

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

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

Excused Members: M. McClure, T. Ruffin.

Visitors: E. Boyce, S. Broberg, J. Butera, B. Butler, A. Dunn, S. Earle, B. Haggard, M. Himelein, H. Holt, L. Horgan, J. Konz, A. Shope, E. Spence, W. Strehl, D. Traywick, D. Weldon, G. Voos.

I. Call to Order and Welcome

On behalf of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee officers, Laura Bond welcomed back faculty, staff and students to another full academic year, and the opportunity to value and support shared governance through faculty senate operations.

Laura Bond also extended a warm welcome to our new Provost, Dr. Garikai Campbell, and welcomed him to his first faculty senate meeting. The Faculty Senate looks forward to collaborating in these meetings, as well as within our subcommittee meetings.

II. Recognition of Micheal Stratton's service for two years as Faculty Senate Chair

The first order of business was to present the former Senate Chair Micheal Stratton with his engraved gavel and block and express appreciation for his service as Faculty Senate Chair (2017-18 and 2018-19).

III. Approval of Minutes: [May 2, 2019 3:15 p.m.](#)
[The Standing Rules and Rules of Order – 2019-20](#)

IV. Executive Committee Report: Faculty Senate Chair Laura Bond

Staff Council: Chair Erin Spence

This last spring Staff Council held their first election. Staff Council is no longer appointed by the Vice Chancellors but is elected by their peers. The council has 18 members based on the size of each division: 2 from Advancement; 5 from Administration and Finance, Strategy and Information Management; 2 from Chancellor's Office, 3 from Student Affairs, 4 from Academic Affairs, and 2 from Athletics and University Enterprises.

Over the summer, they completed a survey of staff needs and concerns so Staff Council could prioritize their goals for the upcoming academic year. At the moment, Staff Council has identified the need to create a Staff Ombuds position, clarification and understanding of various policies and implications on staff (like community service leave),

professional development for staff, employee recognition and morale concerns, and more organized community and campus service initiatives.

Chair Erin Spence met with the Senate EC this summer and is excited about initiatives that Senate and Staff Council can work on together. Staff Council will be working on the State Employees Combined Campaign and any support from the Faculty Senate to encourage faculty members to consider giving would be appreciated. She will have more information about these items at a later date.

Staff Council holds open meetings each month on the second Wednesday at 3:00 p.m. in the Red Oak Conference Room of Ramsey Library.

[Overview of the ALICE Training:](#)

Chief Eric Boyce and David Weldon,
Director of Emergency Management

ALICE Training is based on the concepts of run, hide, and fight or ALICE that represents Alert, Lockdown, Inform, Counter and Evade. This is the fourth year that this training has been provided for students, staff, and faculty. The training is comprised of a lecture portion where concepts are explained and the importance of contacting the Care Crisis Team, your Department Chair, or the University Police if you feel someone is at risk– the concept is called “See Something, Say Something.” There is also a practical component to the training where participants (who are recommended to dress comfortably for movement) are taught how to lock down a building or an office using common accessible items found in offices. Participants are also instructed on how to effectively escape and consider options of fight or encounter. It is unfortunate that we have to teach a program of this type at an institution of higher learning, however, we believe this type of training made a difference in the recent incident at UNC Charlotte.

Look for email regarding ALICE trainings this year (link is above). A minimum of 10 people is needed to hold a class.

The need for identifying and training Building Coordinators was also mentioned as the identified “Goto” persons in emergency situations. This is another key to moving forward in campus safety development.

Many senators recommend this training and commended David Weldon, Chief Boyce and their staff for their dedication to providing this training to our community.

Update on New University Marketing:

Sarah Broberg,
Special Assistant to the Chancellor

Sarah Broberg gave a presentation to Faculty Senate regarding the new university marketing developments.

MLAS Review:

Faculty Senate Chair Laura Bond

Laura Bond read into the minutes the [Monday, July 29, 2019 email](#) sent to Senators from the Senate Executive Committee. Since the email went out, the Senate Subcommittees have been meeting working on the first step of the three-step process, which the Senate Chair read into the minutes:

MLAS Program Review Process

FIRST STEP: Define a Universal Review Process (*Approximately 2-3 weeks*)

Each subcommittee's objective in this first step is to design a repeatable, objective, and fair process for reviewing any UNC Asheville program.

Subcommittees are referring to review questions adopted by the UNC Board of Governors to establish program review standards.

Subcommittees are also encouraged to identify review questions and criteria that may be more specific to UNC Asheville or to the review area for which each subcommittee is charged with for the MLAS program review.

SECOND STEP: Apply the Review to Data Collection and Information Gathering (3-4 weeks)

Subcommittees will use data provided by senior staff, the MLAS program, IREP, as well as any other pertinent sources necessary to answer the review questions fully.

THIRD STEP: Report on Findings and Recommendations (*Preferably by Mid to Late October, 2019*)

Questions:

Regine Criser asked why we were creating standards when there is the Board of Governors Standards. Laura Bond explained that the Executive Committee wanted to leave the door open in case subcommittees felt there were additional standards specific to our institution's mission since we are the designated liberal arts institution. If the subcommittees determine that the UNC system standard review questions are adequate, then that course of action would be fine as well.

There was a question regarding how the Senate could use the same standards for both undergraduate and graduate programs. Laura Bond shared that the UNC System standard questions for reviewing a program do not vary between the master program and the undergraduate program. Patrick Bahls said that IDC does recognize the differences and plans to craft different criteria that recognizes differences between those two type of programs.

Micheal Stratton asked what the role of Senate is in this review and who triggers program reviews. He believes we need to be clear on Senate's specific role and what/who triggers a review. Laura Bond answered that there could be various sources. Her understanding is that a report is sent from the UNC system office identifying programs that are rated by the system as "Low Productivity" and institutions, including their faculty, are to address those in a responding report. In this instance with the MLAS program's tabled enrollments, the Faculty Senate was not consulted on the decision beforehand and according to our Shared Governance Standards should have been included before such decisions were made. Marietta Cameron explained that some faculty have come to the Faculty Senate and requested a review of the program. It is Faculty Senate's role to respond to our colleagues when they come to Senate regarding matters involving curriculum for which we are responsible according to UNCA and the UNC System policies, as well as the UNC Faculty Assembly Shared Governance resolution. The work will be hard but she believes that Senate should give consultation concerning the program. If this was happening to her program, Marietta Cameron would like that consideration given.

Laura Bond stated that the EC is dedicated to supporting the creation of a universal, objective review process. She further suggested that it might help if each of us imagined if this

was our own program under review. Our colleagues have asked us to review the program, for they want faculty input and feedback and in a fair process. We are answering that request in the best way we know how. Laura Bond stated she appreciated Micheal Stratton's question for she and other colleagues too raised similar questions regarding what the UNC system process is for flagging and then reviewing programs. Because this recent event, we are learning a lot about the UNCA system and how our programs are reviewed and investigated. It is important that we all learn about this as senators and colleagues, so we understand more about the UNC system program review standards and procedures. Hopefully, we will get more answers by asking these questions.

Ashley Moraguez asked for clarification. Our role is to make a recommendation. Who is the next decision maker in the process and what happens next? Who has final say? Our role is to recommend. Ultimately, the final approval is the Chancellor's.

Susan Clark Muntean is supportive of the review and our role as a Faculty Senate. However, she has questions regarding the decision, which seemed pretty late in the spring for faculty who were preparing to teach. She questioned what has been the impact on faculty due to the decision to table new enrollments.

Lynne Horgan said that the MLAS program has students still continuing in the program so only new admittance were tabled. The program is still offering classes for continuing students. Gerard Voos, the MLAS Director, said that the program planned to offer five classes this semester and now they only have three classes, which are the smaller Creative Writing Classes. They had to cancel Bill Spellman's MLAS 540 course: The World Since 1945, and no new graduate students were permitted to register for Tim Owen's CCS 560 course: Climate Change Science--Principles and Applications. Tim's class was co-listed with ATMS/PHYS 473, and there are 7 undergrads enrolled. There are no graduate students enrolled in CCS 560.

Gerard Voos also relayed that he is available to all subcommittees to answer questions specific to their charge. He is willing to come to subcommittee meetings, and so are the advisory board members (alumni of the MLAS program) to answer questions.

Micheal Stratton asked if the subcommittees were to come up with the review criteria for graduate and undergraduate programs while getting into the MLAS data. He understands that we are to come up with the criteria without a particular program in mind. Laura Bond said that was correct and that once the subcommittee has that established they are to start the review of the MLAS program. Micheal Stratton asked a follow-up question, "Will we talk about the MLAS at the next Senate meeting?" Laura Bond responded, "No, for the subcommittees will be starting to review the data." Patrick Bahls and Marietta Cameron explained that the subcommittees are going to be able to see each other's questions so they can work to reduce the redundancy and submit one request for data to IREP.

Micheal Stratton asked whether all reviews will go through all three subcommittees? He explained he is trying to understand how this can be applied universally if each subcommittee has different questions, how can that be institutionalized? This would require a handbook change. He appreciates that we are trying to take the MLAS out of the development of the review criteria, but he wonders if the Faculty Senate should vote on the criteria.

Laura Bond said if the Faculty Senate feels we need to vote on the process and criteria, we can do that. Since the situation is requiring expediency, she envisioned testing this model with this review and then finalize the process. Marietta Cameron emphasized that this way would provide the Senators more opportunities to contribute to the process and all will have access to the criteria and the data on the Faculty Senate Shared Google Drive. However, we can

vote on the Criteria before we use it. There is concern about creating a slower process for the MLAS review.

Marietta Cameron relayed that APC has been working hard on their questions and feels since they are all working from the same UNC System criteria and process documents that there will be a lot of consensus between the subcommittees with a few additional questions.

Regine Criser wondered if we are using our time wisely, whether this is the most efficient way or is there a more effective way of honoring our commitment to shared governance and what our handbook says is our role in this process? Will this recommendation hold up if we get the message from the UNC System that this program is to be reviewed?

Laura Bond said those are important questions, and if the subcommittees feel that the Board of Governors criteria/questions are fine without additional criteria or questions, they can just stay with that. The Executive Committee wanted to give the subcommittees the opportunity to determine the criteria. Marietta Cameron pointed out that the Board of Governors have changed their criteria over time also. She is of the opinion that our administrative colleagues here as well as downstate at the system office are open to our feedback. The reviews are important to the Faculty Senate work and senators should be informed about programs, as well as understand the process that the Board of Governors use to determine low productivity. APC felt that the questions from the Board of Governors are vague for we have been in workshops regarding good review where we are taught that questions should be objective and measureable.

As to whether Faculty Senate should do the work, Marietta Cameron's answer is yes, it is worthwhile work for Faculty Senate to do and important to fulfilling Senate's role. To not do the work, eventually, we will lose the privilege. Faculty in the past have worked hard for us to have this privilege.

Sonya DiPalma wanted to echo Marietta Cameron's comments especially about the importance of shared governance. Sonya DiPalma pointed out that we do have two challenges. One way we are wanting to be proactive, but the situation has us in a reactive stance in that we have a program that is under review. The challenge is how to do both and do it well. Is it fair to use the MLAS program as a pilot and what mistakes might we make if we are too hurried with it.

Having similar concerns as Regine Criser, Jessica Pisano suggested that senate could review the MLAS program on these already established system guidelines and then recommend some the revisions to the system guidelines for their consideration. This could be a way to do a good job given the challenge we have right now.

Marietta Cameron brought up that we have had programs that have been identified in the past as low productivity programs. Those departments/program directors have been approached to give a justification for consideration to say why the program should still be in existence. Marietta Cameron's hope is to have a process so that going forward flagged departments do not feel attacked. Also, this knowledge can benefit all departments and programs so we can do the things to sustain and maintain our presence on this campus. Laura Bond emphasized that the work is not to defend, but to review objectively and to use something that is universal standard.

Volker Frank recommended instead of moving quickly that we move very slowly. An important premise here to be understood and made explicit and agreed upon: shared governance. We have already established the idea that we can recommend. That is all we can really do and you are asking faculty to review a lot. Before doing this, we should have some clarity on who are the players involved and how do we relate to the administration – our

provost and our chancellor. This can be done for just the MLAS program or for all the programs. Before we do the work, which we can do, there are other questions that need to be asked and clarified beforehand. Faculty work on this for a year or half a year and then we can recommend. And we may get turned down. We were this close to eliminating German from the Language and Literatures Department. Slow down and clarify and go back to this idea of shared governance. Why do this work and take it to our administration who will say this is great work but we are hearing from UNC who say this is it. There are many players and we can find out from our administration what their vision is and where they stand so that we become allies or not.

Provost Kai Campbell asked to speak. We do not have a lot of time for we have pressures on us. We are under constraints and those constraints are real and felt. Every investment of Faculty Senate's time and every investment of a dollar in one place is not time and dollars spent in some other thing. It is not just a matter of could this program or any program work as is. The real question is whether we are investing our time and dollars in really meaningful and impactful ways. It is not about one single program, but about the whole institution: what we mean, what we want to stand for and where we want to go. There are some criteria that are known to us that we are thinking about. If we could figure out a way where MLAS was the focus that it could be streamlined and make sure folks were not spending extra time by working together all at once, Provost Campbell would be all for that 100% and let's go right now.

Dean Herman Holt, the Dean over the MLAS Program, wanted clarify an important point for he feels like there is a thought process that is mixing up a couple of things here. The UNC System Office has guidelines for low productivity, and there are programs on campus that have had to deal with this. However, this is not what we are talking about here for the System Office has NOT told us to review the MLAS Program. We are using the UNC System Office Criteria to help guide us to review MLAS.

Provost Campbell wanted to emphasize that we are being looked at as every institution is. There are some reasons why we are particularly under the microscope at this time. The strength of that program has absolutely been noticed. They have not said you must review. They have asked, "What is going on here?" The System Office thinks of Graduate Programs as one of the ways an institution can help fortify itself financially. When that is not the case or appears to not be the case to those looking from the outside, it calls the program into some questions. Provost Campbell said that Dean Holt is right that the System Office has not said to us that you must review. He does believe that they have called into question and asked us why we have not done a review.

Laura Bond wanted to emphasize that Faculty Senate is working in collaboration with the Senior Staff on the MLAS review. A decision was made because of this pressure coming from the system office. Our Executive Committee was informed of this pressure during a summer meeting concerning the MLAS tabled enrollments and asked, "What would you do as Faculty Senate?" After talking with many people this summer, the Executive Committee decided the answer was to distribute the work throughout the Faculty senate to ensure as much objectivity as possible and even distribution of workload for the review. Faculty Senate is not creating this pressure, but attempting to assist in whatever way we can and the best way that we can.

Provost Campbell wanted to make clear that even without the outside putting this pressure on he believes it is important for us as a healthy institution to be asking these kinds of questions of ourselves regardless. Although Provost Campbell is new and trying to get up to

speed still, what he understands and sees this would have been a question he would have felt comfortable calling without any outside pressure. Provost Campbell did agree that we are working together and are not completely disconnected here. His preference would be a more streamlined and focused approach.

The Senate considered the Provost's words and brainstormed ways to go forward. A motion was made by Susan Clark Muntean to form a task force to review MLAS program, which was seconded. However, due to the lateness of the hour where quorum of 12 voting senators to conduct business was about to be lost and the senate felt the motion would need further development and discussion, she withdrew her motion.

Laura Bond, Aubri Rote and Regine Criser pointed out that there were several ways that Senate could return to subcommittees, confer, and work toward a consensus before beginning their program review work. Laura Bond proposed that the subcommittees follow this advice and decide next steps via electronic vote.

Laura Bond thanked the Faculty Senate for their discussion and time. Although it was time consuming, it was an important discussion of a valuable topic. Faculty Senate is a deliberative body and it is extremely important that we take the time to discuss and weigh this carefully.

- V. Academic Policies Committee: First Vice Chair Marietta Cameron
APC Memorandum 2019-20 was emailed to the campus on Tuesday and announced the deadline October 14, 2019 to guarantee for 2020-21. When a proposal goes to Alicia Shope, the proposal should also be forwarded to the appropriate Dean as well. Ms. Sellers is working on an automatic application to submit proposal documents where you can upload the files coming before APC to help with making documents available to all who need to see them in a timely manner.
- VI. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee: Third Vice Chair Aubri Rote
New Standing Committee Appointments by Senate will be affirmed through an electronic vote due to the lateness of the hour and quorum was lost to conduct business.
They will be coming up with goals to present at the next meeting for the coming year.
- VII. [Institutional Development Committee Report](#): Second Vice Chair Patrick Bahls
- VIII. Administration/Academic Affairs: Provost Garikai Campbell
The Provost said one of the topics he sees for the coming year is to clarify who has authority over what areas especially regarding compensation, like the Chairs' compensation. One of the documents from the last Senate meeting of the year raised questions for him, concerning whether or not issues of compensation are things that are within the purview of the Faculty Senate. His contention is compensation matters are not matters of the faculty, where they can't vote on compensation for itself. This is a complicated matter with nuances that are the nature of the conversation that he is hoping to have when there is sufficient time to discuss.
- IX. Old Business/New Business
- X. Adjourn: The meeting was adjourned at 5:47 p.m.