

**THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA ASHEVILLE**  
**FACULTY SENATE MEETING VIA ZOOM**  
**MINUTES**

February 4, 2021; 3:15 pm

Members 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, G. Campbell.

Excused Members Ann Dunn, Jeremias Zunguze, Tiece Ruffin (attended beginning at 5:17 p.m.)

Visitors: N. Cable, E. Anderson, C. Augustyniak, J. Beck, A. Bell, R. Berls, L. Bond, S. Broberg, S. Earle, M. Galloway, B. Haggard, B. Hart, M. Himelein, L. Holland, H. Holt, L. Horgan, L. Johnson, J. Konz, L. Linton, S. Nazionale, H. Parlier, T. Rizzo, J. Rhode Ward, A. Rote, A. Shope, S. Smith, J. Taylor, D. Traywick, S. Ungert, L. Ward, S. Wasileski, K. Zubko.

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

II. Approval of Minutes: November 5, 2020 3:15 p.m.  
Minutes of November 5, 2020 passed without dissent.

III. Executive Committee: Faculty Senate Chair Marietta Cameron  
Senate Chair Marietta Cameron decided not to give a report to save time due to the important discussions on the agenda for this meeting, which will reveal the work of the Executive Committee over the past month.

Student Government: President London Newton  
No report given.

Staff Council: Chair Emma Anderson  
Emma Anderson, Staff Council Chair, gave the report from Staff Council. Staff Council hosted a forum on January 20 and learned the lesson never to host a forum during a historical event. In that forum, they updated staff on some of our current initiatives like the ombuds proposal that we have spoken about in the past. They also asked for feedback on how we can best serve staff moving forward. A focal point from that forum is looking at staff appreciation. Looking at the employee engagement survey results from the UNC system survey, we see that that results closely aligns with feedback they received from the forum that the university could do a better job of appreciating and recognizing employees. In response, Staff Council is working with Human Resources, the Alumni Board of Directors and some other campus partners to brainstorm ways that we can establish some staff awards that will be sustainable because we have had a little bit of back and forth over the years for staff awards. We really want to make sure that if we can start up a sustainable program that is also very equitable recognizing that we have staff across our campus in a

variety of roles that need the opportunity to rise to the top and receive recognition from leadership.

Staff Council also has recently partnered with Human Resources and Faculty Senate on the Leaves of Gratitude. Emma Anderson is happy to say they received 625 submissions of Leaves of Gratitude across campus, which she thinks is an excellent response for the first time digitally. They are working through the data to merge and send out to staff and faculty across campus as a show of support. They will be working with communication and marketing to highlight some in the Weekly Wag as a friendly note to remind ourselves of the collective appreciation.

They are also working with London Newton on De-escalation Training for Staff Council Representatives. They are also continuing their work with the Ombuds Proposal. We have our Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Task Force that is working on trainings for Staff Council that may serve as a model for other staff on campus. They are hoping they are building sustainable programs for Staff Councils in the future. If there are any questions, they can be emailed to [staffcouncil@unca.edu](mailto:staffcouncil@unca.edu).

[Faculty Assembly Executive Committee:](#)  
[Faculty Assembly Minutes from January 2021](#)  
[Proposed Policy on Common Course Numbering](#)  
[UNC System 2020 Peer Study](#)  
[UNC System Racial Equity Task Force Final Report](#)

Representative Melodie Galloway

Student Recruitment/Enrollment, Persistence,  
and Attrition:

Regine Criser, Jeff Konz, and  
Sarah Nazionale

[Presentation](#)

[Presentation Data](#)

### **Questions:**

Brian Hook asked Regine Criser if she could tell us how the percentages of reasons for leaving compared to past semesters.

Regine Criser replied that given that we have never as consistently collected this data, comparisons are a little bit complicated. It is complicated since we are starting this analysis in the middle of an extraordinary time. She thinks over time this will be more valuable. Of course, we are going to start looking for historical data. We are trying to connect a few more data points at this point. Items such as a student who is leaving for COVID-related reasons or takes a gap semester, what did they answer in the continuing students survey; how many academic indicators did they get; and once a student has also an academic warning - this kind of like connection of different data points she does not believe has happened in consistent fashion previously. We really hope we can get to a point where we do better understand why our students are leaving, or why they stay with us.

Amanda Bell added she is responding based on the survey that we were doing before the beautiful process that Regine and her team are doing. The distribution of reasons with the exception of COVID are similar between transferring and taking time off. If you combine the concept of COVID-related being connected to mental health, by just eyeball/review that, they look similar. At least, that is her interpretation. We have not triangulated all of this officially yet.

Marietta Cameron asked in terms of the graduation rates, how do gap semesters affect that? There are statistics presented about how long it takes students to make it through degree. Students have already been explaining this was pre-COVID that students would take a semester off, and then come back and then take another semester off. She has a student right now that has been here eight years.

Jeff Konz pointed out that graduation rate is four calendar years, not eight semesters. If a student takes a gap semester, unless they are making up the credits and having seven semesters of coursework, they are not going to be in that four-year graduation cohort, they will be in the sixth year cohort instead.

Marietta Cameron asked in terms of the retention, has anyone looked into the statistics as far as underrepresented groups? Have you looked at any statistics on the retention of these students?

Jeff Konz replied there is not a clear pattern over time. If you look at one term to another, there was no significant distinction. In our spring to fall attrition, he thinks the attrition of our black and multiracial student populations was slightly higher, but combining all underrepresented minorities, there was not a lot of difference. He can send that full report. That is a single semester snapshot. Looking at the historical data as well, we do produce a report every fall that looks at the fall-to-fall retention. He will look at the historical trends on that point. Later Jeff Konz conveyed to answer Marietta Cameron's question, in looking at the fall-to-fall retention rate of first-time students, we have historically retained a higher proportion of our non-white or Hispanic students than overall. However, in the last two years, we have not (72% vs. 73% and 73% vs. 76%, respectively).

Marietta Cameron asked one last question. Do we have any characteristics of students who are struggling with online versus students who are thriving on online? What is helping some to thrive and others to not?

Regine Criser said that her office in some ways is an intervention office. We step in to get students back on the path. That is a data point they could move on since they know who is exclusively online and look at the standard measures of academic performance. She believes there is a good number of students who are successful. We know our transfer students are drawn to the online opportunities. She thinks that is one of the reasons why our transfer numbers are up is more students can make online classes work with their schedule and with their lives. There are positive stories to tell about online courses as well. Those who are exiting, that is the different side of the coin.

Analysis on the Continuing Student Survey

Amanda Bell, Director of Institutional Effectiveness

After Amanda Bell made her presentation of her slides and seeing no further questions, Marietta Cameron thanked Regine Criser, Sarah Nazionale, Jeff Konz and Amanda Bell for their presentations and ask to forward their presentation slides to be attached to the minutes.

- IV. Academic Policies Committee: First Vice Chair Sonya DiPalma  
**First Reading** [Decision Summaries](#) [APC Memorandum 2020-21](#)
- [APC 13](#) Change Scheduled Offering of MATH/CSCI 441 and MATH 452  
(Sam Kaplan, MATH)
- [APC 14](#) Delete ANTH 355, Marginality and Radicalization  
[APC 15](#) Change the credit hours and descriptions for ANTH/SOC 305;  
Change the description for SOC 405; Change the description for SOC 390
- [APC 16](#) Add new courses: ANTH 340, Anthropology of Bees SOC 330,  
Sociology of Families SOC 395, Class, Power, and Inequality  
(Marcia Ghidina, SOC/ANTH)
- [APC 17](#) Delete LIT 398, Integrating Literary Skills & Knowledge  
[APC 18](#) Delete LIT 497 and 498, Senior Capstone I and II; Add LIT 490,  
Seminar in Literary Scholarship;  
Update Course Descriptions for LIT 440, 484, and 488
- [APC 19](#) Increase the credit hours and revise the descriptions for LANG 395 and 396;  
Update Course Description and Prerequisites for LANG 494
- [APC 20](#) Revise the narrative for the English major;  
Revise the requirements for all concentrations in the Major in English;  
Revise the requirements for the Minor in English and the Minor in  
Professional Writing and Rhetoric  
(Kirk Boyle, Erica Locklear, Jessica Pisano, ENGL)
- [APC 21](#) Add two courses to the ENVR curriculum:  
ENVR 352, Plant-Animal Interactions  
ENVR 397, Herbaceous Plants of Winter and Spring  
(Irene Rossell, ENVR)
- [APC 22](#) Delete the following courses: BIOL 108, 333, 336 and 340  
[APC 23](#) Add new courses to the Biology Curriculum:  
BIOL 424, Reproductive Biology  
BIOL 425, Developmental Biology
- [APC 24](#) Edit the listing of courses that satisfy the categories in Biology;  
Remove BIOL 333 and 340 from the list of Advanced Ecology electives in  
Environmental Studies  
(Jonathan Horton, Rebecca Hale, BIOL)

Sonya DiPalma gave a quick reminder to proposers of documents who submitted by the deadline of Fall October 16. She encourages all document contacts to work closely with Alicia Shope in the preparation of your documents and promptly submit your availability to meet with APC to Lisa Sellers. APC has a concern that we may reach a point in the latter half of this semester that we have more documents to review than time allows. We know everyone is stretched, but we encourage you to respond to emails from Alicia Shope and Lisa Sellers to keep things rolling.

Today we present 12 documents for first reading. We encourage you to read the decision summaries and please present any questions or concerns you might have to APC members before the second reading. You may simply email those to her at [sdipalma@unca.edu](mailto:sdipalma@unca.edu).

### **Second Reading**

- [APC 6](#) Remove Declaration of Major Requirements for the BS and BA majors in Chemistry  
(Sally Wasileski, CHEM)
- [APC 7](#) Change credits, course number, and title for HWP 253;  
Change credits, course number, and description for HWP 265;  
Change credits and course description for HWP 316;  
Change credits for HWP 317;  
Change credits for HWP 333;  
Change credits, title, and description for HWP 356;  
Change title and description for HWP 360;  
Change credits for HWP 365;  
Change credits for HWP 381;  
Change credits and description for HWP 401
- [APC 8](#) Delete HW 111, Pilates  
Delete HW 123, Aerobics  
Delete HWP 323, Workplace Wellness
- [APC 9](#) Add new course, HWP 326, Food is Medicine;  
Add new course, HWP 384, Genetic and Evolutionary Principles of Health  
[APC 9 with friendly amendment minor edits](#)
- [APC 10](#) Update listing of approved elective courses in the Health Sciences and Public Health concentrations of Health and Wellness Promotion  
[APC 10 with friendly amendment minor edits](#)  
(Aubri Rote, HWP)
- [APC 11](#) Changes to the Repeat Course Policy
- [APC 12](#) Change to the number of possible course withdrawals  
(Lynne Horgan, Registrar)

Since these documents were unanimously approved and no questions or concerns have been submitted for second reading documents, Sonya DiPalma requested that APC 6, APC 7, APC 8, APC 11 and APC 12 be bundled for voting. Although the following were unanimously approved, APC 9 and APC 10 will remain unbundled to add friendly editorial amendments to these documents. Jake Butera asked to have APC 11 and APC 12 removed from the bundled for questions as well.

A motion was made to bundle and vote on APC 6, APC 7, and APC 8, which was seconded.  
APC 6, APC 7 and APC 8 passed without dissent.

A motion was made to accept APC 9, which was seconded.

Aubri Rote explained that the friendly amendment is to remove the word genetics from the title of HWP 384 for genetics is repetitive given that evolution talks about genetics. Jason Wingert did not want students to think it was too much genetics when the focus is evolution and principles of health.

No questions nor objections to the friendly amendment.

APC 9 passed without dissent.

A motion was made to accept APC 10, which was seconded.

Aubri Rote said this friendly amendment corrects the listing of courses to include HWP 326.

No questions nor objections to the friendly amendment.

APC 10 passed without dissent.

A motion was made to accept APC 11, which was seconded.

Jake Butera had a concern or question about listing at 16 credit hours. Since the university has a mix of four credit hour majors and three credit hour majors, there seems to be a little discrepancy where some students would be allowed to withdraw or do grade replacements. This concern applies to both APC 11 and APC 12. This would allow some students to withdraw from only four courses while others could withdraw from five. Perhaps we could do as other schools and say four courses rather than the mix terminology.

Lynne Horgan replied that her preference is that we do both of these policies (APC 11 and APC 12) by hours and not courses. She believes it hurts the student to have to count them by courses for it lowers the amount they could replace or withdraw. For example by stating courses rather than hours, a one-hour lab ends up carrying the same weight in these policies as a four-hour course because the one-hour lab would take out a course. This was their motivation to switch to hours. From a technical side point, the system office built a way to count withdrawals in hours. Hours actually allow students to get the most out of the withdrawal policy.

Jake Butera said that he still has concerns but defers to those who understand the system better.

Alicia Shope replied that for years it was 15 hours of replacement.

Lynne Horgan said that we are just bringing the limits up to where the state already is and most of the other system schools are at those maximums as well.

APC 11 passed without dissent.

A motion was made to accept APC 12, which was seconded.

No further questions so a vote was ordered.

APC 12 passed without dissent.

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

[Decision Summaries](#)

**First Reading**

[FWDC 3](#)

Revise Guidelines for Awarding of Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion for Faculty (SD1092S) (SD3701S) (SD0102F) (SD0202F) (SD1003F) (SD10316S) (SD10316S)

Faculty Handbook Section 3.5.3

[FWDC 4](#)      Revise Non-Tenurable Ranks Faculty Handbook Section 2.1.2.1

[FWDC 5](#)      Revise UNCA Tenure Policies and Regulations Faculty Handbook 14.2

Caroline Kennedy relayed that the Faculty Welfare and Development Committee (FWDC) presents three documents to Faculty Senate for first reading. These three unanimously supported documents collectively provide clarity around the process of promotion to senior lecturers as well as establish the procedure by which senior lecturers are reappointed. Caroline Kennedy welcomes any comments or suggestions to be sent to her by email at [ckennedy@unca.edu](mailto:ckennedy@unca.edu).

FWDC support of new [Annual Faculty Record](#) (FWDC Chair Caroline Kennedy) and discussion of how [faculty input](#) was incorporated in this document (Dean Melissa Himelein)

FWDC also expressed their unanimous support for the new annual faculty record, which is much improved over last year's document with better organization and clear expectations. We specifically appreciated the addition of the inclusive pedagogical or curricular efforts section, which asks faculty to share examples of their work in supporting diversity, equity and inclusion in the classroom. They also find it helpful to untenured faculty. In particular, the instructions state specifically that brevity is both encouraged and appreciated. She thanked Deans Melissa Himelein and Tracey Rizzo as well as Provost Kai Campbell for crafting the new Annual Faculty Record (AFR). Dean Melissa Himelein is here to talk us through how our comments were incorporated into the development of this new document.

Melissa Himelein wanted to say a few words about the origin of this form. As you all know, we attempted to pilot a new form last year. Despite great intentions and input from FWDC and others, we all agree that it was a failure. It was clear that we needed to try again and create a better form. The first thing we did was carefully examine all of the feedback that we got on last year's form - the two questions that solicited faculty input about the changes made. Most faculty did respond to one or both of those questions. She promised that she read every one of them carefully and painfully as there was a lot of passion in those responses. Then she did qualitative analysis, organizing all of those responses into themes. Then she condensed her analysis into an executive summary that is linked into the agenda under faculty input.

She wanted to point out a few things about that summary. First, due to the universal concern about the use of Google Forms last year they will not be using that this year. Instead, they will be using Interfolio, which is our new digital platform that is specifically designed for faculty personnel purposes. Some faculty have used it already when applying for promotion, tenure, or PTR. This allows faculty to complete records in Word, preserving all of your preferred formatting. Then either you or the Interfolio system can convert your work to a PDF to be shared electronically with Chairs, Deans and the Provost. The other thing to note about my analysis is that she grouped responses by frequency in the effort to give voice to the weight of particular sentiments. Obviously, the AFR has to be a consensus document. We all know there is a lot of individuality and faculty work so no single form is ever going to be perfect for everyone. Therefore, she felt it made the most sense to focus first on items of greatest concern to the most faculty members. You see a resolution column on the qualitative summary at the right indicating how we tried to respond to each of the concerns from last year's form. For example, the number one most frequent concern

was having the AFR form as soon as possible so that is why we are talking about this form today. The goal is to get this completed AFR to everyone by the end of this month. It is not a document that senate actually votes on, just to clarify. The purpose of sharing here is really to ensure that we have given as wide a group of faculty as possible a chance to review and respond. She asks faculty to email her at [himelein@unca.edu](mailto:himelein@unca.edu).

No Questions.

Faculty Elections Update (Caroline Kennedy) followed by discussion of request by faculty to have candidate statements (Regine Criser)

Caroline Kennedy gave a quick summary of faculty elections. We have completed the Committee of Tenured Faculty election and she sent out congratulations to the new CTF members, Jackie Languile and Patrick Foo. The Faculty Senate elections are happening February 8 through February 12. Faculty should look for a call for nominations early next week for the Hearings Committee, Academic Appeals Board and the Faculty Assembly.

Regine Criser wanted to take a moment to speak to requests that FWDC received from faculty regarding candidate statements. Multiple members of FWDC were contacted by fellow faculty members asking for editing candidate statements for the elections of any senate-appointed committees. That concern came up specifically around the election for the Committee of Tenured Faculty. The chief concern from junior faculty is we are asking faculty who have been on this campus the shortest length of time to vote on a committee that has quite an impact on their lives as the committee that reviews reappointment and tenure files. More transparency about who wants to run for office and why might be important information to share. We all agreed that any changes at this point for this election cycle are likely not going to happen. We also reached out to ITS with regard to what is technologically possible and found out that candidate statements cannot be linked to the voting website. There are other possibilities to share those candidate statements with campus to make sure that people can actually make informed decisions instead of clicking on the bolded names but to understand who wants to serve and why. For FWDC, this seems to be an issue that can increase transparency making us voters that are all more informed. This topic is up for discussion at this point though they would like before the next election cycle a way to move forward.

Marietta Cameron pointed out that this is a matter of process and a change to the Faculty Handbook. She also wanted to explain why the method mechanism that we have is currently in place. The idea that serving on the senate and these other faculty-elected committees is supposed to be a service for all faculty to be able to participate and not to turn elections into a competition that relieves a number of people, or there will be a perception that faculty may say they do not have to do this service. Technically, all faculty are supposed to take time and value this service, just as we have, in terms of other items that we are evaluated on like scholarship. She hears quite a number of faculty saying do not have time to serve because they have to do their scholarship. All faculty have scholarship that we need to be doing and taking time for so she hopes to have a discussion one meeting about that in the future.

Regine Criser is fine with putting this conversation to the future. With what Marietta said, maybe we can come up with a suggestion for what an updated handbook language would look like because then we have an actual proposal to look at. We have time since this is not going into effect until the next academic year and the next election cycle.



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

[IDC 2](#) Sense of the Senate Resolution to recommend that Faculty Chair should serve as a non-voting ex officio constituent representative on the Board of Trustees

Jinhua Li had two things that IDC wanted to report. One is that they have discussed the second reading of Minor Proposal-Innovative Change Making (see their Decision Summary for details). If there are questions, please contact Jinhua Li at [jli@unca.edu](mailto:jli@unca.edu) or any of the other IDC members. They are happy to discuss and explain their decisions.

They wish to bring up to vote a resolution IDC wishes recommend that the Faculty Senate chair is a non-voting ex-officio constituent representative on the Board of Trustees and attends their meetings. The Faculty Senate chair would have access and be welcomed to all the meetings except the executives meetings of the Board of Trustees meetings. They unanimously believe that this would promote a much needed faculty voice and representation at the leadership level and would facilitate a two-way communication between faculty and leadership.

IDC continues their work to prepare for University Planning Council (UPC) reconvening in the spring. IDC is waiting for some documents regarding campus master planning and revitalization from the Chancellor and Provost to start their work. They have conducted extensive discussion regarding online teaching and its implication to NCAA on multiple levels. They will continue to explore and investigate the future of online teaching and online degree programs in the coming semesters in relation or within the context of the campus revitalization and master plans. IDC continues to ask the Chancellor and Provost for updates on our relationships with indigenous communities, specifically regarding with IDC recommendations on strengthening our collaborative relationship with the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians. The Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians recommends operational actions to promote further institutional equity and racial justice.

A motion was made to accept IDC 2, which was seconded. No Questions.

IDC 2 passed without dissent and 1 abstention.

VII. Provost Garikai Campbell Remarks  
[Academic Strategic Priorities & Leadership Implications](#)

Provost Kai Campbell presented the Academic Strategic Priorities & Leadership Implications (see link above) document that he presented at a meeting of department chairs, program directors and Faculty Senators on Monday, February 1, 2021. The Provost is working on an organization chart with bullet points and costs. He will need the weekend to pull that together. Today, he wanted to hear faculty reaction and feedback about what you have read and heard.

Marietta Cameron asked the Provost to give an overview for those who were not present at the meeting on Monday.

Provost Kai Campbell replied absolutely. Essentially, he is proposing to change the structure of leadership from a Division Deans structure to an organization around functional areas. In the current Division Deans structure, there are two vacant positions: Assistant Provost for Assistant/Academic Administration and Associate Provost of University Programs. He is proposing instead of the three Deans over division areas to have four main areas: Assistant Provost for Curriculum, Assistant Provost for Student

Success, Assistant or Associate Provost of Faculty Affairs & Academic Operations, and Assistant Provost for Faculty Development and Innovation.

One of the primary reasons for making this shift is that these areas match up well with what work we need and planning that will move the institution forward and make us stronger in important ways. This proposal acknowledges the conversations that we have held over the last couple of years. That is a very quick summary.

**Questions:**

Marietta Cameron opened the floor for questions and the floor was silent. As a response, Marietta Cameron acknowledged she has received feedback through email. One of the comments a colleague shared with her was they hoped the Senate will have the strength to ask the right questions and to represent that we need to slow this down. Her response to such a comment is that the Senate has the strength that is backed up by the strength of the faculty they represent. We definitely try to represent exactly what we are hearing. Now is the opportunity to ask the questions and put forth the concerns that you have or things that you are interested in saying about the direction as far as our institution is concerned. She is definitely used to standing up and saying what everybody needs to be said, but she is putting it out to the floor of Senate. She gets weary just like anybody else of putting things out there and hearing “the crickets” in the echo chamber during the meeting, and after the meeting, she hears people tell her they are glad she said that. If you have something to say, here is your opportunity to say and not rely on her or someone else to speak because she/they are willing to stick their neck out and be perceived as being the only one who has these concerns.

Provost Kai Campbell that he is gathering questions and addressing them as fully as he can.

Jake Butera said he was at the CPD meeting where we had discussion before he had a chance to read over the document. He has heard concerns from a few people of the Humanities Division. One concern is that this has been presented as a proposal asking for some feedback and concerns. The document mentions that two Deans are stepping down that will not be replaced. It seems as though some decisions have already been finalized. Another concern is there is a bit of uncertainty about what the structure in the proposal will exactly look like. Another big concern is the question about how the areas are going to be organized and where each department will be located and who is making those decisions and what the structure is going to be like. In the proposal, you state there is room for creativity, but the vagueness is a concern for smaller departments who worries about ideas of productivity and the question of resources. The uncertainty makes for a lot of uneasiness. More clarity and specifics would go a long way to helping people better understand what the end result will look like and how we fit into the structure so we can determine the strengths and possible weaknesses.

Provost Kai Campbell replied that there is a tender balance between more detail if he were to simply decide what the areas would be and providing an opportunity for us to work together to figure out what we want to be together. He can certainly put forth a selection of ideas about how areas could be organized that comes with a certain weight if he does, but he wanted to leave the room as it relates to area formulated. However, he can put forth a few ideas. His thinking is if we simply keep the three areas of humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences that would essentially default us back into the structure that we currently have. We could shift Division Deans to being Division Chairs; however, he would argue that there are more creative, more interesting ideas to explore that could potentially advance us in some really interesting and great ways.

The Provost said that currently the Deans serve on Faculty Subcommittees that does have any relationship with the work they do as Dean. In the proposed structure, there would be one Assistant Provost position that a functional relationship with the Senate subcommittee they serve as opposed to a divisional only relationship. In my mind, the new structure actually makes more sense that the person is actually working more closely and able to focus more of their attention working in a shared governance model.

Jennifer Rhode Ward expressed appreciation of the transparency that is going into this process and the thought that has gone into the proposal and providing an opportunity for feedback. A question that she had is that some of the things that make us different as an institution include the humanities program and undergraduate research. She is wondering in this proposed scheme, where does the Provost envision undergraduate research might be.

Provost Kai Campbell replied there are two possibilities he thinks are worth exploring: keeping the position of Director of Undergraduate Research for that role seems to be important to maintain. The question then becomes whom does that person report. Two possibilities is either Curricular Evolution or Student Success. He personally sees the role being in the Student Success area as part of how we ensure that we are bringing vibrant, vital, high impact practices, resourcing them, and giving them the life that they need as well as collaborating with those outside Academic Affairs whose work enrich the experience of students.

Rob Berls replied that as a past APC Chair having a Dean of Curriculum who works with APC makes sense.

Laura Bond had questions about process and where this proposal is going. Her sense is the proposal is still in draft form because more information is to come. She is curious where this process goes next in order to provide our campus community the opportunity to engage in discussion about this proposal more fully. There is a need for greater detail and a longer period for consideration. Clearly, we are stressed for time right now. People would be very interested in discussing this at length and coming up with more questions as we receive more information.

Provost Kai Campbell said first completing the document with the components everyone has asked for and what he always intended to have in this document including organizational charts with bulleted points and cost analysis. He is trying to get that done as quickly as possible. He intends to share that and keep the form available to invite question submission. One of the challenges is constructing a conversation that allows 250 people to participate. He thinks three settings for conversation where people sign up for a session. We have had conversations as a campus community over the last two years. Prior to the Provost coming, there were there were listening sessions with the Chancellor and common grounds conversations in addition to listening sessions he has had. Even on his interview, he recalls asking just about every group that he interviewed with what is top of their list in terms of what the next Provost should be thinking. In the top two priorities of each group was this issue of restructuring. He does not feel this is a new conversation or a new discussion amongst the faculty. He says this that he hopes that this is not seen as something coming out of the blue or left field. This proposal emerges out of a series of conversations that he has had and he understands the campus community has had before his arrival. His hope is after having some chance to respond, there is a sense of consensus around us moving forward. By consensus, he is not saying everybody in the universality agrees with every single point, but that at its heart and at its core, this is a direction that we see as valuable and important to advance the university. He is looking for a sense of endorsement that this is the right way to go.

Sonya DiPalma thanked the Provost for clarifications and letting us know there is more information to come. She would suggest that our subcommittees on Faculty Senate digest this information and the information to come and then they would be able to provide feedback that is more valuable.

Provost Campbell welcomed that.

Volker Frank had a question specifically about proposed ideas around the Humanities Program. The document proposes that the role of the Director of the Humanities program be split between the Assistant Provost for Curriculum and an area chair. Can you tell us a little bit more about the thinking that led you to that perspective or idea?

Provost Campbell replied there are components about how we have been thinking about the Humanities Program that are bigger and encompass more than just the Humanities Program. For example, we have had many conversations about how the Humanities Program and the Liberal Arts Core interact with

each other. There are various things like student outcomes and student feedback that could benefit from a broader purview of thinking that allows us to think about how the Humanities Program connects to the other components of the curriculum.

There is also certainly a value in being closer to the ground on the work. He does not want to lose sight of some of the “close touch” going on out there. He believes the area chair would provide connection to other disciplines that help strengthen what the Humanities Program can do. He imagines the question in determining area for each discipline is flipped a little bit to say what area we want to be connected with that program to center it. He believes there is some real benefit to be gained by thinking about what we can do in that structure.

Jake Butera asked to follow-up. This has been presented as a proposal where you are talking about having additional listening sessions. At the same time, two of the deans are not having their contracts renewed. It seems as though some of these decisions have already been made and will be put in to action. Another question in regards to areas is how the decisions are going to be made about putting programs into different areas. He understands that there is some room for creativity, but the mechanism for how that decision will be made is still a little unclear.

Provost Campbell made a correction. Two of the deans are stepping down, and it is not a decision that he is not renewing their contracts. Their term is up. I would dare say that they are ready to step down after the past year. They have worked extraordinarily hard, and the Provost is extraordinarily grateful that Herman Holt has agreed to continue for it is a ton of work. He wanted to pause and say how grateful he is for the work that they are doing and working with the Faculty Senate.

Jake Butera pointed out that the actual language is that these two Deans will not be replaced, which is his bigger concern, not necessarily why they are stepping down, leaving or otherwise. It is the question of they are not being replaced that a number of people have raised concerns about since this document seems to have “more teeth” than then just a proposal and that some of these decisions have been already made.

Provost Campbell responded that he did not realize he had used the words that they will not be replaced. He was trying to articulate that their stepping down presents an opportunity or a good moment to consider this kind of proposed transition before we get into the situation of having to replacing deans. The question is not in his view whether or not we should but when we should. The Provost is saying that their stepping down make a good opportunity to go ahead and make the move.

The Provost believes embedded in Jake Butera’s question is to what extent is this proposal a done deal and to what extent is there an opportunity for some real authentic genuine feedback. The Provost is being upfront, honest and authentic when he says he wants to hear what people are saying and their assessment of how this is benefiting the institution and what might be a cause for some for some harm. He admits that if someone makes the argument that is not how we have done it is not a good argument to why this might not be a good idea. He says this not to say anybody is making that argument, but because he wants to be clear that he is listening, but he will also want to be able to respond to how he understands what those arguments are. He would like to really engage and exchange ideas about this.

Jake Butera responded that he thinks the concern especially in the Humanities Division where he comes from is that it is unclear who exactly will be representing us in the interim. The Provost mentioned that Herman Holt would continue and have increased responsibilities. He understands how that brings unease in regards to potentially having somebody from outside of their division representing or taking over the Humanities Program who has additional heavy responsibilities. Some of the mechanisms that are unclear is where the concern for the immediate future and uncertainty about the proposal’s benefit stems.

Provost Campbell responded that it not that the Humanities Program is losing representation. It is shifting, but there still will be somebody chairing that program. People have various ideas about the difference between a chair and a director. He is not proposing a magnitude of shift where you lose representation. The Provost does understand that folks are anxious to know exactly who, what and how the structure will be exactly organized. Again, he wants to leave some room for that to be engaged by all of us.

Rob Berls asked (and said this might have already been answered) for a possibility to extend this out to the faculty at large and getting feedback. He also wonders about the proposed timeline on searches and hiring of August 2021. Is it the Provost's preference to do the searches soon and the hiring within the given timeframe or has that changed?

Provost Campbell said the timeline in the proposal would be the ideal. If as we engage in a conversation where it becomes clear there is something truly problematic, then we would need to we need to stop and think about that. If I were not willing to do that, it would in fact be a done deal. He wanted to hear first the substance of a disagreement in the timeline and proposal. He knows that they are waiting for the components in order to make an accurate assessment. He understands that and those components will get into the proposal.

Marietta Cameron has questions but she does have other opportunities to ask and speak with the Provost and Chancellor given she is part of the Executive Committee. However, she does have questions that need to be answered publicly. Number one question is what is being proposed so far will present a challenge to us as a Senate on what does that mean for the Faculty Senate's structure as according to our policies and our bylaws on that proposes a change to our structure and how we handle that. Moreover, a change of our structure goes before the full faculty for approval. Senate needs to decide how to restructure and address cultural shifts this proposal presents to us and shared governance. These additional items of work needs to be incorporated into the timeline.

Provost Campbell responded that he does not necessarily see the need to restructure the entire Faculty Senate because of this change. In some ways, he thinks this proposal strengthens how the Provost Office can engage the faculty, the Faculty Senate and its subcommittees (APC, FWDC, and IDC). He thinks that it creates stronger, more natural connections. If the Faculty Senate, in evaluating this proposal said to itself, we need to change our structure, he would not object for that is your decision to make. He is saying that he does not see that Senate has to make a change.

Marietta Cameron replied she does see it as necessary. Respectfully, she sees it as a necessary move since our faculty elections are based on our current divisions. It is not only a matter of interfacing with our leadership; it is also about representing our at large colleagues. In the new organization, we would need to make sure that each of those new areas are represented in this elected body since Senate is supposed to be the voice for everyone.

Provost Campbell relayed that one way to think about that is that you will still have the same list of departments. In this proposed structure, there is nothing inherent in what this proposal does that means that Faculty Senate is mandated to change.

Marietta Cameron thinks that this is a matter for discussion for she does thing other things and others may see further concerns. She also thinks that there is a discussion for us to have in terms of the timeline. In terms of the tradition that we have set when we are making significant changes to our structure, the concern she and other colleagues share is that we have been in essence away from our home for a year now due to the global pandemic. When return to face-to-face operation, there is a perception of a shock that will come in to this institution if it is changed so dramatically in this timeline. Although in terms of prior discussions, there have been subsets of discussion among colleagues talking about changes to the structure and to the structure of our academic leadership. However, those discussions have not reached the floor of the Faculty Senate. IDC has had conversations but they did not make any conclusions and the discussions stalled is her understanding. Marietta Cameron said she was on Faculty Senate and the Executive Committee and did not know these conversations were going on in IDC.

Therefore, if she was on Faculty Senate and did not know these conversations were taking place, imagine the shock to those who do not have immediately connected to Faculty Senate. For a large group of our colleagues, this proposal is completely new and a shock to them. She understands from the Provost and the Chancellor's perspective where people brought this to you during the searches. However, that was not coming from the official elected body that represent faculty but through different individuals. She

appreciates that the Provost has decided to have these meetings for the larger community to come in, hear, and understand as well as get more information on this proposal. There also needs to be an understanding that faculty at large have already undergone many changes this past year and are doing a good job. At the same time, people are stressed with all sorts of levels of change going on right now. The timeline in the proposal will not help the morale go higher as we want it.

Regine Criser asked whether the additional community sessions would be held on Friday.

Provost Campbell replied that he thinks that is the likely time to hold those sessions that make sense. Although, he does ask for 24 hours to let him think about how to structure those that make the most sense.

Upon hearing no further questions, Provost Campbell thanked everyone for reading the proposal and taking it seriously. He appreciates that. He looks forward to getting more information to you and appreciates everyone's patience waiting.

Marietta Cameron expressed appreciation for the time, effort, and energy going into getting this information to the faculty. She wants to support her colleague Sonya DiPalma on what she said about the subcommittees feedback and is supportive of all three committees and the EC as a collective taking this up this work.

Sonya DiPalma thanked the Provost Campbell and Marietta Cameron for their words and remarks; she has appreciation for Marietta Cameron's remarks about Senate process as well as for the Provost for his replies. APC looks forward to other information as provided. APC meets next Thursday at 3:15 p.m. so anything that can be provided before then she will have Lisa Sellers put on their agenda.

#### VIII. Chancellor Nancy Cable Remarks

Provost Kai Campbell relayed that Chancellor Cable had left the Senate meeting for her meeting in Greensboro. She apologizes and looks forward to the next time when she can address Faculty Senate.

#### IX. Old Business / New Business / Adjourn

Jessica Pisano relayed that a faculty member asked her to ask this question at the Faculty Senate meeting, and she wanted to honor that request. Their question was how concerned should we be about our COVID case counts going up. In less than a month, we have nearly reached our totals for the entire Fall 2020 semester. Is there anyone (maybe Heather Parlier) who could speak to that? Perhaps others have similar questions.

Heather Parlier relayed she received the question privately, but thought to answer it publicly here regarding whether we have an update on when University employees who are in Group three will receive the vaccine. The UNC System Office has asked for clarification about what documentation should be provided and what does it mean by "instructors and support staff" language. As soon as they know, they will share that with the campus. She apologizes for not being able to give a more definite answer, but we do not have a definite answer at this time. Right now as you know Groups one and two are being served and vaccines are still slowly rolling out. As a result, they expect to have a more definite answer well before Group three is eligible for the vaccine.

In regards to case count, we had anticipated having more cases during the Spring semester than the Fall semester because where our country and our region is. As part of Student Affairs and HR training, we had our employees go through the Johns Hopkins Certification for Contact Tracing. We are doing our own contact tracing and have been since

the fall. In these cases of those testing positive, we are having those who were in close contact tested according to CDC guidelines tested. That is where extra positives are coming from is that additional test. What they are doing is working: we are putting those who test positive in isolation and quarantine in either our own housing or directing them to do it at their home. From our contact tracing in the fall and in the spring, we know none of the cases has come from classroom contact nor employee-to-employee contact. It is all coming from personal interactions off campus or personal relationships. She and Sarah Humphries is working on an email to go out to the campus.

Provost Kai Campbell also wanted to add that the increases are not just happening to us but is the situation in the entire country. There has been protocol fatigue and relaxation of rules to follow. It is up to us to be mindful and to continue to have diligence exhibiting all the right behaviors.

Regine Criser wanted to add that from a student perspective there is a pressing concern for students who are currently on campus. This is clearly a stressor for them. There is a concern of students that we may be sent home again this semester like last year. Students who were here last spring fear that they will be sent home again. This is also a concern for students who are currently living on campus and are in the classroom. She looks forward to the forthcoming email to the campus community.

Marietta Cameron invited Bill Haggard, Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, to speak regarding this topic.

Bill Haggard echoed what has already been said. While there may be some fatigue, he thinks we have great students who are very compliant and are taking all this very seriously. As has been said already, we anticipated higher numbers because there is more virus out there. A significant amount more compared to when we started in the fall semester. As Heather Parlier has said, we are following up with every case doing our own contact tracing, and the contact tracing happens immediately. In some cases, the contact tracing is completed within a couple hours and we take the right action. While the numbers are up, he still strongly believes we are handling those higher numbers very well. He was actually in a presentation with our county health director, Stacy Saunders, earlier today. Stacy Saunders said all of the statistic indicators are trending downward and have been for the last couple of weeks in Buncombe County. We hope what we are seeing right now will continue to go down for us as well.

Marietta Cameron thanked everyone and adjourned the meeting at 5:42 p.m.