

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA ASHEVILLE
FACULTY SENATE MEETING VIA ZOOM

Official Minutes

April 29, 2021; 3:15 pm; Last meeting of the 2020-21 Faculty Senate

Members Present: M. Cameron, S. DiPalma, J. Li, C. Kennedy, M. Bettencourt, J. Butera, S. Clark, A. Cossette, D. Clarke, R. Criser, A. Dunn, V. Frank, B. Hook, S. Kapur, T. King, J. Pisano, T. Ruffin, J. Zunguze, G. Campbell.

Visitors: N. Cable, T. Adcock, E. Adell, E. Anderson, C. Augustyniak, P. Bahls, A. Barber, A. Batada, J. Beck, L. Belt, K. Betsalel, A. Boakye-Boaten, L. Bond, C. Boone, E. Boyce, K. Boyle, S. Broberg, R. Bruce, M. Burchard, E. Chiang, K. Cole, L. Cornett, A. (Alvis) Dunn, S. Earle, D. Eggers, T. Elgren, A. Ellenbogen, H. Epperson, J. Flora, M. Galloway, M. Ghidina, C. Godfrey, R. Gusain, B. Haggard, M. Hall, B. Hart, E. Harvey, P. Haschke, S. Haynes, L. Hewitt, M. Himelein, H. Holt, L. Holland Goldthwaite, L. Horgan, A. Jansen, L. Johnson, S. Kaplan, K. Kessarais, L. Kloeppel, J. Konz, L. Linton, B. Lundgren, M. M. Manns, K. Maitra, J. Sanchez Martinez, A. Maxwell, S. Mills, W. Motch-Ellis, N. Hernandez, P. O'Brien, H. Parlier, J. Perry, J. Pierce, M. Pugh, G. Reynolds, M. Richmond, T. Rizzo, A. Rote, N. Ruppert, A. Shope, C. Smith, S. Smith, N. Stottlemeyer, R. Straub, K. Swenson, J. Taylor, D. Thomas, S. Traboulsi, D. G. Trautmann, Traywick, J. Ward, L. Ward, A. Wengrow, C. Whitlock, J. Wilcox, P. Willis, A. Wolfe, A. Young, K. Zubko.

I. Call to Order and Welcome by Faculty Senate Chair Marietta Cameron

II. Chancellor Nancy Cable Remarks

Chancellor Cable yielded her time given the length and full Senate agenda, and she will give remarks at the end of year meeting.

III. Provost Garikai Campbell Remarks

Provost Campbell asked to make a statement before Faculty Senate talks about APC 44. Request was granted. Regarding the academic leadership structure, he hopes that everyone has had the chance to wrestle with the ideas expressed there. The Provost thinks that the latest version of the document reflects the efforts to be responsive to what was shared in many of the earlier conversations. For today, he is hoping to get a general sense of the Senate that this is the right direction and to be able to move forward. The document is EC 9.

The Provost hopes by tomorrow morning to be sharing the proposal about hiring. They have opened up the pathway for those who are non-tenure track to be on the tenure track. There are still some details to be discussed about what that looks like and how that is done. It absolutely needs to be tied to what our capacity is to be able to hire that is fundamentally connected with our enrollment and our retention. These are critical in the evaluation and assessment of whether

or not a particular department or particular area has such a pathway. There will be more about this in the days to come.

IV. Student Government:

President Demon Thomas

President Demon Thomas is looking forward to working with everyone and bringing back announcements to Faculty Senate from SGA. He is ready to learn. He wished everyone a “Happy End of the Semester,” and he looks forward to a better semester.

V. Staff Council:

Chair Emma Anderson

Chair of staff counsel, Emma Anderson reported that she does not have any items today.

VI. Bookstore RFP Report:

Joy Flora, Budget/Auxiliary Liaison

Joy Flora relayed that we outsourced the bookstore in the summer of 2011. We had a five-year contract that was awarded to Follett. We renewed that contract for an additional five years bringing it to a conclusion June 30, just about two months from now.

The nature of the state purchasing system is such that we had to go out for bids and we did. Four companies attended a mandatory site visit in the middle of March. We received responses from three companies. One of the companies that responded was an online bookstore provider so we did eliminate that one. Joy Flora showed an outline of the two proposals they received. The first one was from Follett and the second on Barnes and Noble.

The evaluation criteria is listed in the first column. There were four criteria and there was an evaluation committee comprised of two faculty members, three staff members, including Joy Flora, and two students. Their record of performance was important since we could not have an outlier offer a lot of money who did not have university bookstore experience. That was not an issue with these two companies for we know them well and they are both industry leaders. The second evaluation criteria was financial return. Follett did offer a signing bonus. Typically, companies may make an investment in your facility and technology. That money does not come to us, but is money spent on our behalf. Although Barnes and Noble offered more, the signing bonus made up for the difference. Also, the commissions were very different and surprising. Follett’s commission was considerably higher than Barnes and Noble. For both companies, the commission gets higher if we go over a million dollars. Follett also currently pays \$10,000 a year for scholarships, and they have included that in their proposal. The third evaluation criteria was strategy to lower student costs. Both companies are moving towards a program where all adaptive course material is provided for a fee. She expected it to be required. Fortunately, it was not required in either proposal. However, Barnes and Noble certainly structured their commission to entice us to jump into their program, which they call “First Day” (Follett calls their Access). Dr. Campbell and Joy Flora have spent quite a bit of time with other faculty members looking at Access and did pilot an Access program this semester. The last evaluation criteria was marketing strategy. Both proposals look back at that same inclusive material strategy for students’ success, for increasing sales, for lowering student cost, and we have volumes of data on those programs.

The evaluation committee had a healthy conversation, mostly around how the store does feels rather stagnant. The students said there was no “wow,” no excitement – it just exists. While the committee certainly sees clearly that the Follett proposal is stronger and should award to Follett, they very much want to have a more proactive relationship with Follett, and possibly, a

cross divisional committee would meet quarterly to really get some more things happening in the store to make it more enticing. A question that came out of the evaluation committee was around satisfaction. Student satisfaction scores were average to other schools in the region. Tracy Rizzo was on the evaluation committee and kindly reached out, as most of you may know, to the deans and chairs this week about faculty satisfaction. For the most part, they heard that the faculty is satisfied with the management of the bookstore. The report went to the textbook committee on Tuesday of this week, and they concurred with the findings of the evaluation committee that we should go forward with awarding the contract to Follett.

John Pierce added that when they ran the commission calculations, Follett commission was significantly higher than Barnes and Noble in addition to the upfront money Joy Flora covered. The financial advantage of Follett over Barnes and Noble was clear.

Marietta Cameron commented that in recent years, students are becoming more and more likely to find other venues to purchase textbooks. She asked Joy Flora to share any news about how our bookstore may be affected by that trend.

Joy Flora said the bookstore industry is declining that is related to many factors: enrollment challenges, cost, the advent of digital materials, and more open educational resource materials in addition to students going elsewhere that happens not to be an increase but a challenge that has always been present.

Dr. Trey Adcock asked if he wanted to use an independently owned indigenous bookstore to support his American Indian studies courses where the students buy the books from those stores, could he do that.

Joy Flora said that would be in violation of our contract on all the course materials we have given Follett the exclusive rights. We would not be in a good position as any faculty member recommending the student go elsewhere. We cannot stop students from going elsewhere, but we do not want to be in the position of being the one recommending that. Follett is very committed to working with us to match any prices that students are seeing elsewhere, which is part of the reason they have that price guarantee.

Dr. Adcock replied that this inquiry was not really about price, but he understands what she is saying.

Faculty Assembly Executive Committee: Representative at Large Melodie Galloway
[Minutes from April 16, 2021](#)
[Rep. Galloway's Report](#)

Sense of the Senate Resolutions:

[EC 8](#) Support of Shared Governance regarding the hiring of Chancellors
[EC 9](#) Senate Endorsement of Restructuring of Academic Affairs

Senate Chair Marietta Cameron presented the two Sense of the Senate Resolutions.

Upon bringing EC 8 to the floor, Dr. Cameron relayed background information. As part of Faculty Assembly, she is a member of the Committee of Chairs made of all UNC System schools' faculty senate chairs. In their meetings, they discuss things that affect each of the institutions across the system. The chairs have a concern from seeing what happened with Fayetteville State where the Chancellor appears to be appointed rather than following the planned search process.

Other institutions have had some interesting challenges to their search process. Regarding EC 8, the Committee of Chairs have asked that each of the institutions consider a resolution that affirms the following principles of shared governance: there is a search committee, that faculty be represented on the search committee in a significant primary role in selecting the candidates, and the candidate who is hired must have the search committee's support. EC 8 is actually modeled after a resolution that was passed by UNC Chapel Hill at their last Faculty Council meeting.

A motion was made to accept EC 8, which was seconded.

Questions.

Herman Holt asked how were Chancellor's chosen. Do the Board of Governors choose the Chancellor from a group of two or three candidates selected by the institution?

Marietta Cameron relayed that the Board of Governors definitely have the last say as well as the UNC System President would have the last say also. However, in terms of shared governance, traditionally, the principles are that the faculty also have a say in who gets to lead them. EC 8 is affirming that principle and tradition. As with anything where leadership is given a possibility to decide otherwise, you know, they decide otherwise. Surely, we have the right and the courage to stand up and say, "These are the principles that we support. We look to working with you to continue our work to hear whom we ask to help lead our institution."

Melodie Galloway wanted to offer a point of clarification that this comes directly from a new policy stated and action taken by President Hans almost upon the start of his administration. There have not been Chancellors appointed, but there have been some actions taken that have disrupted the search committee process that caused this to become a hot spot of concern. President Hans, from her understanding, did not appoint or hijack the search committee; it was that the search committee was at a late stage when a new name was added by President Hans that seemed to go against some of the principles. Melodie Galloway wanted to clarify that this is a sensitive issue since search committees must retain integrity. There is a lot of discussion about whether these searches should be open or closed due to privacy issues. The intent of EC 8 is to make a statement that we want to hold on to the integrity of the search process. Search committees in our history as North Carolina institutions have been made up of faculty, staff, students, and representatives of the university's Board of Trustees committee. She remembers in our own search for Chancellor Cable how important the integrity of the search was.

EC 8 passed without dissent.

Marietta Cameron presented EC 9 Senate Endorsement of the Restructuring of Academic Affairs. On February 4, Provost Campbell presented the document Academic, Strategic Priorities and Leadership Implications. Under the Provost remarks on that particular meeting, you see in the list of rationale that we have presentation of the leadership priorities that occurred within the department chairs and program directors meeting on January 25. There was the first formalization of the document that was presented on January 31. The Provost met with the senate, program directors and department chairs together on February 1 (Monday) in a special meeting where there was a discussion. From that discussion, there was feedback. Part of the feedback was doing other data gathering discussion sessions held during the week on February 12 and February 19. The Provost has received feedback from faculty at large during these open discussions and has incorporated this feedback from those discussions into this document that was sent to all faculty on March 31, 2021. Before opening up for a motion, Marietta Cameron turned the floor over Provost Campbell to speak towards the restructuring.

Provost Campbell hoped everyone has had a chance to read the documents. He does not think he needs to say anything though he is more than happy to entertain any questions, but also happy for the Senate Chair to invite a motion.

A motion was made to accept EC 9, the endorsement of the academic restructuring of Academic Affairs. A motion was made and seconded.

Discussion. Rebecca Bruce raised concerns about the placement of the engineering program and the most recent version of the organization chart. She has expressed these concerns previously and thought they had been moved. Her concern is they are currently placed in the Natural Science Department Group. They are a joint program with NC State. She does not think they qualify as a department at UNCA as she is the only full time employee. Every other faculty member in that program is an NC State faculty member. She does not think they should be placed in the chart where we are.

Provost Campbell thinks that particular thing can be discussed. He believes in fact the engineering is a department at UNC Asheville and it is useful to have engineering continue to operate as a department. There is a value in that you are also a joint program and a department. There is a certain limitation to where it is placed on the organizational chart. Regardless of location on the org chart, engineering is functionally operating in both capacities.

Rebecca Bruce asked to clarify further that with only two UNCA employees, the character of the program is that of a joint program than a department. If it could appear that way on the chart, it would seem more reasonable.

Regine Criser wondered what happens if we end up with version 2.21.3.F.

Provost Campbell asked to make a distinction between what he would consider major structural change and refinements. The question here is around are we in agreement about the overall larger framing structural change? Then what he would call smaller changes would proceed as usual.

Marietta Cameron asked in as far as changes, smaller changes versus larger changes, who gets to decide whether it is a smaller change or a larger change

Provost Campbell said he is having discussions about what those changes are so that we can we can talk them through. He has tried throughout the course of this year to always share what he is thinking with everyone so there is an opportunity to make a determination of whether or not that is a big thing or a little thing and how might we proceed. He thinks there has to be at some level that we keep working at how do we find the right balance and just stay in conversation. He thinks there is some element of shared governance that we are never going to nail down everything. Probably, there is always going to be some fuzzy boundaries. He hopes that we can continue to work together to figure out what those things are. He thinks it is very difficult to try to define in the abstract.

Jake Butera asked what was the rationale of presenting the document at this time and why the need for a statement with things still in flux as they are.

Provost Campbell replied he guessed to get them out of flux is fundamental. There has been discussion, and he would like to think about moving forward in a way that suggests that there is agreement about us moving forward. He would not have brought it forward unless he thought that that we had gotten to the point where we had achieved that. There are things that will change, but he thinks that most of those things are fairly minor in a way that diminishes any point that anybody would make. The overall bigger, sweeping change he believes we are in

agreement, and that is why he is asking for this vote. If we are in agreement, he would like to move forward.

Marietta Cameron asked what happens after this semester with the faculty activity reports that go to the Deans. After June, for the next year, what happens with the faculty activity reports?

Provost Campbell said the faculty annual records is right now with the chairs. Who gets the second review is something that we have to work through for we have not determined what happens. That is the big question.

Marietta Cameron has heard other questions seeking clarification concerning once the deans go, what happens to the divisions. Do the two Associate Provosts do the second reviewing? The chairs are evaluated by the Deans. Will the Associate Provost be doing those evaluations? What is going to happen there as far as the chairs are concerned?

Provost Campbell answered that has not been finalized, but certainly, somebody to whom those chairs are reporting would do the evaluations and reviews. He has not yet finalized exactly who is going to do that evaluation. There are certainly a small pool of people who could do that.

EC 9 passed 11-5 and 2 abstentions.

VII. Academic Policies Committee: First Vice Chair Sonya DiPalma

[Decision Summaries](#)

***First Reading**

****[APC 45](#)** Remove/reduce requirements to declare a major
(Lynne Horgan)

****[APC 44](#)** Revise the Liberal Arts Core requirements, adding an additional Diversity Intensive course chosen from AFST 130, AIIS 200, AIIS 305, ETHN 100, and SOC 320.
[Letter of Support from the Liberal Arts Core Advisory Committee](#)
[Graduates with Overlapping DI and LAC Required Courses](#)
(Tiece Ruffin, DI Committee)

Sonya DiPalma asked for a motion to waive the Comer Rule on APC 45. A motion was made and seconded. No questions nor discussion. The motion to waive the Comer Rule passed 17-1. A motion was made to accept APC 45, which was seconded.

Discussion.

Lynne Horgan said that they have discussed this with the departments to reconsider the purpose and need for requirements to be met prior to declaring that major.

Regine Criser applauded the Registrar Office's work on this document and the speediness of the turnaround. This document is an important step in removing barriers that we have for our students to progress to graduation.

APC 45 passed without dissent.

Sonya DiPalma turned the floor over to Provost Campbell to speak before asking for a motion to waive the Comer Rule.

Jake Butera asked for a point of order and wondered whether the vote to waive the Comer Rule vote should come before the remarks. Marietta Cameron explained that the Provost asked to

have his first of the meeting remarks moved to this point of the agenda and in those remarks the Provost may cover the topics he wish to cover.

Jake Butera asked simply about whether or not it would potentially have an impact on the looming vote on the Comer Rule.

Provost Campbell replied that his answer is yes, that he thinks the remarks he had imagined saying he hoped would have an impact. Whether that is an affirmation or whether that is a change of heart – he does not know. He does not know where people are with respect to the proposal.

To follow the point of order that Jake Butera is asking, our APC chair will go ahead for a motion to waive the Comer Rule and then the Provost will have the first right to speak.

Sonya DiPalma asked for a motion to waive the Comer Rule for APC 44. A motion was made and seconded.

Provost Campbell said his comments were broader than the Comer Rule. He appreciated the opportunity to share a few comments. He apologized for the lengthiness of the remarks, but given the intensity of the conversations around this issue, he felt these were important issues to share his thoughts.

In Provost Campbell's view, there are three fundamental questions:

1. Are we ready? How important and is it important enough to add to the curriculum?
2. Is this a good start? Are the particulars offered in this proposal?
3. Can we establish a process? Do we have the institutional fortitude and commitment to address all of the challenges that remain?

Those are the three big fundamental questions. There are other questions but the questions he has heard fall under these three questions or point to a difficult reality, namely, that the questions highlight either structural racism in themselves, or at least a structural opposition to anti-racist work.

Are we ready? Do we want to add in a requirement that privileges engagement with race? It can feel like an obvious first question, or maybe even a facetious one, or rhetorical, but he really means it. Is this really that important? Is it important enough to rise up and add to the requirements? Is it enough to make us rethink other things in the curriculum, and if need be, take something out by four credit hours? And the answer for Provost Campbell is, yes, it is that important. It is important enough for us to add to the curriculum.

Is this a good starting point? This is the place where most of the questions about process or form and finances seem to come into play. There have been questions about process in general, not necessarily formally. The process for putting this on the table has been followed as is outlined by all of our guidelines, meaning this was submitted in a timely fashion to be considered. There was, in fact, a huge list of proposals to go through from the committee. This coming up in this particular committee meeting has nothing to do with anyone in the chain of review or in the chain of formal process – not in any way, shape, or form. He has heard elements of that, and he just wanted to speak to that. Even with that, there have been questions about how do we make a change of this type to the Liberal Arts Core? Have all the key people who are impacted been contacted? Who would be impacted by this by this proposal? A host of other process-oriented questions. In some ways, there are reasons why one can think about those questions as being

valid and important because they are the questions that we would ask any of any proposal. He thinks this has been shared in a number of different conversations. When thinking about these questions, even if these are the same questions we imagine ourselves to ask in any circumstance, the questions and process do somehow seem to always get in the way of us making real substantive change and making advancements in our curriculum as it relates to matters with respect to race. This issue has been raised and is an issue that has created a lot of the tension. Quite frankly, this is the pain that has been around or underneath a lot of our discussions. The way that even he asked certain questions, he could feel the tension there and has felt the impact of that.

That has created for him the reason for coming back to the bigger question: is this particular proposal, a really good starting point? For some proposals, there needs to be at some level a way to simply rise above because they are more important than the particulars of the process. He thinks this proposal is one of them. He thinks this is a very good starting point. It does not answer all of the questions for there are some very big things for us to wrestle with, but that should not in and of itself trip us up from getting started. In some ways, he would be absolutely hypocritical to demand that of this item, when in fact, he just asked us to move forward and advance changes in the academic leadership structure, where not all of the answers have been figured out. There are times when we need to be able to move forward. We need to be able to be bold and courageous. He thinks every one of the proposers in many of the conversations that he has heard have said just that, and he just wanted to come back to that, in part, acknowledging that the way that he has asked questions himself at times has not lent itself to hearing with clarity. What he hopes all of us hears right now is that this is important. This is important enough for us to say, this is a very good start. Let us get going. Let us figure out the rest.

That brings to the last point: can we in fact, establish a process that reflects a commitment to addressing these challenges? There is absolutely no doubt there are some very big questions that we have to figure out: how we fund this, how we stack this, and how do we make sure that there is an opportunity for students to complete such a requirement in a timely fashion. We should not put forth a general education requirement that would have students not be able to complete it in four years. That is not tenable. He believes that we can put forth a process over the course of the next year. One of the advantages of this proposal is that it does give the time necessary to answer those questions. He thinks it is possible to establish a process and agrees with the proposer that it was not within the bounds of this proposal to solve all of those questions. Going back to an earlier question, one of the reasons for him to be involved is that there are some very big questions that he is obligated to think about. Funding is one of the big ones. He is committed to establishing a process and a group over the course of the year that will work with the Liberal Arts Core, Finance and whoever else needs to be involved to figure out how to make this work and create a timeline so there is a deadline for getting this done. What he hopes is that that we can figure out what the boundaries are and the right set of defaults so if we do not get it all done, we still are left with something that advances and moves us forward. There are still some questions there, but it is important to say that those points should not deter us from taking a bold and courageous step.

The last thing is just a further acknowledgement of what he sees as a part of this discussion, not just in this moment but also throughout a number of the conversations that he has been in over the past year. He acknowledges this past year has been a hard year for a host of

reasons, but these conversations have had a tremendous amount of pain at the surface, underneath the surface, and at times, bubbling out. That pain is historic and comes from years of trying to do certain initiatives and agendas, particularly, as it relates to the issues that intersect with identities that are not in the majority. He thinks it would be an omission not to recognize and name the pain, and the impact of that work on those who are engaging in that work. In conclusion, he would like to say that those who have been working on this proposal in particular have been doing a lot of this work. You all have his deep gratitude.

Marietta Cameron thanked Provost Campbell. She greatly appreciated his comments.

As a point of order and as Senate Chair, Marietta Cameron is charged with keeping order as far as the senate procedures and policies are concerned. If she does not keep that order, then future meetings may have issues. That is why she is trying very hard to stick with the policy. Right now, there is a motion on the table to waive the Comer Rule on this document meaning waiving the two readings policy that we have. The discussion is to be on waiving the Comer Rule at this moment.

In terms of that motion, Marietta Cameron would like to speak. She has been extremely consistent about her feelings of large issues hitting the very last senate meeting of the year and that is not blaming anybody at this point. It always seems to happen. However, she is voting not to waive the Comer Rule. This is large enough issue that it deserves a second reading for the faculty at large. She takes issue with folks saying that there have been past discussions about diversity. She heard the same thing in regards to the FYI prefix that there have been ongoing discussions. To point out, the faculty at large has just received this particular proposal, though this is not the fault of the DI Committee. It is not the fault of APC. It is the way this has worked out. She called for this body's remembrance that the very first resolution of this year was withdrawn that proposed we would not entertain changes no matter whether it was major, minor or certificate. Senate said they could do this even during a global pandemic, so here we are. Marietta Cameron has been consistently against waiving the Comer Rule because she thinks it undermines the whole purpose of the two reading process. However, she also acknowledges that if waiving the Comer Rules fails it will be a rare time that it does fail. She is very much aware of the optics if waiving fails today where every time it has something to do with racial diversity that we are following process. However, most faculty know she has consistently voted not to waive the Comer Rule and follow the process. She proposes by voting not to waive the Comer Rule that the second reading takes place in August and give everyone more than enough time to digest this and provide more time to have discussions.

Demon Thomas wanted to say he supports APC 44 and thinks a race-centric course will be beneficial to the curriculum. There needs to be a course on uprooting systematic racism. The students are trying their best to dismantle white supremacy as a community. With faculty's help, we can bridge this gap. Students can only do so much, and more race-centric courses will allow perspectives and narratives that are often overlooked in teaching courses and will add to the liberal art standard we are known to have. Professors are teaching us to use our education to liberate against social issues. As a student of color, his attending this school and educating those who are blind to his existence will only allow us to grow as a university and create conversations that we are supposed to have.

Volker Frank asked to speak to make a point about Waiving the Comer Rule. He does not wish to speak either in favor or against it. He simply wish to make a point in reference to what the

Provost said. He thinks the Provost is absolutely right in saying that sometimes the process gets in the way of achieving change. No doubt, about it, however, not always is process an obstacle to getting the goal that one wishes to achieve. He would like to remind the senators and everybody else that last time we did a reform process. When you look back, you could say process also became an obstacle, and we did less than what we wanted to accomplish. However, that is not his reading. He chaired that committee and the committee worked for two years and two summers, as he reminds people. He believes that part of why we managed to do this was process. Certainly, more could have been done, but he looks back on the last time we reformed our curriculum where he was trying to make sure that they had a particular process. He thinks that the process that they chose did not get in the way of achieving a humble goal.

Jessica Pisano said her understanding is that in this case, part of the concern is that Tiece Ruffin and one other member will be rotating off. She understands the urgency to have this discussion now, not only because students have been asking for this for years, but also because there will be a shift in leadership. It seems as though this is a really important moment to have this conversation. She is exhausted, but willing to stay here tonight and have the conversation because she thinks it is an important conversation. She feels like we need to see this out to its end, before the end of this academic year.

Jake Butera's question has to do not with a willingness or not to have this conversation for he thinks everyone wants to have the conversation. He thinks waving of the Comer Rule has more to do with giving people time to in engage in that conversation. Some of us have been involved in some of these processes and know what has been going on with this document since October, but others were seeing it for the first time on Saturday when it was sent out. We have been receiving as a senate comments up to this meeting and just received one maybe 20 minutes ago. As a deliberative body answerable to the rest of the faculty, his question is, if we waive the Comer Rule, are we going to be able to have that conversation, as the Senate is designed to do? He does not know the answer to that. By having the conversation now, will we miss something? Is there a reason why we have asked to waive the Comer Rule? Is it just a matter of the rotation of the DI committee? Are there other concerns that have led to this request?

Sonya DiPalma said there are a couple of things that are at play here. One of the big ones APC had going into this academic year, was that we said any proposal that came before us they were going to look at resources as well as examine systemic concerns. Anyone who comes before APC knows that we work with them. The timeliness of this proposal is the need to improve diversity on our campus seems so Paramount that we felt really strongly compelled to vote unanimously for this. This proposal is looking at a roll out not until fall 2022. APC has followed process and held many joint meetings. In the next year, the LAC Advisory Committee will work with this proposal on how to implement this.

Jake Butera asked would this work begin over the summer or would it need to continue when the committee reconvenes which is not until fall anyway. Is the proposal too broad to implement?

Sonya DiPalma responded that there might be a reallocation of some resources, which is in the decision summary. Her experience has always been that meetings and work happens over the summer. APC started our meetings before the semester began.

Jake Butera said that was helpful to know for that is a three-month addition to this potential work on this document based on our decision for waiving the Comer Rule.

Jennifer Rhode Ward, as a member of the DI committee and one who co-authored this proposal with DI members and faculty of color on our campus, she would like to speak to the matter of urgency. This urgency is in response to being a student-centric campus, she would like to point out as outlined in APC 44, that students have been requesting this change to our curriculum since 2015. Multiple leadership of the Student Government have requested that and most recently, Demon Thomas, we heard his statement said this. This is the sense of urgency certainly has a little bit to do with personnel turnover, but it is mostly driven by students. We are a student-center campus. We respond to student requests and needs, and the students have been requesting this for six years now. It is time for us to decide whether we will respond to them or not.

Waiving the Comer Rule on APC 44 passes with a vote of 13-5.

A motion was made to accept APC 44, which was seconded.

Discussion. Tiece Ruffin said the document is self-explanatory. Many people contributed to this document and she thanked all of them for their time, effort and energy to collaboratively work on this proposal. As mentioned in the proposal, we have a race-centric course to petition and instigate for change to be responsive to student needs. The liberal arts committee signed a support statement. This is not an anomaly or novel. The University of Pittsburgh, Cal State University system, Western Washington University, the University of Washington and Bowling Green State University have all agreed to have such race-centric courses. We believe, as we stated in the proposal, that this is the first step of the process. This is by no means exhaustive and finite in our efforts to address racial inequity and racial justice on our campus. The research that we have placed in the document also says that when we have race-centric courses, we know that it reduces individual racial prejudice and improves the cognitive and social development of students. Thank you again for the opportunity to be for all today - to be bold, to be courageous by not only placating gestures and rhetoric, but in concrete actions for change. Thank you all very much.

Nadia Stottlemeyer is a student who would like to speak on her support for APC 44. She believes it is absolutely vital that we put forward a diversity intensive course that is based in race. She, as a student, would be willing to deal with any complications that may arise to the program because of the vital importance of taking action and having conversations about race because when the campus does not have conversations with students about race, the silence perpetuates white supremacy.

Ken Betsalel said the Provost thought that this was a good place to start. Ken Betsalel believes the question is, "Is this a good place to continue for a lot of work has been done with respect to diversity intensive. About 20 years ago, he was part of the first DI committee members reviewing proposals. His sense was the initial impetus really was around race and we do have DI requirement. What happened at the time was that we did not have enough faculty to teach. They could not meet the demand of a required DI course. His concern is we might be in the same situation and his perspective on this proposal, APC 44, is that it does not go far enough. The history of racism in this city and the history of racism in this university is undeniable. He would suggest that you look at "[All Deliberate Speed: School Desegregation in Buncombe County](#)." The document was published by the Center for Diversity of Education that documents the history of racism with respect to our own university. We started out as a segregated University and were under court order in the early 1970s and 80s to essentially to desegregate and have more students of color on this campus and more faculty of color on this campus. There is lots of work to be done.

His point is that he is not speaking against the proposal but there is the question of resources that needs to be addressed and suggesting that the work to accomplish the goals of anti-racist work is simply not there. Those five courses as much as he thinks they are powerful for himself, it is not clear how they address the issue in ways that build more than the DI courses that we already have in place. He doesn't want to put it off, but he thinks we could just do so much a better job of institutionalizing DI courses in relationship to a long term strategy so that we have entry level DI courses and upper DI courses that connects students with community service, and so forth. The other thing that he thinks is really important is that this is a primarily a white student campus and we know that the court order at one time called for 10% students of color. We have never really met that goal. He has concerns that students of color will be in these courses being the subject of study without having much space for themselves. As one BIPOC student said to him recently, she felt that our diversity efforts were aimed at educating white students, and as a BIPOC student, this particular student said she has become completely alienated at UNCA from this effort. We need to have robust conversations about how we can actually bring race-centric courses in a way that is meaningfully impactful and does not in fact alienate BIPOC students from our campus.

Tiece Ruffin pointed out that they expect to have a call for proposals for race-centric courses and expand the list of course offerings. That is written in the proposal. The 5 are not finite. Courses would need to meet the following SLOs:

1. Students understand the socially constructed nature of race in the United States.
2. Students understand the significance of individuals' differing relationships to race and power in the United States, and how structural racism undergirds institutions.
3. Students understand how individuals, organizations, and institutions create, perpetuate, or challenge racial inequality in the United States.
4. Students are better equipped to reevaluate their ideas about racial diversity and difference.
5. Students understand the transnational dynamics of race, migration, and ethnicity, and the relationships among history, culture, politics, and race.
6. Students understand social and political histories of migration to, from, and within the United States.
7. Students understand the nature of race and racism, systemic and institutional racism, racial injustice, and what it means to be an anti-racist.

Sam Kaplan began by saying he is a longtime faculty member and is currently chair of the Math Department. He pointed out as Tiece posted in chat that the proposal does include mechanism for adding courses. That proposal identifies courses we already have in the catalog. There is the opportunity to generate new courses or reimagine existing courses that can naturally fit into a race-centered class. He also wanted to point out Jen Rhode Ward's comment that research shows that all students benefit from a race-based curriculum. As a continuing member of the LAC Advisory Committee, he wanted to reaffirm that if this were to pass and a process is set in place, it will likely include the LAC Advisory Committee as part of that conversation or a central component of that conversation. As a continuing member, he wanted to voice my support for APC 44. In addition, it is been his experience, not just at UNCA, but other places in the academy, the faculty really want all of the questions they could imagine answered and the path laid out and be perfect before taking that first step. In fact, the Academy, again, in his experience teaches us to stay within the areas of our mastery and in the silos of our discipline. Stepping into the unknown

to take action without researching every possible path really is counter to the impulses that we had to develop in order to get our degrees, but we cannot expect to grow without stepping into the unknown. He hopes that the Senate will be guided by our collective moral understanding and willingness to learn from trial and error without having to know all of the answers. Without APC 44 is a catalyst, our campus might never address the work required to reform the Liberal Arts Core we are currently using. Some folks are certainly using knowing everything in advance as a barrier to making any change. He is calling on the Senate to be responsive to the requests of our students for race-centered courses and calling on the Senate to advance the vision of equity that we claim as central to our mission. He is asking the Senate to vote for APC 44.

Evelyn Chiang pointed out that Tiece added in chat about expanding the five-course option that addresses one of her primary concerns upon first reading the document with the five courses that are currently specified that she believes leaves out our AAPI students. In regards to feelings of alienation, as of fall 2019, our factbook said that we have 72 students who identify as AAPI and about another 60, who are multiracial. She really hopes that if this passes, that there are intentional efforts made to address race, including AAPI people, and not leaving them out of the conversation.

Marietta Cameron wanted to follow-up regarding rules and the game that she sees. She has been taught to follow rules, and in her Senate Chair role, she recognizes that she cannot support the rules only when they favor herself. She supports the rules regardless. She has listened to the case about the BIPOC students feeling alienated. She has had quite a few BIPOC students who are saying just the exact opposite. When she presents these, she is told that it is antidotal and they ask her, "Where is the evidence?" for we do not make curricular decisions based on one student. Another issue that our factbook shows that there are 11 black faculty out of 220 so we can safely assume that most students graduate without having had a faculty of color as a teacher. Also, as a note 11 out of 220 is 5%. There have been some questions that come up and call into question the quality of the proposal that she thinks are weak, vague, and coded especially in regards to saying it does not go far enough. Until this proposal, there was plenty of lip service. In her first year in Senate, the LAC document came through, and there is a statement that actually says we need to flesh out and do a better job with the diversity intensive requirement. It is there in black and white. Now this particular proposal comes forth and everybody now has some ideas. She thanked the DI Committee, LAC Committee and APC for reviewing, developing, and putting this up for a discussion. She was against it when she first saw it, and she expressed why she was against this proposal to the proposers. Like quite a few people, when she first saw it, it said that it was adding four hours to the LAC Core and that is a concern to someone who is in a department that is sitting right on the line regarding credit caps. APC has looked at that spreadsheet that shows how many of our students are using a DI intensive to overlap with other requirements. That is an initial study. She is sure we can get some more studies to get a more concrete, but 71% of our students are using the DI to fulfill other requirements. That means it is not adding to the list of courses. Our students are pretty savvy when it comes to making their schedule. They are going to use a social science course that fulfills the social science requirement and the diversity intensive requirement. There are a bunch of diversity intensives that fulfill the requirements of the major. She pointed out there is an overlap and will not add to the curriculum. If the Registrar's office would confirm that then she would be supportive of APC 44 having her credit caps concerns

addressed. She does see issues where diversity is so broadly defined that the issues of the day are not addressed.

Jake Butera asked if there have been discussions on where the 4 credit hours will be found to support this proposal. His second question is will faculty be given training on how to teach these courses.

Regine Criser that they have not made any decisions about what requirement is going to change. It is clear in our letter where stated that we understand that this specific proposal is requiring the review of the entire Liberal Arts Core. The Provost made it clear that just raising and adding to the liberal arts core is not an option for many reasons. The LAC committee has committed itself to working on that review, and we are happy to work within the structures that the Provost is envisioning for this process. She thinks she speaks for her colleagues when they are not just looking at cutting one thing. This is an opportunity to review the core at large in a collaborative and communal process so that we can involve as many voices as possible so that we can actually move our core as a whole forward to attend to the needs expressed in this proposal, but also to bring our Liberal Arts Core into the 21st century.

Provost Campbell replied that he thinks Regina really did articulate most of what he was going to say. He wanted faculty to know there is clearly some work to be done and questions that need to be answered with respect to how this will impact the rest of the curriculum. The CTL, this summer, is running some work that is intended to intersect this very question. We need to dedicate resources, and he is working to find ways to provide those resources of training and compensation for faculty. He has the commitment to getting that done and he hears the commitment of the LAC Committee to getting that done. If this were to pass, within the next week or so, he will be really trying to outline what he sees and what he can provide in terms of structure for the Provost Office to help move this along. He is absolutely committed though there are very hard questions that we will have to wrestle with for it is not him saying he will go out and find a pot of gold to add and make everything happen. It means balancing our existing resources, balancing what we currently have. He is absolutely committed to that and it is going to take all of us to commit to that.

Kirk Boyle said his initial reaction came from being a former APC member that this proposal kind of flew in the face of the big charge that APC should check resources, resource allocations on any kind of proposal. Considering the resource allocations was of vital importance, and this proposal put the cart in front of the horse on that front. That was my initial reaction. However, he is in support of APC 44. After learning that it was introduced in October at the deadline and like every other proposal that should be considered. Since it will not be instituted until 2022, we have time to work out the details next year. He also loves that it is the catalyst for reforming our liberal arts core, which is sorely needed. APC 44 dovetailed nicely with his own proposal that he came up with on PDL and does want to get the conversation started about reforming LAC at some point. He is willing to share his document with the whole faculty. He would love it to be part of the conversation that that we have next year about reforming or even replacing LAC. His only concern is that concern shared by Evelyn Chiang about the course listings. He feels there could be other courses that could be listed. Maybe Professor Anne Jansen could speak a little bit more to his second concern US ethnic studies 100 and the viability of that being an offering going forward.

Michelle Bettencourt said that as a Senator she feels it is part of her job to represent the voice of faculty in her department when they are unable to attend. She expressed two voices

neither are hers. One of her colleagues felt very strongly in support of this for inaction is not an option any longer. We need to move forward despite the questions and the logistical implications that we are not quite sure about. Another voice in her department also felt very strongly but expresses concerns that a lot of you have already expressed. In particular, they support Linda Cornett's email where this process has been anything that democratic and that the faculty member would like a more broad robust conversation campus-wide. There are concerns about the idea that multiple faculty can teach these five courses. There are issues when only one person on campus can teach. Lastly, her colleague is wondering where the voice of the Humanities Program is. How will this impact the Humanities? How might the Humanities Program support this initiative?

Tiece Ruffin responded that on the DI Committee, Anne Jansen represents the Humanities Program, Sonia Kapur represents the Social Sciences, and Jen Ward represents the Natural Sciences. Tiece Ruffin stated that they do wish to include other courses. When working on this, they reached out to faculty with expertise in cultural studies and curriculum studies, and other BIPOC faculty. They started small because they wanted to be on decolonizing imperialism, anti-hegemonic, and anti-racist content and pedagogy. They assembled a small group with the attention as stated in the proposal, we use the word flexibility and we use the word expansion.

Megan Pugh, the Director of the Office of Multicultural Affairs at UNC Asheville, she speaks to the potential impact on the all-around and holistic learning that we in all institutions tout as a major benefit to college students experiences and their outcomes. It is her belief that having additional DI courses in the LAC only helps us with the co-curricular connection between her work and the DI program is clear. Generally, there has been a hesitancy to associate our curriculum as a whole in any impactful and long-term way, with the work happening outside of the classroom space. In order to raise the floor of understanding and lift the ceiling of exploration and analysis around racial equity and inequity, in order to engage students in the critical conversations and cultural shifts necessary for them to participate in making UNC Asheville an anti-racist institution, and in order to make the value of co-curricular engagement specifically related to equity and inclusion a priority for all students, it must be made clear that it is a priority in our Liberal Arts Core. It is her opinion that APC 44 does that, or at the very least, it opens the door wider for that possibility.

Rebecca Bruce asked to speak representing Engineering. Simply, if we do not maintain our credit cap on the LAC general education program, it will be difficult for the engineering program to comply. We are at an overall 128 credit hour load right now. Our program is a joint program with NC State and the engineering aspect of that program is largely controlled by NC State. It would require a shifting of our division of credit hours that is done beyond her level. She, as the representative of engineering, wanted to put this out there so that is known. She is personally in favor; however, there is this problem.

Jen Ward chatted that as outlined in APC 44 references, ALL students benefit from race-based curricula.

Anne Jansen had three points here. Regarding 100 Introduction to Ethnic Studies, this course is designed as a course to be shared and is modeled after WGSS 100. She has not been the only one to teach it. It was never designed for her to be the only one to teach it. Additionally, it might be helpful for people to know that it is written into the way it works that departments who allow faculty to teach that course are granted adjunct funding or funding for adjuncts to

teach it who have been teaching other courses in their departments. With regard to that particular course and that particular program, it is not nor has it ever been “my” program. I wanted to speak to or just make a small comment about your proposal. For Kirk, she wanted to note that as far as she could tell, there is only one requirement for a DI course in that proposal. She hopes that future iterations of his proposal would require two courses, especially if this document is passed. More specifically, this proposal is addressing the student voice need for a course that specifically focuses on race in the United States. Current courses do not have to focus on race specifically. Hence the proposal to add such a requirement without taking away from the existing DI requirement. Finally, she does think it is important to note that any changes LACC decides to make are up to them. The nature of those changes is not the topic of this discussion regarding APC document 44. We would not presume to redesign the LAC requirements. While there is certainly a curricular implication of potential changes that might come out of this is that is not what is at stake in this particular discussion. The reason for the year to implement was to allow discussions on the LAC broadly and the humanities program peripherally and not this DI requirement.

Juan Sanchez Martinez thanked the DI group that put together this and for all of you for your patience. He wanted to say that anti-racist work requires that we all hold space for BIPOC students and faculty to propose ideas, dreams, and concerns. This means like opens the circle and allows that everybody fits, and that everybody has the same space so we all feel comfortable. This is an important conversation, but it is a process you all have knowledge and is good that is happening. This is about BIPOC representation and is from that experience that we are propose this. It is important to remember that BIPOC student and faculty population is growing and shall grow in our university. That is the long vision. The long vision is that a belief in a place that is diverse, and the public university should represent and be part of that community. At the same time, the BIPOC word is just label and is used in the context of the U.S. This list of courses touches that complexity.

Lora Holland wanted to say that she is very much in favor of revamping the curriculum, and she had sent out a note to the entire senate asking about revising the humanities curriculum. She saw that Samer had a note about 414, but she would be in favor of revising the entire humanities curriculum, not as a replacement for APC 44 proposal, but in addition to APC 44. She thinks a multi-pronged approach that involves as many faculty on campus as possible will only be for the better and will help us affect real change.

APC 44 passes 17 to 1.

Second Reading

[APC 36](#) Add a new course, AFST 380, Modern Day Slavery
(Tiece Ruffin, Agya Boakye-Boaten, AFST)

[APC 37](#) Deletion of German licensure
(Michelle Bettencourt, LL)

[APC 38](#) Change the description for MGMT 130
(Susan Clark, MGMT)

- [APC 39](#)
[Appendix](#) Delete EDUC 315, replacing with EDUC 304, Teaching Global Citizenship Through the Arts, K-6; Delete EDUC 317, replacing with 327, Language Arts in the Contemporary K-2 Classroom and EDUC 338, Language Arts in the Contemporary 3-6 Delete EDUC 219 and 322, replacing with EDUC 323, Inquiry-Based Science, Physical Activity, and Healthful Living Instruction, K-6 Revise the requirements for Teacher Licensure in Elementary Education (K-6)
(Kim Brown, EDUC)
- [APC 40](#) Add new course: LA 115, Self and Community Care
(Jordan Perry, LA)
- [APC 41](#) Add new course: LA 250, Discovering and Developing Grit and Perseverance
(Jill Moffitt, Melanie Fox, LA)
- [APC 42](#) Add new Outdoor Leadership courses:
LA 205, Foundations of Outdoor Leadership Training Program
LA 210, Applications of Outdoor Leadership Training Program
LA 305, Advanced Foundations of Outdoor Leadership
LA 310, Advanced Applications of Outdoor Leadership
(Leah Belt, Wendy Motch-Ellis, LA)
- [APC 43](#) Add new course: LA 110, Rape, Aggression, Defense: R.A.D. Self Defense & Empowerment
(Robert Straub, Kenda Mullert, LA)

Sonya DiPalma asked what Senators wish to withdraw from the bundle of second reading documents. Marietta Cameron asked to withdraw APC 40, APC 41, APC 42, and APC 43 from the bundle of Second Reading Documents for discussion. Sonya DiPalma also pointed out that APC 37 would not be part of the Second Reading Bundle since it was not unanimously approved by APC. Sonya DiPalma asked for a motion to accept APC 36, APC 38, and APC 39. The motion was made and seconded. APC 36, APC 38 and APC 39 passed without dissent.

Sonya DiPalma moved to APC 37, Deletion of the German Licensure. She asked for a motion to accept APC 37. The motion was made and seconded.

The proposal was represented by Michelle Bettencourt, who gave an overview. She explained that the Literature and Languages department were requesting that to delete the German licensure program from the catalog because they can no longer at UNCA support the requirements of licensure in German in North Carolina. This is due to the Department of Public Instruction in North Carolina requirement that a part of the licensing program is student teaching at a specific number of field hours in the classroom. Currently, there is not anyone teaching German in K 12 public schools in our county or any of the neighboring counties. Therefore, they

cannot fulfill the requirements of the state and the Department of Public Instruction to license people in German.

APC 37 did not pass APC unanimously and APC is given an opportunity to add their comments to the record. No comments were added.

Regine Criser spoke as the Chair of the Department of Languages and Literature as well as a member of the German program in that department. She relayed that their decision was not made lightly. They were fully aware that not continuing this program is also minimizing the chances of placing German teachers in the State of North Carolina, which then immediately has an impact of our ability to place future licensure students as well as an impact on our pipeline into our program. They really thought this through and it just appear to be unethical to allow students to enroll in this program when we cannot support them finishing the final step that they need to get licensed. That is why we made this decision. It was a hard decision to make, but one that we could avoid if we want to remain ethical in our offerings to our incoming students.

APC 37 passed 15-0 and 2 abstentions.

Sonya DiPalma asked to bundle APC 40, APC 41, APC 42 and APC 43. A motion was made to bundle APC 40, APC 41, APC 42 and APC 43, which was seconded.

Discussion:

Marietta Cameron said she has the utmost respect for each and every one of her staff colleagues listed as teaching each of these courses. She has the respect for her APC colleagues that they have evaluated the academic value of each of these courses and have determined that they are worthy to add to the catalog. While she understands that these courses have been taught as special topics for probably more than the three times, she is sorry that they are just now coming before Senate after all the years they have been taught. Her concern is we have a set of courses that will be taught by our staff colleagues and not by faculty that has different position descriptions. She is concerned about exploitation on one side of staff while undermining of faculty and faculty influence on the other side. Staff have very structured job descriptions that do not have the protection that faculty has. She is worried that this would start a trend to find a staff person to teach courses and not add faculty lines. We are already looking at limitation on tenure track positions and this could further this situation by not hiring faculty when a teaching position comes open especially lecturers. She does understand that accreditations should protect us. However, we are the first level of that protection, we are the first level to recognize that, and to be concerned about the exploitation of our colleagues to teach things if the department says they cannot teach a course and there is a money saving mechanism involved.

In terms of assessment of the courses, how other courses going to be evaluated right now, faculty have the student feedback instrument that is used as part of our faculty record that evaluates our teaching. Our teaching is evaluated by the department chair. The assessment is different that amounts to evaluation by an administrative position. Her point is that there is a blurring of the lines as far as faculty and staff that is inconsistent on how the evaluation of teaching is going to be done and who gets to do it. One of her concerns in regard to adding these courses is the perception that it is okay to reduce faculty lines since staff would be available to teach courses. She just wanted to bring these issues out and have them in the minutes.

Sonya DiPalma took the opportunity to say that many of these courses go towards retention of our students and are necessary in that aspect. These courses have been on the books as Marietta Cameron has pointed out.

Sonya DiPalma gave the staff who are teaching these courses an opportunity to respond.

Wendy Motch-Ellis, Director of Campus Recreation and instructor of the Outdoor Leadership Courses, replied that she works very closely with Leah Belt, who is the faculty member on record. Having been in this career field for 30 years, she has had dual appointment roles where she has been in an exempt, salaried position as well as having an appointment to teach. She has seen many models. One is on the Student Affairs side, where we teach a course because it is critical to our mission and operation, as well as delivers a curriculum experience that is academic and rigorous for students. For example, with the Outdoor Leadership Program, we will be teaching that course for credit or not as a feeder program into becoming an outdoor guide working for us. They are the largest employer of students on campus and outdoor programs is our most popular utilized by students. Many other college campuses offer this course for credit and have advanced degrees. Some of us have master's degrees and doctoral work behind us. From a credential standpoint, we meet the rigor and standards necessary to teach this course. She cannot speak for all the courses, but their course is hoping to continue growing. We have the credentialed staff to be able to deliver. For her to provide release time for my staff and for myself to assist in teaching these courses is not an issue, they are exempted and this is already part of their job duties, and in fact, it is in their job description. To teach this course, it is actually coming from students who pushed us to look at having it available for credit, because it is so time intensive and academically challenging to go through all of the different aspects of the course curriculum. You can see in our curriculum layout, a pretty extensive document of how we teach our course. There has been times where as staff, not here but at other universities, we have taught as a lecturer where we are brought on by a department and maybe given a monthly stipend as a secondary appointment. Normally, it is a stipend. It is above and beyond normal work, and cannot conflict with work obligations.

There are models that exist for managing the inequity piece. It would be wonderful for us to get paid for teaching these types of things. For us, at this time it is part of our job. If this were to progress into academic minor program, I think we would have to look at whether we need additional resources to support the delivery of the entire course curriculum. She knows staff who are interested in teaching, potentially, in the diversity intensive courses. She is willing to look at where staff may be able to play a role in developing curriculum, and teaching or co-teaching with other faculty to deliver that critical curriculum for students. She wanted to put this out there for it is a balancing act that we already do. The only staff for us that are doing these courses she believes are exempt EHRA staff, or it is part of their job description written into their duties when they are hired.

Robert Straub expressed that he does not feel exploited at all. He agrees wholeheartedly with Wendy Motch-Ellis. He is teaching his course (Rape, Aggression, Defense: R.A.D. Self Defense & Empowerment) because he believes in the course and has seen it work. He thinks it is important and the students have asked for it. Not only is he not being exploited, he would like to think that his supervisors and his vice chancellor gave him the opportunity when he asked for it. He does not feel whatsoever that he is being exploited or being required or anything. He thinks it is an important course. He thinks our students should take it though he does not think we should force them to take it. We are going to teach this class either for or without credit as well. It is that important.

Jordan Perry wanted to begin by saying that moving her course from HWP to LA is not something that they requested. It was what they were told was happening. She is hurt by the idea that the assessment that we would be subject to is not as rigorous as at what faculty are subjected to for she does do the student feedback on instruction. Every semester, she has done peer review where she has had other faculty come and sit in on my classes. She does not buy the idea that our assessment will not be as rigorous. Like what Robert Straub said, she does not feel exploited. She feels honored to be able to teach this course, and as Wendy said, they do not get paid extra for it. She does teach as an adjunct sometimes for the Health and Wellness Department at UNCA. The classes she teaches as an adjunct is very separate. This course is something she does as part of her staff role as a way for her to reach students in a different way. Often the classes she teach as an adjunct are in the evening or early morning or are courses that the faculty do not really want to teach. She just wanted to caution folks against concerns that these classes are somehow less rigorous because they are taught by staff members.

Marietta Cameron has no intentions of offending or upsetting her staff colleagues at all. What she is saying is staff should be paid for teaching these courses, especially if it is not in the original job description. As someone who has frequently taught in-kind over her 30 years of teaching, she never felt exploited. However, when she looks back and sees what is going on, she realizes that there are some people over here getting paid for the very things that she agreed to do. She is quite protective of others about that. Her intention also is she is quite protective of faculty influence, because that is her role. Whether people can see it or not, this is a way of continuing to undermine faculty influence and faculty presence. That is what she is concerned about, and why she asked these documents to be bundled together. It really has nothing to do with the academic quality of the courses. It has everything to do with politics.

Regine Criser shares Marietta Cameron's concerns about not having our staff colleagues paid for work that for many of them is beyond their contract. At the same time, she was happy to see these documents moving forward because she thinks it is a way to make the important pedagogical educational work of our staff colleagues legible in our course catalog. She also wants to point out that she thinks these are classes that we do not necessarily have faculty who want to teach them or faculty who are equipped to teach them. We are leveraging specific staff expertise in some of these areas. She wants to be supportive of the staff colleagues knowing from her work as Director of First and Second Year Academic Success what important contributions they are making with these classes to the student experience and to students success and retention. She supports this proposal.

Heather Parlier shared that there is a difference. We do have general rules around who teaches when they are staff, and there are differences essentially related to job duties. When they teach as an adjunct, they are compensated in addition to their job's duties. When it is part of the job description, there is not additional compensation for teaching.

Jessica Pisano said she too worries about exploitation. Especially as a contingent faculty member, she shares some of those concerns. However, she thinks in this case our staff colleagues have clearly indicated what is best for them. We have had extensive conversations in multiple APC meetings listening to them and hearing what they want. She supports these documents because she believes that they are in the best interest of our staff colleagues.

Marietta Cameron asked Heather Parlier if it is possible that a department that needs an entry-level course taught and they do not have, enough faculty to cover the sections could find a

staff colleague with the expertise to teach those. For example, in Computer Science, our ITS colleagues could teach our entry level programming courses and a way could be to rewrite their job description to accommodate the staff member to teach without the adjunct pay. Is that possible?

Heather Parlier replied that anything is possible, but that would not be in the spirit of what we are doing here.

Marietta Cameron explained, like these colleagues, there are staff who want to teach courses in their expertise. Her goal is to protect staff also, but her role is to protect faculty. She has experienced wanting to do something only to find out later that there were greater costs that were not her intent nor the spirit. We have seen already through administration's change over processes that allow for what was not the original intent. If we put this process in place, that allows somebody to do exactly what she has just described and say it is okay. By bringing these situations up and discussing, at least in the Senate minutes it will be documented that this is not the spirit of it. This could become another one of those cases of somebody saying something is a possibility and folks are going no it is not and then years later, this will happen and it is like, "Why didn't anybody tell us about this? Why didn't anybody say anything about it?" She is bringing this forth to make sure this gets in the minutes.

Wendy Motch-Ellis agreed with Marietta Cameron and is concerned about staff exploitation as well as faculty preservation of positions. Going beyond the spirit and looking at the courses that are being taught are directly related to the mission and purpose of that function of that job. With all of these positions, each one of us these connect to our job, the actual duties we do in direct delivery of service to students, and the content is part of what we do. Sometimes staff are not in the normal business of teaching students as part of their job and it is outside the scope of their job's duties. She does think there are some test points that could be clearly articulated related to whether there is an opportunity for compensation or whether it is really is part of a job. Most of these positions have started as parts of a job; they became and grew to the point where we wrote them into the job description even before they became an academic class. She believes there are clear tests points on whether it is directly related to the mission and purpose of the delivery of that program to that department in what they normally do day to day. If it is not what they normally do day to day, then she thinks there should be an adjunct opportunity if that department has a need and have the funds to pay for it.

Sonya DiPalma relayed that part of the discussion is, as Jordan Perry touched on, was moving courses from one prefix to the other and realizing that the instructors for these courses did not have a coming together beforehand. The purview in this instance is these courses have been in place and are successful and we would like to see these continue because the staff would like to continue instructing these.

Jordan Perry (Self and Community Care Course) added that students would really like to see these continue. In the course that she teaches this semester, she had to bump up the enrollment number. She has 28 students in a class that was originally intended to have 18 because students are really interested in obtaining academic credit for things that historically have been considered co-curricular.

Lynne Horgan placed in chat that these are not anomalies and are popular at other universities, and in the case of Outdoor Leadership, there are Masters level. She believes that it would be a really good idea for us to consider offering a Master's or bachelor's degree in that area.

Sonya DiPalma replied that such a proposal would go to IDC.

To follow-up, Marietta Cameron said she really believes we should pass something like Wendy Motch-Ellis was talking about and make sure that our staff colleagues that are teaching courses be acknowledged in a faculty line.

APC 40, APC 41, APC 42 and APC 43 passed 13 to 3.

[APC Year-end Report](#)

Sonya DiPalma said that the APC committee has been like no other committee that I have worked: Jessica Pisano, Ann Dunn, Toby King, Michelle Bettencourt and Volker Frank. They have rallied and read many documents to provide feedback. They have been so supportive of her in the position of chair and she really appreciates that. She thanked Alicia Shope and Lynne Horgan of the Office of the Registrar for their tremendous help with all of these documents. Everything goes to Alicia Shope show first where she goes through and makes sure that copy is catalog ready - that is a huge lift! All of our ex officio members who give their insights, Herman Holt and Provost Campbell, she really appreciates that. In short, 45 documents and numerous Student Government resolutions APC reviewed and acted upon during a pandemic where they have taught hybrid or totally online courses. She is deeply indebted to our Faculty Senate Chairman Marietta Cameron who answers so many questions as well as her dean Melissa Himelein, who is a great resource and support for since she arrived on campus. Lisa Sellers who is our glue and like a Wonder Woman where she sends out our APC agendas and answers all of the in-between questions and put her hands on Faculty Senate documents going back decades, if need be. To her fellow EC members, she thanked them for a wonderful ensemble experience.

VIII. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee: Third Vice Chair Caroline Kennedy

[Decision Summaries](#)

Second Reading

[FWDC 7](#) Revise Description of the Roy Carroll Distinguished Professorship
(Faculty Handbook [Section 6.4.8](#))

[FWDC 8](#) Revise Syllabus and Class Policies
(Faculty Handbook [Section 5.2.5](#))

[FWDC 9](#) Additions and Revisions to Election Procedures
(Faculty Handbook [Section 10.2.1.3](#))

[FWDC 10](#) Proposal to Establish New Standing Committee SFI Review Committee
(Faculty Handbook [Section 10.4.1.4](#))

[FWDC 11](#) Proposal to Establish the Institutional Biosafety Committee
as a New Standing Committee (Faculty Handbook [Section 10.4.1.4](#))
[Friendly amendments to FWDC 11](#)

- [FWDC 12](#) Revise Summary of the Evaluation Procedure I
(Faculty Handbook [Section 3.5.4.1](#))
- [FWDC 13](#) Revise Summary of the Evaluation Procedure II
(Faculty Handbook [Section 3.5.4.1](#))
- [FWDC 14](#) Revise Summary of the Evaluation Procedure III
(Faculty Handbook [Section 3.5.4.1](#))

Caroline Kennedy asked for a motion to accept the bundle FWDC 7 through FWDC 10 and FWDC 12 through FWDC 14. The motion was made and seconded. No discussion. FWDC bundle passed without dissent.

Caroline Kennedy asked for a motion to accept FWDC 11. The motion was made and seconded.

Caroline Kennedy brought to the attention of Faculty Senate the friendly amendment document. Kevin Gibson, who is the Environmental Health and Safety Officer who has knowledge of the requirements of the Biosafety Committee. This is a committee that we would like to establish so that some faculty members on campus who worked with recombinant DNA can have NIH funding. Kevin Gibson made some suggestions to this after it already had been approved by FWDC. They are relatively small changes. One of those is the title, changing it from the Biological Safety Officer to the program manager. A second change, I actually just went ahead and made because it was wordy. The last change, we actually needed to have two members that are unaffiliated with the university rather than one, which was initially on this document, but neither of them have to have expertise in biohazardous materials. FWDC 11 passed without dissent.

[FWDC Year-end Report](#)

Caroline Kennedy thanked her FWDC members (Regine Criser, Susan Clark, Christopher Oakley, and Sonia Kapur) including their ex officio member, Melissa Himelein. She thanks them for their hard work this year. She is also very grateful for the support and camaraderie of the Executive Committee. She thanked them so much for their work.

- IX. Institutional Development Committee / UPC: Second Vice Chair Jinhua Li
[Decision Summary](#)

- [IDC 3](#) Sense of Senate Resolution: Address Biases against AAPI
(Asian, Asian American, Pacific Islander) Communities

Jinhua Li asked for a motion to accept IDC 3. The motion was made and seconded.

Discussion:

Jinhua Li provided context and background for IDC 3. This resolution is not only a response to the horrific act of violence against AAPI people in Atlanta and to the biases against AAPI communities in many other places in our country, but more importantly, a long overdue acknowledgement of AAPI people in our campus community as well as an initial attempt to

address their needs concerns and expectations. It starts with a request for a clear acknowledgement of AAPI as diversifying people from university administration and then continue with concrete measures that aim to support AAPI students, staff and faculty to form a sense of community and solidarity to provide a safe and empathetic space to share thoughts and concerns. This builds on the previous IDC resolutions to advance our work in matters of racial justice, equity, inclusion and diversity. If you read the eight points that were brought forward in this resolution, the first one is asking for the clear statement and the seven remaining points specifically focus on student support. She thinks these echoes and quotes her brilliant and powerful colleague, Jen Ward, "We are a student centered campus." This AAPI document show that we are concerned and we will support our AAPI student population, we hear them, we see their existence, and we acknowledge their needs.

Toby King said he enthusiastically in total support of this document and imagines a lot of other people feel the same way.

Jinhua Li thanked Toby for let her know and appreciates his feedback. She also thanked Dr. Evelyn Chiang who contributed substantially to the document for this would not have come to fruition without her input. She also thanked Heather Parlier and Luke Givens who gave us detailed feedback on all of the points.

IDC 3 passed without dissent.

University Planning Committee (UPC) meeting update

UPC met for the first time in more than two years on April 15 where they discussed parts of the presentation that Provost Campbell, John Pierce, and Chancellor Cable gave on the revitalization plan. They also discussed some summer projects. That discussion was not completed so they scheduled a second meeting to complete the discussion. That will be on May 4.

IDC Year-end Report

Jinhua Li thanked all the IDC members: Jake Butera, Tiece Ruffin, David Clarke, Brian Hook, Ashe Cossette, and Tracey Rizzo for their support and their fearless hard work, powerful support of important matters pertaining institutional health and development and equity. She thanked her fellow EC colleague: Marietta Cameron, Caroline Kennedy and Sonya DiPalma as well as for Lisa Sellers. She thanked all of EC for their support of all matters that were brought before them.

X. Senate Chair Year-end Report

Faculty Senate Chair Marietta Cameron

Marietta Cameron concluded her presentation by thanking everyone for their hard work during this very difficult year with COVID. She expressed an appreciation for the Chancellor Cable for meeting weekly with the Executive Committee where she welcomed open and frank discussions. She thanked Provost Campbell for his leadership and willingness to receive feedback. To Lisa Sellers, she could not express how much she appreciates her being able to take a lot at the last minute for things like "Hey, I need this report," or "How many documents are out there that are matching this policy." Also always being willing to make that last minute change. She thanked her for being so understanding, willing to accommodate, and helping keep us updated in as far as

logistics. To Sonya, Jinhua, and Caroline, she thanked them for all they did during a very difficult year. She also thanked them for the gifts that were delivered while she has been in this meeting.

The three Vice Chairs presented Marietta Cameron gifts to thank her for her leadership as Faculty Senate Chair this year.

XI. Old Business / New Business / Adjourn

Marietta adjourned the meeting at 5:50 p.m.