

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

March 4, 2021; 3:15 pm

Members Present: M. Cameron, S. DiPalma, 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.

Excused Members: J. Li

Visitors: N. Cable, E. Anderson, K. Betsalel, L. Bond, E. Boyce, K. Boyle, S. Broberg, J. Cutspec, S. Earle, M. Galloway, M. Ghidina, B. Haggard, B. Hart, L. Hewitt, M. Himelein, H. Holt, L. Horgan, J. Horton, J. McHargue, B. McNamee, J. Mennell, H. Parlier, T. Rizzo, J. Rhode Ward, I. Rossell, N. Ruppert, A. Shope, J. Taylor, D. Todd, D. Traywick, L. Ward, D. Weldon, K. Zubko.

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

II. Chancellor Nancy Cable Remarks

Chancellor Nancy Cable provided a few brief updates.

Congratulations to Marietta Cameron who receives Alumni Distinguished Faculty Award. First, she offered a hearty congratulations to Dr. Marietta Cameron, who has received this past weekend during homecoming, the top Alumni Award for faculty service and faculty work: the Alumni Distinguished Faculty Award. Chancellor Cable told Marietta Cameron that we are so proud of her and thanked her for all that she does. She admires deeply our alumni appreciation for all of her work, including a number of her former students. Bravo and well done.

Vaccination Site at Reuters Center. As most of you know, we have been working very hard over the last six weeks to set up the vaccine site here on campus at the Reuters Center. She is so grateful primarily to Shannon Earle, David Weldon, David Todd, Bill Haggard, and Heather Parlier as well as a number of folks who made this all possible. We had expedited approval from the state to do this. After a third weekend and a full week of doing this, we have vaccinated over 2500 individuals who are in this region and who are neighbors and friends. She could not be more proud of everyone for their tremendous efforts that included over 160 of our faculty, staff and students volunteers. They hope to continue our vaccine site through early June until all the vaccine is used. She is grateful for the volunteers to be giving this as a community service showing the power and the interest in the care of the university to the entire region.

Commencement. At this point, a small group have been working including Jill Moffitt, Sarah Broberg, Shannon Earle and Alicia Shope after consulting with senior staff and a couple of faculty leaders. The final decision will be made in mid-March about whether we can go to in person or we have to remain virtual. We are hoping for the former, but we are prepared for the latter. A decision will be made between March 15 and March 30. The honorary degree work is also happening to secure our honorary degree recipients for this commencement. Now the possibility of next May 2022 Commencement is also well underway. We received permission from the Board of Trustees to have exploratory conversations with seven individuals as honorary degree recipients. She will keep us posted as soon as they know whom our individuals will be.

Recruitment and Enrollment. Jeff Konz has distributed to the entire campus an enrollment report today. As you can see, retention continues to be a concern, but we are making progress. For the

last three semesters as she understands, we have had an increasing percentage of students returning from one semester to the next. Because this is something of great concern to the system office, and us she is thrilled to see that progress, even if it is minor at this point. Let us keep it up. If you have any questions or inquiries about the enrollment report, do not hesitate to let her or Jeff Konz know. The Admission and Financial Team continues to work with the recruitment of the inbound high school graduates for the class of 2025, but also working for our transfer students. To confirm, they will be recruiting and hope to enroll around 650 to 700 first time students and between 300 to 350 transfer students. That will begin to build back up to re-establishing the size of our enrollment that will be best for all of us. They are also working on the admission recruitment and enrollment possibilities for high school juniors who would be in our class of 2026. As you see members of the Admission and Financial Aid Team, please communicate your appreciation on behalf of Senate. She would appreciate that for they are doing good work for us as a university.

Racial Justice Roadmap. Racial Justice Roadmap work continues and is happening in a variety of different places around campus. Perhaps Heather Parlier can keep Senate briefed with details about what is going on there. Chancellor Cable is pleased with our early efforts, thinks they need to pick up pace, and she hopes that they will be far more widespread. All of this will also include a thorough review of all of our policies and procedures at the university that will commence sometime in late May. They will have results available for our review and shared governance over the coming academic year.

Capital Campaign. The new Vice Chancellor of Advancement, Kirk Swenson and Chancellor Cable have now conducted 13 virtual sessions with over 130 individuals commenting on the opportunities or the priorities for the campaign. At some point, she hopes that Marietta Cameron will allow Kirk Swenson and the Chancellor to come before the end of the Semester to the Faculty Senate to give a briefing on some of the ideas that were shared with prospects and donors. She would like to ask for faculty input on that list.

Owen Hall Reopening. Owen Hall will open as scheduled on August 1. Owen Hall houses our Art and New Media Departments. At some point, we will celebrate and have a wonderful opening together at a time when we can be in person.

III. Provost Garikai Campbell Remarks

Provost Kai Campbell had only two items to speak on briefly.

Provost Campbell thanked everyone who have participated in the conversations about the leadership structure change. He wanted to give a quick update indicating that he will continue to think about the responses that he received over the last couple of Fridays. He is working on an update that he will share with everyone. There will be one more opportunity to engage on this.

The other thing is he is starting to hold two rounds of conversation about centrally and the issue of modality that will get us to talk about scheduling and space. He looks forward to hearing the chairs ideas what the schedules would look like as faculty come with good ideas about how they might teach a course using all of the learnings that they have developed from remote, hybrid, and high flex learning environments. We need to think as a community what that means. What will we be doing in that space? How much remote offerings will become part of our curriculum? What does that do to the community and to our campus environment here? How do we think about that? These are the series of conversations he has shared this with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. Once the framework of the pertinent questions have been collected and the conversations are held, then we need to think about how we should structure our policies. He hopes to share a framing document soon and then start having those conversations next week. Ideally, he would like to get in the schedule to give faculty a chance to weigh in so he can hear what people are thinking about that. He will have more updates via email over the next couple of weeks.

- IV. Approval of Minutes: February 4, 2021 3:15 p.m.
Motion made to accept the minutes for February 4, 2021, which was seconded.
Minutes passed without dissent.

- V. Student Government Association: President London Newton
No report from the Student Government Association.

Staff Council: Chair Emma Anderson

Emma Anderson provided updates on what Staff Council's work. They are continuing to do some work around staff appreciation and launching Staff Spotlight is one of the ways to recognize the work of our staff. They are also continuing their work on the ombuds proposal. A new item they will be looking at in the coming months will include an accessibility audit where they will look at our practices and the ways that we host our meetings to be as accessible to abilities as possible. They are also partnering with some campus offices to do digital accessibility training. Our Executive Committee was discussing that we feel many staff are experts in their own area in terms of accessibility but are often missing a lot of the supplemental context for how they can think about accessibility in a very broad, everyday way. They are working with some campus colleagues to get materials together for staff that pertain to how their professional roles interact on campus. They also have their elections and onboarding coming up in the next few months. We actually established onboarding for the first time during our last election cycle.

Marietta Cameron announced that the Board of Trustees has approved that Emma Anderson will serve as Chair of the Staff Council and herself as Senate Chair as the Faculty / Staff Constituent Representative to the Board of Trustees. We all received an email about that, and she definitely wanted to thank and recognize her colleague Emma Anderson and herself will be attending the Board of Trustees meetings regularly representing the interests of our colleagues. Marietta Cameron definitely enjoys working with Emma Anderson. She thanked Chancellor Cable and the Board of Trustees for approving that resolution as well as thanking the Faculty Senate for putting forth a resolution in support that was passed at the last Senate meeting.

Faculty Assembly Executive Committee: Representative at Large Melodie Galloway
[Faculty Assembly Minutes February 12, 2021](#)
[UNC System Racial Equity Task Force Final Report](#)

Executive Committee: Faculty Senate Chair Marietta Cameron
***First Reading**

[EC 4](#) Proposed Faculty Senate Constitution Revision
[EC 6](#) Faculty Senate Response to SGA Documents SSB 20-014, SSB 20-015,
SSB 20-017, SSB 2020
[SSB 020 014](#) [SSB 020 015](#) [SSB 020 017](#) [SSB 020 2020](#)

Faculty Senate Sense of the Senate:
[EC 5](#) Faculty Response in Support of the Racial, Equity, & Diversity Taskforce

Marietta Cameron gave a brief overview of the two documents that were up for first reading. She wanted to give important information about EC 4, the proposed faculty senate constitution revision. To change the Faculty Senate Constitution, the process says that we must have a full faculty vote. At least half of the faculty needs to vote, and in order for the change to be approved, we need to have two thirds of the faculty vote in affirmative. In other words, two thirds of at least half of the faculty must vote in the affirmative in order for the change to pass. The process also says that faculty need to have at

least a month notification about the proposed resolution. Since we are going through two readings, the faculty will have more than a month notification. If this passes the Senate on second reading at our next meeting where we will discuss and vote on this, then it goes to the faculty for a full vote. If you are reading the document, there is a timeline that expresses this.

The proposal is to remove the language of secret ballot from the Constitution. As it stands now, when we have our voting for our officers, our Constitution explicitly states that we are to have secret ballot. There are other places where it explicitly states that we are to have a secret ballot. The changes removes the language of secret ballot, but it does not remove the option to have a secret ballot. Only the word “secret” is removed. It does not say anything about exactly how the vote is to be conducted. Right now, the Faculty Senate is being interpreted as a public body by the UNC System. In saying that, we are subject to the Open Meeting laws, and the state's Open Meeting laws prohibits secret ballots. All 17 institutions are dealing with whether or not we are subject to open meeting laws. None of the 17 institutions has secret ballots. We have different ways of as far as the roll call is concerned. Our practice since last year when our university counsel told us that we were in violation was to cease doing secret ballots and we have been voting via Google Form. According to law, voting is available upon request. She encourages not only the senators to read and do their due diligence. The reason to change our constitution is to keep our Constitution credible. If we are in conflict with state law then that leads us open to questions as to why follow the constitution.

The other item for first reading is the response to the SGA's documents, EC 6. You have access to the four requests. At the November meeting, SGA President London Newton presented those documents to the Faculty Senate. The Executive Committee met and determined which subcommittee deliberate over each document. The subcommittees made recommendations based on their deliberations. Marietta Cameron thanked London Newton and the Student Government Association for their documents and presentation. Marietta Cameron believes the recommendations definitely relay that we appreciate our students bringing their requests to us and is an excellent demonstration that we take seriously those requests and see the legitimacy of the requests that come from our students. This is definitely in line with being attentive to creating an environment that is inclusive, welcoming, and engaging. Please read EC 6 that is a summary and incorporation of all of the responses and the action items. We have highlighted the action items. The structure of this is a little bit different from some of our other resolutions where you have the whereas and then all the resolutions in one section. Since there are four documents, we went with the responses to each of the four documents.

If you have questions about EC 6, please send to the Executive Committee so we can respond and be prepared to incorporate friendly amendments for this on our next senate meeting.

In Melodie's report, you heard about the Board of Governors response to the recommendations of the UNC system Racial Equity Task Force's final report. Marietta Cameron serves on the Faculty Assembly's Racial Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee where there was spirit expressed to their response. In a nice diplomatic way of saying, there was a lot of frustration that was expressed in the committee about the response to the report. In EC 5, we have institutions that have drafted a letter of support of the UNC System Racial Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Task Force. They are requesting of the Board of Governors to give a response in writing to the recommendations. In our resolution EC 5, we are trying to support this task force in receiving a written response. This resolution is a letter that has gone through our Executive Committee. The letter was written by a colleague at another institution that passed their Senate. The letter addressed to Board of Governors Chair Ramsey and UNC System President Hans will be distributed to the Committee of Senate Chairs and Faculty Assembly. All 17 institutions have a copy of that letter.

A motion was made to accept EC 5, which was seconded. EC 5 passed without dissent.

VI. Academic Policies Committee: First Vice Chair Sonya DiPalma
[Decision Summaries](#) [APC Memorandum 2020-21](#)

***First Reading**

- [APC 25](#) Change course description for IST 310: Ideas to Action
(Laura Bond, IST)
- [APC 26](#) Add new course, CSCI 364: Cybersecurity
- [APC 27](#) Add CSCI 329 to the list of data science courses
(Marietta Cameron, CSCI)
- [APC 28](#) Delete EDUC 303 and remove it as a requirement for all licensure
areas, reassigning the 2 hours to EDUC 314 and the 43X methods courses
- [APC 29](#) Delete EDUC 434, K-12 Health and Physical Education Teaching Methods
(Nancy Ruppert, EDUC)
- [APC 30](#) Add new course: LL 316, Teaching and Learning Languages
and Cultural Expression at Home and Abroad;
Update the Licensure Requirements for Latin and Modern Language Licensure
by removing EDUC 316 and PSYC 328, and adding LL 316 and LANG 395, as
indicated
(Nancy Ruppert, EDUC; Elena Adell, LL)
- [APC 31](#) Add new prefixes for Greek, Hebrew, and Latin;
Delete CLAS 103 and 104, replacing with GRK 101 and 102;
Delete CLAS 305 and 306, replacing with GRK 305 and 306;
Delete CLAS 405 and 406, replacing with GRK 405 and 406;
Delete CLAS 105 and 106, replacing with HEB 101 and 102;
Delete CLAS 101 and 102, replacing with LAT 101 and 102;
Delete CLAS 212, replacing with LAT 212;
Delete CLAS 307 and 308, replacing with LAT 307 and 308;
Delete CLAS 407 and 408, replacing with LAT 407 and 408;
Move CLAS 365 from the list of Hebrew courses to the list of
Additional Courses in Classics
- [APC 32](#) Revise the requirements for the Classics major:
Concentration in Classical Languages and Literatures;
Revise the requirements for the Classics minor
- [APC 33](#) Change the equivalencies for AP and IB exams from
CLAS 101 and 102 to LAT 101 and 102
(Lora Holland, CLAS)
- [APC 34](#) Revise the credit awarded for Cambridge International exams
(formerly known as British A Level Exams)
- [APC 35](#) Revise the credit awarded for International Baccalaureate exams
(Lynne Horgan)

***Second Reading**

- [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 asked that any questions or concerns for first reading documents be brought to her before the next meeting. Regarding the Second Reading documents, she relayed that all twelve were unanimously approved by APC. APC has not received any questions or concerns so a motion was made to bundle and accept APC 13 through APC 24, which was seconded. APC 13 through APC 24 passed without dissent.

VII. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee: Third Vice Chair Caroline Kennedy
[Decision Summaries](#)

***Second 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
[Document with Proposed Friendly Amendments to FWDC 3](#)

[FWDC 4](#) Revise Non-Tenurable Ranks Faculty Handbook Section 2.1.2.1
[Document with Proposed Friendly Amendments to FWDC 4](#)

[FWDC 5](#) Revise UNCA Tenure Policies and Regulations Faculty Handbook 14.2
[Document with Proposed Friendly Amendments to FWDC 5](#)

Caroline Kennedy presented the three documents for second reading, all of which are providing clarity around how lecturers become senior lecturers and the process by which senior lecturers are reappointed. A motion was made to accept FWDC 3, which was seconded.

Discussion:

Caroline Kennedy first pointed out that all three of these documents have friendly amendments. She had a few people contact her with some editorial changes that added some greater consistency among the documents. No Discussion.

FWDC 3 passed with 1 abstention.

A motion was made to accept FWDC 4, which was accepted.

Marietta Cameron expressed concerns related in this particular document. Her first concern is that there making a change in the Faculty Handbook knowing there is a high possibility that we will be changing the administrative structure soon. She understands that we need to put in policies that are in light of our current structure to take effect immediately. Here broader concern is putting the evaluation for our lecturers to be different from the evaluation and assessment for our other ranks by placing the evaluation in the hands of a partial administrative committee instead of a full faculty committee. In the current structure, Deans are faculty and administration and are out of the pipeline in terms of evaluation of the four other ranks. One of the reasons why that bothers me is because she is an advocate for lecturers having a pathway into tenured ranks among faculty. She has been advocating for this idea that there should be a way for our lecturers to have a path into becoming an Assistant Professor on the track for tenure, or there should be something related to tenure with our lecturers. As it stands right now, there is a potential of exploitation. If we who are in the tenured ranks do not recognize that possible exploitation or the exploitation that happens and do not try our best to head it off, one day that will affect the tenured ranks where we will not have any moral high ground to stand. We have a potential right now, as we are not increasing in terms of tenure track positions. Instead, we are increasing our non-tenure track positions. The tendency to decrease tenure positions and increase teaching into the non-tenure ranks eventually be to their own detriment. She is concerned about unwittingly taking away evaluation of faculty-by-faculty and saying that is okay.

Caroline Kennedy pointed out that lecturers have never been evaluated by other faculty, and so, the establishment of this protocol for a senior lecturer is not differing from the established protocol that already exists.

Jessica Pisano wanted clarification. Her understanding is that the initial process to become a senior lecturer does go through faculty and is the same way that other full time faculty positions are approved. It is only for the renewal of senior lecturer after that the end of one five year contract that that this changes. First, she wants to make sure that she understands this correctly. Second, she asks FWDC for an explanation of why the renewal process is different from the initial process to be promoted to senior lecturer.

Melissa Himelein pointed out the analogous process that you might have in mind would be for senior lecturers to go through something along the lines of PTR. For the specific circumstance of renewal of senior lectures, we did as a group consider that process. There are two issues with that. One is that the timing just did not work, depending on whether we go with the handbook timing that senior lecturers have to be informed of the decision about their renewal on May 15, or on October 1. That is why there are three documents here because there was disagreement in the handbook. Neither of those was possible. When we backtracked for PTR, we tried to map it all out and it would not work. The second issue is that the evaluation of senior lecturers for renewal is uncomfortably not just an issue of evaluation of performance. It is also an issue looking at institutional need. We did not feel like it was appropriate to ask a faculty committee to do the piece about institutional need. Now you know the Dean's structure is probably going away; and therefore, there will need to be an update here. There are 200 places in the faculty handbook about policies in the future. She thinks that for now, we just had to do something this semester for this year.

Provost Campbell asked to speak about the challenges about the faculty handbook and he wanted to acknowledge thanks to Caroline Kennedy for her work. There were things about the way the handbook addresses lecturers where the ambiguity and differences do not give answers. Part of this he thinks is due to the senior lecturer position being fairly new. As Melissa Himelein pointed out, there are places where something is worded one way and another place worded differently. He agrees with Marietta Cameron on making sure that the handbook is consistent and believes the goal here was to try to develop consistency. They did try to align this with the idea of PTR recognizing the differences of lecturer position. Also to Jessica's point, there is evaluation by faculty by the chairs and peer reviews. He believed that FWDC also considered PTR for lecturers.

Caroline Kennedy confirmed that FWDC had a number of conversations before these documents were drafted. She was not sure that point in particular was discussed broadly in FWDC. She thanked Provost Campbell for his words and the explanation was helpful for her.

Jessica Pisano stated that it seemed to her that part of the rationale for the difference in evaluation for senior lecturers and renewal of senior lecturers highlights the fact that faculty who have been at the institution for 14 plus years could still have their contracts terminated at any point. Being one of those people in that position, she would love to see some kind of language that gives her more assurance that she might be valued after 14 years of service.

Sonya DiPalma had a comment and a question. She agrees with Jessica. She is in a department where we have some stellar senior lecturers and instructors. One has been with us over 20 years. She looks at this and thinks we are not looking at language about being appointed to a permanent tenured position that seems exploitive in some ways. She says that because her colleagues and her friends work as hard as everyone else does. They do great things. Her question is for clarity. The last bullet says that senior lecturers will be notified of the decision no later than August 1. Could we add in there that is the last year of their contract, right? Can we make that clear? Being notified on August 1 is not a good time for they are not likely to find another position anywhere else.

Caroline Kennedy responded that is correct August 1 before their last year of their contract. They will add wording to make that clearer.

Provost Campbell asked to speak for he feels it is imperative to articulate that we absolutely value the work of every single member of this community who does not have tenure. Tenure is a very

unique instrument that is only held by a portion of those who work here. He believes there are at least 500 people who do not have tenure for whom this same reality exists. That does not translate into not valuing. Even saying that he understands and appreciates 100% the sentiment that Jessica expressed.

Marietta Cameron asked if these resolutions do not pass, would we not this year do exactly what is being stated in therein? As far as the evaluation is concerned, would we not do that? Because there would be no other choice but to do what has been stated already? Is that not true?

Caroline Kennedy said she does not have an answer for her questions.

Provost Campbell asked Marietta Cameron to repeat her question.

Marietta Cameron explained that right now, the reason that we are putting this in is because there is not a process for senior lecturers in the handbook on how they have their contracts renewed. Is that not correct? That is why we are doing this. Her question is, if these documents did not pass, what would happen? She would suspect that we would go through the process that is outlined here, is that not correct?

Provost Campbell clarified that what she is asking is regardless of whether or not this passes, we are going to do this anyway. Is that what you are asking?

Marietta Cameron confirmed that is what she is asking that right now for this year something has to be done.

Provost Campbell agreed something has to be done. If this were to be rejected, his supposition is that we would very quickly try to go back and work with FWDC again to see if there was something that we could develop and expedite that would find consensus. Otherwise, ultimately, it does land in his purview to make this decision, and he has to make a call. Either there is a way that works in some collaborative sense that tries to figure out what is the best way or he has to make the call.

Marietta Cameron clarified that what she is saying to this right now is because she is looking at this is going to be in here only for this year and then there will be a structure change. This will not happen next year because the structure will change. She proposes that this way works for this year and then we look at what is going to happen because something has to happen whatever the new structure is. She asked if everyone understands what she is suggesting for she sees faces looking like, "Huh?"

Caroline Kennedy replied that she thinks she understands what she is saying.

Melissa Himelein replied to Marietta Cameron's point that if she is asking people to reject this document that would increase instability for our senior lecturers. The whole idea here was to try to give senior lecturers as much advance notice as we possibly can to provide as much stability for what is by definition, a tenuous experience. To Jessica's point, I want to say I want to echo Provost Campbell's comments and she certainly recognizes her privilege in having tenure. It has been painful in some ways to work on these documents and wrestle with these issues. Her understanding that the rank of senior lecturer was created to provide at least a five-year period of stability. This is a movement in the right direction and a renewal for another five years she believes would also add to that stability. We are, trying to solve a problem that the faculty Handbook's inconsistency created as simply as possible. You know if you vote to reject in it, then it is just the Provost's decision. She guess that is your option. She thinks you get more faculty input this way.

Marietta Cameron corrected that she was not saying reject. What she is saying is just do this for this year and not in the future. Just for this year, this would be okay due to this COVID situation. She is not rejecting but helping our colleagues have a process for this year. What she is trying to point out are the things she sees as problematic in the long term. In addition, she wants to come back to that inconsistency as a problem as far as the faculty handbook is concerned. When the proposal for creation of senior lecturer position came to Senate for discussion, she was on the senate then. Then there was a whole issue about increasing workload of lecturers to make that a distinction. At that time, the faculty definitely rose in that occasion and defended the workload of our colleagues being increased. Actually, the actual proposal that she was trying to push before this proposal that did not happen was for a

pathway for lecturers to become a tenured member of assistant professor rank. The inconsistency came because there was kind of a patchwork on trying to figure out how the faculty handbook was related to where there was no senior lecturer. She did not catch all of those places. Again, it is just like when we put something in right now and then when that new structure comes in there is going to be even more inconsistencies with that. She would rather not blame and put that off on the handbook. The handbook is inconsistent because we all have these little patchworks things that we are putting in without trying to look ahead all the time or not being able to catch all the time what is going to happen in the future on that. She wants to maintain that her motivation always is to make sure that we do not unwittingly exploit another category of people, or in this case, continue to exploit. Just because exploitation has been in the handbook already before does not mean we have to continue to support it. Because it has been there always before does not mean that we cannot speak out and see if there is a way not to make it a pathway to that influence. No, everybody does not get tenure. However, she thinks there should be a way.

From the past, in some areas people that have been lecturers become assistant professors while in other situations lecturers do not have that option. In her department, she is trying to get a person who deserves to be an assistant professor a path to that position. To justify denial, it is always pointed out what the handbook says. We have a situation where in certain circumstances it is pointed out that we have to follow the rule. In other situations, the rules in the handbook are not followed, which has happened before our current leadership that is in place.

Caroline Kennedy relayed that Susan Clark commented she is a member of FWDC and wholeheartedly supports FWDC 4 and that Melissa Himelein placed commentary about how this came about.

Regine Criser added as a member of FWDC that she was really encouraged by the fact that this was spearheaded and supported by many current senior lecturers and lecturers who look forward and plan to apply for senior lecturer status. She hears the concerns about writing something in without fully knowing how the structure is going to end up. For her, the situation gives even more reason to add this to the handbook now because she wants to be attentive to concerns about exploitation and how we manage the workload for senior lecturers. She feels it is more important that we have a more solidified process, with clarity and transparency for senior lecturers in the handbook before any of those changes happen. We do not have a process and that seems to be more problematic than having an imperfect process in place that will likely change down the road.

Marietta Cameron pointed out that the way this process is written, we could put this in and then I can see when we come and start looking at how to update with the new structure that we now have justification that a Council of Assistant Provost can make the decision now, instead of days with this structure right now. The Deans still have the classification of being faculty at least. With the incoming structure should this and that document pass, what would we do? The obvious forward would be to say it is a Council of Assistant Provost, and we would not have a leg to stand on and decisions then simply become a matter of need in the department in terms of finances. That is another one of her concerns.

Jake Butera hears Marietta Cameron's point that eventually if we restructure the handbook that what are called Dean's responsibilities will shift into potentially Assistant Provost that could be non-faculty external hires. There is a lot of uncertainty there. By the same token, those same responsibilities could shift towards the area chairs that are being discussed, which would be faculty members. It seems that any rewrite of the faculty handbook will involve faculty as we are doing right now. One of the advantages to putting this in there now is that when we do revisit these rules and any security or clarity will remain for senior lecturers. Whereas if we leave it out and try to make these changes later in the handbook, there is a scenario he sees where this is overlooked and these rules and regulations are not placed in that Handbook. The process takes two or three years or more to be approved while senior

lecturers are left in the lurch because that language is not in there right now. Having these rules approved and in the handbook seems stronger than remembering to put them in later.

*****Faculty Senate Chair Marietta Cameron asked to have following explicitly placed in the minutes: In passing this document, FWDC 4 is NOT an invitation nor saying that faculty evaluation and assessment should belong solely in the hands of the administration.** Marietta Cameron has seen too many times proposed faculty handbook changes presented where advocates said her concerns were not the intention only at a later date to turn around and tell her that the senate meant the opposite in passing a document in order to pass more changes that enact the very problems she warned. They insist on that while forgetting she was in the room and knows that was not the case so she is putting this statement in the minutes. Thank you.

Caroline Kennedy thanked Marietta Cameron making sure that is added to the minutes.

Volker Frank wanted to remind his colleagues about the issue of Senior Lecturers that there is also an institutional history. He would ask all his colleagues to think about something that might not be so readily apparent to them. Right now, it is probably fair to say that an important context in which we live and make decisions is shaped by COVID-19. So ask yourself the question, how you would think about the issue before us if the context were somewhat different in an important conversation around campus, not just before Senate. An important conversation around Senate would be how lecturers are treated here at UNCA. We have had exactly that kind of time in the past, so much so that senior lecturers, or lecturers before the title change, actually left UNCA because they felt that they were not appreciated. He asks the senators to do a hypothetical here. Despite COVID, think about the salience of the issue of senior lecturers on campus for us, and how long many have been here. Whatever your decision might be with the documents before us now, it seems to him that the senior lecturer position right now and the conversations around senior lecturers are somewhat weakened by the dominance of COVID-19 and all the great work that all of us are doing. So without making any individual judgments here, but I would think that for us, as Senate as a group, the salience of Senior Lecturers is important, though limited importance and not as important as it once was. One could probably remember a time back when it was very, very important. We might move once again into a different time in the future where the salience and the issue of senior lecturers might become more important to us. It would be good to have made the decision today not only with hindsight, but also with foresight.

FWDC 4 passes 13-2.

A motion was made to accept FWDC 5, which was seconded.

No Discussion. FWDC 5 passed 14-1-1.

VIII. Institutional Development Committee / UPC: Senator/IDC Member Jake Butera

Decision Summary

Jake Butera presented updates of IDC's work. The first is that they continue to move forward on restarting the meetings of the University Planning Council. It is their hope that the first meeting will happen sometime this month. The second is that they are looking to revisit a project that was started last year in IDC with Patrick Bahls of developing a system for program major and minor review. This is something that came out of some of the MLAS discussions that were sidetracked with COVID. If anyone is interested in having a program proposal reviewed by IDC although the system has not begun the process of actually approving and accepting those, IDC will still consider them and give feedback. That will aid in starting the process.

IX. Old Business / New Business / Adjourn

No old nor new business. Marietta Cameron thanked Jake Butera for stepping up to represent our IDC chair Jinhua Li, who is presenting to a conference right now. She wished her safe travels virtually. Marietta Cameron adjourned the meeting at 4:59 p.m.