do it differently where some delegate more than others. However, in the handbook, it is the same job; whereas program director positions all differentiated. That discussion is definitely still happening to make those also more equitable as well.

Ashley Moraguez asked if we are moving away from base salary to a level where we are basing it on complexity and things like that. Will there be clear standards?

Aubri Rote replied that we need to improve the clarity of the handbook on what can and cannot be delegated.

Provost Campbell stated that it is true that some of the chairs of smaller departments have concerns because they do everything.

Susan Clark wanted to express one thought and one concern. Her thought is there might be the underlying consideration regarding market forces on certain disciplines' base salary that challenges determining an equitable base salary that should not be pushed under the rug for it is the bigger conversation. Her other concern is particularly for those departments and programs that are on a higher pay scale where unintended negative consequences might cause issues in recruiting faculty for chair positions in the future.

Aubri Rote said one of the ideas being considered is faculty chairing multiple departments and they know of one instance of that on campus where this seems to be actually working well.

Tiece Ruffin said there are also issues where some departments have chairs and associate chairs who receive stipends and course releases which further complicate this issue.

Marietta Cameron wanted to back up what Susan Clark has said. Dr. Cameron has actually heard colleagues say that and she is not talking about her department. She has heard colleagues from other departments say that if the chair stipends decrease as much as indicated that they would not want to serve as chair. Coming from a department that has the higher market value rate in computer science, she is not going to dance around the issue. She believes she gives this institution more than its money's worth and some days it is a thankless job. Regardless whether it is considered service for the purposes of evaluations, it feels like a whole lot of service. There are

additional issues because the department chair position is a rotating position. Issues like the chair is one day making decisions and evaluations then tomorrow someone else is - a person who you made evaluations and gave feedback on. The issue of retaliation is real in these circumstances. Also, there are different perceptions across the disciplines on what the chair position is supposed to be. Some chairs think that they have more power than they actually have. She personally perceives it to be a weak position because the department chair does not make the hiring or firing decisions.

Regine Criser said this discussion has been occurring in FWDC for two years now and the conversation is not based on the assumption that chairs make enough money nor is based on the assumption that chairs should make less money. Nobody is saying that. What FWDC came up upon, based on the listening sessions and their concern for their colleague's welfare, is that there are gross inequities across pay for a position that in the handbook is very clearly defined. These inequities have intense implications for the current campus climate. She understands where some will not be willing to do this work for less while there are others doing the same work for much less money. This has been a harsh discussion in FWDC because there are department chairs who serve on FWDC. FWDC is addressing this equity issue because they feel as the Faculty Welfare and Development Committee that this is a huge faculty welfare issue for our entire campus. If we were to move forward with the package FWDC is currently considering, the stipend would increase for most chairs and decrease for some in order to increase the welfare for the campus at large and that is what the Faculty Welfare and Development Committee is supposed to be doing. That is where this discussion is coming from.

Marietta Cameron appreciates the work that Faculty Welfare and Development Committee has done. From the Senate Document that passed last year, she definitely understands the work and the intent. She also understands that Senate does not decide the amount of the stipend. In essence, we have recommended the flat rate, but someone else is over this and this is not within our jurisdiction. There are also other factors weighing on workload that come from higher student enrollments and division of roles where some chairs are not only chairs but are also the Advising Liaison and Admission Liaison. These should figure into the formula rate as well. She is grateful for the Former Provost Karin Peterson's concern, for Brian Butler's concern, and for our current Provost Campbell's concern about what the ramification of that document that passed the Senate actually means, and she is glad that we are having this discussion beyond FWDC.

Jake Butera said his understanding is that flat rates taken off the table.

Aubri Rote replied he is correct that FWDC has now moved on to something that might account for workload.

Tiece Ruffin said other duties like community engagement and connection with Student Affairs need to be considered as part of the workload. As an example, although she is over a small Africana Studies program, she meets community leaders, Executive Directors and other community partners in addition to the staff from Student Affairs, Residential Education, and Multicultural Affairs. She asked to remember that community engagement and any partnership with Student Affairs as part of an academic unit in what the chairs and program directors are required to do.

Aubri Rote said the current idea would be that we would have an algorithm based on factors that are common among chairs and then have some flexibility for chairs that have different responsibilities and have a conversation about additional complexities that add to the job.

Marietta Cameron wanted to also point out that there is additional workload due to department makeup. For example, a department that could have mostly junior faculty, which

means the chair will be writing reappointment or tenure letters. Activities like this are hard to formulate especially since there are different perceptions about what the role of chairs is. There are some departments that will look at the chair's role as a representative coordinator, representing the will of the department. Other departments see the chair as the manager who makes the final decisions. These terms of talking about these things are all interconnected.

Aubri Rote summarized that FWDC is certainly taking this feedback very seriously and integrating it, but there will never be a perfect formula. However, all faculty have these issues where from year to year they have different student enrollment numbers in their classes while they are not paid any differently. Student dynamics may be troubling one year and not the next year, but the pay is not differentiated due to that. Getting too much in the weeds may cause a lack of needed change. She is not willing to not change for the better because any formula is better than the current policy. She understands there are many, many different complexities that change year from year, but we can never predict all of them. She does not see the challenges in determining a formula as an adequate argument to not do this.

Marietta Cameron wanted to clarify that she is not saying to not do anything, She is actually trying to say some things that should be considered in enhancing the formula as well as bringing up concerns of chairs who could not attend the Senate meeting. What one may consider in the weeds could be considered a major concern by another person.

Marietta Cameron thanked FWDC for sponsoring these conversations in front of the full Senate.

XI. Old Business

John Brock stated regarding the Hearings Committee ballot that we have nominees in Social Sciences but not in Humanities. He asked if the senators know anyone who would be good to serve on the Hearings Committee from Humanities that would be really helpful. Let them know there is summer time serving on the Hearings Committee when issues roll into the Summer Semester. This may be a factor in the low number of nominees.

Marietta Cameron suggested that John Brock also contact Wiebke Strehl, the Humanities Dean and talk with the Provost.

XII. New Business

XIII. Announcements

XIV. Adjourn

Marietta Cameron thanked everyone for their attention, time and patience. The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.