

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA ASHEVILLE
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES OF MEETING VIA ZOOM
September 3, 2020; 3:15 pm

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

Members

Excused: S. Clark.

Visitors: N. Cable, A. Barber, A. Boakye-Boaten, L. Bond, S. Broberg, L. Cornett, J. Crite, S. Earle, B. Felix, M. Galloway, B. Haggard, B. Hart, L. Hewitt, M. Himelein, H. Holt, L. Horgan, S. Humphries, C. Hung, L. Linton, B. Lundgren, B. McNamee, M. L. Manns, A. Martinez, S. Mohr, P. O'Brien, B. Parker, H. Parlier, S. Plevier, S. Purdy, T. Rizzo, J. Rhode Ward, S. Shepard, A. Shope, S. Smith, J. Taylor, D. Traywick, L. Ward, K. Zubko.

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

On August 20, 2020, Faculty Senate was going to have a retreat. Part of that retreat was a session regarding racial equity here at UNC Asheville. Today, Senate will hold that session during the Senate meeting and then hold our traditional meeting after that session. By the way, this is not a one up and then we are finished. This session is supposed to show us what the initiatives are already going on campus and Senate will decide how we can support those initiatives. In addition, as the academic year proceeds and Senate deliberates, we can determine what changes we need to make to make sure that we are more equitable and inclusive, in terms of racial specifically in our persons of color communities including our Native American colleagues.

II. Session on Racial Equity at UNC Asheville

Introduction. Provost Garikai Campbell started by recognizing that when he arrived at UNC Asheville, there was already work in place and there are people that have been working on how we are as a community with respect to diversity and equity in many ways throughout their careers here at UNC Asheville, on campus and in the Asheville community. This work will be continued even after us. His hope is today we will lay out some of the ideas in our racial justice roadmap as a way of starting to have some important conversations.

Over the summer, as we saw things unfold, particularly in the aftermath of George Floyd's death. There was a lot of deep introspective work done looking back at some of the campus climate work that folks like Lyndi Hewitt have done. Today, we began to look anew and a little deeper at some of the things that we are doing, internally and as an institution.

Provost Campbell laid out some categories of the work in Academic Affairs: student support initiatives, faculty initiatives and curricular initiatives. One of the important items when doing this work is looking at quantitative and qualitative data about racial climate in higher education. It is important to hold the mirror up to ourselves to think about issues of belonging. There is a great dissonance with between what people feel is said to them and between what is

experienced. We need to look at issues of how we are facilitating unhealthy segregation and our capacity to have healthy congregation. There are artifacts that Provost Campbell calls “mana cultural” artifacts that are ways of feeling that we are all in a single monoculture. Our experiences affects the way that people feel whether they have voice or do not have voice and the emotional content that develops fears and misunderstandings related to their experiences. These are qualitative measures that are studied in terms of what it means to understand one's racial climate. Provost Campbell is calling for us to maintain a constant, persistent, sustained self-examination – honestly, openly and transparently. He believes this is important in respect to the various campus groups. For instance in regards to the Admissions funnel, we need to study students’ experience in terms of usage of service, persistence in particular degrees, and performance within particular majors and disciplines to understand the overall performance and outcomes of students.

Regarding faculty and staff, we need to take a hard look at ourselves in studying overall percentages as well as look at our hiring pools, who we are retaining, what is going on in terms of leadership and promotion, salary and compensation, rewards and awards. All of this is fair game for us to take a hard look.

Regarding curricular initiatives, one of those areas is the Humanities program and the work to address issues of diversity and racial equity. Kate and others have begun this work.

In summary, these three categories involve looking at the data about ourselves and deciding what we want to change. None of these categories or initiatives are of surprise to anyone. Of course, we cannot stop there. We also need to craft action steps that are going to begin to address and change the data so that it looks different. We will need to set targets and identify the measurable impact that we want to have. We have to know where we are heading and have a sense of what kind of measurable impact we want to hold ourselves accountable. The Provost raised these up so that we may begin to put some very real tangible action steps together that will have meaningful impact.

Update on UNC System Racial Equity Task Force. Provost Campbell gave an update on the work of [the taskforce](#) that he and Isaiah Green are members. The taskforce has been meeting in subcommittee work predominantly over the last month. There are several subcommittees, for example one on Human Resources and one on the Student Experience, that are working recommendations to bring to the taskforce. Each subcommittee is formulating four or five recommendations. These are preliminary recommendations that have not been vetted by the taskforce so it is premature to call these the recommendations but giving a sense of subgroups’ conversations. Recommendations have been about ensuring a strong pipeline of racially diverse group of students coming to the UNC system schools, particularly from North Carolina. While out of state students are welcomed, we are interested in building better pipelines to our state’s high schools. Looking at the kind of high school prep programs to build a better cohort of diverse teachers as well as ways to connect with families about navigating financial aid matters. There are recommendations for an equitable and inclusive pedagogy to make sure the content of the curriculum is diverse. They have heard recommendations regarding utilizing technology to reach out to a diverse set of learners as well. They are looking to ensure that faculty are aware and have development opportunities to support appropriately faculty in learning how to be pedagogically rich in the way that they reach out to all kinds of learners and all students. There are recommendations to look at data on student recruitment, enrollment and transfer outcomes. In particular, at the system level, data shows Black and Latinx students are transferring at rates that are disproportionate relative to white students.

Their next step is to bring these recommendations forward to the full taskforce for discussion. They will have a racial climate survey out in the next month for every institution in the system. We will all have an opportunity to participate in that. We will also have an opportunity to bring on board someone from that same group to do some specific work on our campus.

Marietta Cameron pointed out she serves on the [Faculty Assembly's Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Committee](#). They have had their first organizing meeting this past Monday. This first meeting centered around dealing with our attitudes on what we are talking about in terms of race and equity. They are dealing with different attitudes of comfort / discomfort regarding how we deal with the identities that make us most uncomfortable in terms of skin color involving ethics, marginalization, inclusion and diversity.

Racial Roadmap. Chancellor Cable presented the work of the past three months of the senior staff as they have been grappling with how to energize an action agenda that would include everyone at UNC Asheville. She is aware that there has been decades of work here by champions for racial understanding who have worked very hard to reject discrimination, bias, bigotry, and racism on this campus. Our work stand on their shoulders. She wants to speak to the hurt, harm and pain that has been caused by the racism within the community of Asheville and UNC Asheville. Within in our past, various different incidents show that UNC Asheville still needs to do extensive work to eradicate or eliminate structural racism, bigotry, bias, and hate in our own community.

Let us use this moment of reckoning to get about this business. For the last two and a half to three months, the senior staff has been searching for a way not to provide anything that should be seen as a top down. In fact, just the opposite, an open invitation for action, participation and education to make UNC Asheville more aligned with the values that we espouse and to reduce and eliminate where possible racism that exists in our own community. Instead of creating a document that could be seen as an edict that comes from on high, they crafted a process that suggests a number of key strategic priorities for action and for education.

This is an invitation for the entire community - our students, our faculty, our staff, our leaders, our trustees, and our volunteer boards to participate in real actionable work. She wants to begin by quoting one of our alums who was Student Body President Maya Newlin. In November of 2015, she brought forward [a student decree on diversity and inclusion to the campus community including the Board of Trustees](#). With that, she started with this quote:

“We believe diversity is basic in a free society. Diversity is a matter of form, as well as content. Diversity opposes coercive assimilation. The idea of diversity changes and requires continual review and the achievement of true diversity. True diversity is difficult and takes practice and requires skill.”

Why do this? It is not just to eradicate racism, it is to make us a better university, a better academic community and to make us a more collaborative, true, humane and honest place to be.

Our commitment envisions a future where UNC Asheville faculty, staff and students will know that they belong regardless of their race, ethnicity, age, religion, disability, socioeconomic status, gender expression, gender and sexual identity, national origin, cultural and ideological beliefs. The work of this racial justice roadmap is the invitation for us to focus on these inclusions as well as to focus on race. Asheville, as a university, should reflect the diversity of this world and should be willing to include in our community all perspectives - those that

emerged from pain, discrimination and racism and those that emerged from privilege who need to learn about the scourge of racism in our world.

A document titled “Privilege, Power and Racism: a Proposed UNC Asheville Racial Justice Roadmap for Education and Action” will eventually be circulated to the entire campus for feedback, response, and critique ideas that will help us all frame the things that we will work on both immediately in this semester, in the coming academic year, and the years beyond that. The key constituencies for feedback and initial response will be the following:

- Faculty Senate and Faculty Senate Executive Committee
- Staff Council
- Student Government Association and all forms of student leadership including athletic and co-curricular
- Diversity and Equity Working Group
- UNC Asheville Board of Trustees
- UNC Asheville National Alumni Association
- UNC Asheville Foundation Board
- Departments, Department Chairs, Program Directors

Chancellor Cable saw a very fine presentation today by Dr. Tiece Ruffin and Dr. Leroy Ray in the Education Department about understanding pedagogical changes that can be reflective and inclusive so even departments, program directors, and department chairs will be consulted and asked for feedback about all of this as well as athletic coaches and our community partners. As Provost Campbell just mentioned, the UNCA curriculum adopting inclusive pedagogy that is based on inclusive excellence and the decolonization of our curriculum, which will not be easy but must happen. UNCA student experience in education about racism, social justice, and racial injustice, a number of our students if asked would not be able to tell you what the definition of structural racism is. Every student who crosses the platform at graduation and receives a degree should be educated well enough to serve across all racial organizations, groups and individuals, if they are ever to lead in the society that they will inherit. There is real work to educate these young people, our transfer and nontraditional aged students to be able to hold a UNC Asheville degree that says, “I am aware of these issues.”

There have been many efforts in hiring and retaining a critical mass of faculty and staff of color as well as recruiting and retaining a critical mass of students of color. Some of them have been well intended but were not backed up by good financial aid policy. Sometimes we got the financial aid policy in place, but our admission staff was not recruiting actively enough Cherokee students, students of color, and Latinx students. We have to bring these efforts together and she agrees completely with Provost Campbell that we have to have metrics that show our failures, as well as our successes, though we refuse to accept failures. Employee and student orientations will emphasize equity and inclusion. She would like a completely different faculty and staff onboard process that will focus on efforts underway and priorities we are looking not only to make us more racially tolerant, but a racially celebratory place to educate our students.

Another priority is to discover and eliminate all symbols of racism and oppression on our campus, not just building names. That has certainly started to happen with some work that our Board of Trustees did at the recommendation of the senior staff this past weekend. There is more to be done on that to eliminate all symbols that would represent hate, discrimination and bigotry.

Ensuring curricular upgrades as well as developing and implementing programs that will expand our community outreach and equity advocacy to address, study and reduce inequity in educational, healthcare, housing, and transportation opportunities in Asheville. We can be a change agent on our own campus and meet the dire needs in our community.

Provost Campbell named a few ways to dismantle structural racism within our university policies and procedures, and Chancellor Cable thinks there are more that need to be discovered and evaluated. This racial roadmap is one of many initiatives across campus to become sustained action by asking questions and evaluating our progress. This is work for all persons on our campus. They are suggesting three phases that includes ongoing initiatives already in play. The first phase would be this semester, despite COVID and the second phase would be the spring, summer and fall academic work next year in 2021. The third phase would be the 18-month period from the spring of 2022 through the fall of 2023.

We must remember, quoting the Council of Education President Ted Mitchell,

“Racism and its effects on people and systems remain among the toughest and most complex problems to meaningfully address.”

It will not easy and some of it will be very uncomfortable. Chancellor Cable is confident that we can make progress in this. Another goal is to make clear at all times that our university’s values of diversity, equity, and inclusion are distinct goals in every aspect of our work. The way in which we conduct our academic business is to help students sustain an understanding of historic ravages of racism in this nation and to equip our graduates to live lives as enlightened and informed persons who reject racism and all of its forms.

There will be a dashboard of metrics, as Provost Campbell mentioned, to track and reveal our progress to develop a comprehensive and values-based response to racial incidents on our campus.

They have collected at least eight questions that we believe are salient right now and some of these questions came from some of the national reading that the senior staff has done:

1. Does the demographic makeup of our faculty, our staff, our senior leadership, and our university fiduciary leaders reflect an openness to all races?
Does our student demographic reflect the nation at large, our state, and our region?
How about faculty? How about staff?
2. How does our institution mitigate bias in the classroom experience? Does our curriculum reflect attention to principles of equity and inclusion? Not only along the lines of race, but on the lines of racial knowledge and understanding across the globe?
3. How does our university regularly assess the current campus climate for all persons studying and working here?
4. How can we ensure that students, faculty and staff of color, feel embraced, welcomed, supported, and encouraged here with a sense of belongingness?
5. How can we ensure that our students of color receive the necessary support, advising and counseling?
Some incredibly good work has been done in the last four months by Deaver Traywick and others that helped us preserve the number of students admitted and enrolled here.

6. How is our university addressing food and housing insecurity for our students in need, especially our black and brown students?
7. Are we actively, meaningfully engaging students of color in co-curricular leadership experiences that are prominent and give voice where voice not may not be currently available to those students?
8. What is the relationship between students of color, campus police, and local law enforcement?

London Newton has been working on this through the summer.

These are some of the questions that we are putting forth before you. Not that all of those have to be what we work on first.

Next steps in this will be to talk to leadership groups, to distribute this document and to share our ideas that can allow us to criticize what is not represented here, what is wrong or ill-conceived here. It may be possible to have an anonymous Google Doc to aid us in some of this work. Out of that work, we hope by mid-fall to have a way of moving forward.

The process itself is an invitation to all of us. Chancellor Cable is offering this as one way forward to improve the quality of UNC Asheville's academic integrity and to eliminate racism within our midst.

Marietta Cameron thanked Chancellor Cable and the senior staff. She also thanks the colleagues mentioned for their work. The Senate Chair reiterated that this is not a one off. We would like to have like an idea of some engaged activities where we do not just sit and listen to what has been going on, but actually have some activities to get us involved in initiatives involving answering those questions. There are very few people of color from the community on this campus, but they need to be present and involved in some of these activities.

Questions. Volker Frank thanked the Chancellor very much. He said he is usually very critical of our institution, and most of the time, critical things come out of his mouth. He wanted to acknowledge what we just heard. He said he has been here for 25 years. He has never ever heard any Provost nor any Chancellor speak with such passion about our institution, its mission and its future work. As a senator and as a faculty member, he wanted to express his profound gratitude to what I just heard because it reveals a lot of passion, not just a diagnosis, but also a commitment to action, which he has never heard before. He thanked Chancellor Cable and Provost Campbell very much and he really appreciates it.

Jessica Pisano echoed his statement saying although she has not been here as long as Volker Frank, she would like to thank the Chancellor and Provost as well.

[Land Acknowledgment](#)

Preface by Chancellor Nancy Cable. Chancellor Cable thanked Trey Adcock for his continued leadership in Interdisciplinary and Indigenous Studies. Working together with him, Andrea Martinez and the Cherokee community, she has had the incredible privilege of presenting what Trey Adcock had written as a land acknowledgement resolution to the Cherokee Eastern Band of Cherokee Indian Tribal Council about three to four weeks ago. She was asked to stand before the council and read the long version that clearly says that the land that we prize now as the University of North Carolina Asheville belonged many years ago to the Cherokee. It was special and sacred land then, and the European influence of running roughshod through in a murderous way so many of the Cherokee along the French Broad River that actually happened on this campus too.

What we were able to do in offering the land acknowledgement that Trey Adcock and the group has beautifully written was to offer up our understanding of this sacred land with our Eastern Band of Cherokee colleagues and friends. The Chancellor said it was an honor to do that. The vote was taken as she was standing there, and it passed unanimously. With great respect and admiration for Trey Adcock, the Chancellor wanted everyone to know what a great privilege that was for her.

Kate Zubko relayed that the land acknowledgment was drafted by alum Watson Harlan and was worked on by the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians group that has met the past year and a half under the leadership of Trey Adcock.

Reading of the Land Acknowledgment by Andrea Martinez. Marietta Cameron explained that Trey Adcock could not be here today and suggested that Andrea Martinez be invited to read the acknowledgment aloud.

Andrea Martinez, Associate Director of Admissions for Pre-college Outreach, teaches as an adjunct on campus as well. She has been working the last six months to reinvigorate a relationship in the recruitment of Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians (EBCI) students. Trey Adcock asked her to remind everyone that these were community collaborative baseline acknowledgement statements created within the group that Kate Zubko was referencing called Dinikanawidido'i (community advisory committee) at the University of North Carolina at Asheville. Dinikanawidido'i is translated into English literally, "those who oversee." Trey Adcock looks forward to coming in and giving a more detailed contextualized account of how this was created, when it should be used, and how it should be housed. Most importantly in his mind, working with IDC, to discuss institutional follow up to this acknowledgement statement. There are two versions - a short version and a long version. The short version was created keeping in mind practical considerations of delivery at public events. Andrea Martinez read long version since this is the first reading before Faculty Senate:

"The University of North Carolina at Asheville acknowledges, with respect, that the land we are on today is ancestral land of the *Anikituwagi*, more commonly known as the Cherokee. We recognize the Cherokee as the native people and original stewards of this land. The stories that come from this land teach how to live, interact and mutually care for all relations.

We, as an institution, understand that there is a need to listen and learn from the people of this land. Now this place we stand upon is known to many as Asheville. To the *Anikituwagi*, this land is known as *Togiyasdi*, Where They Race. This town sat in the shadow of the Blue Ridge Mountains and for many centuries was a place of Cherokee life, trade, ceremony and culture. *Togiyasdi* was part of the Cherokee Nation, *Tsalagi Ayeli*, which covered as many as 108,000 square miles of the American Southeast as late as 1730 and consisted of sixty or more towns, each autonomous but joined in ceremony and in times of war.

Thus, the story of the people from Kituwah neither begins or ends with the arrival of Europeans but intertwines and becomes a complex historical legacy that defines both UNC Asheville and the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians in the present.

For more than 10,000 years, Cherokees and their ancestors lived around the junction

of the Swannanoa and French Broad Rivers. Cherokee land east of the French Broad River, including where part of Asheville and the UNCA campus sits today, was taken by the Treaty of Hopewell in 1785. The Cherokees agreed to major land cessions in that treaty after an armed invasion, led by General Griffith Rutherford and more than 4000 troops, in the fall of 1776. The town of Nikwasi was among thirty-six towns decimated in addition to crops, livestock and winter food supplies. Cherokees held onto legal claim of the land west of the French Broad River, now part of Asheville, until 1791.

On a cold November day in 1791 after years of bloody conflict, invasion and colonization, leaders of the Cherokee Nation met on the banks of the river Holston to sign an agreement to cede the west of UNC Asheville's campus to the very settlers who had been encroaching upon Cherokee lands for the better part of a century. This agreement was neither the beginning nor the end of the Cherokee people's struggle. For the city, now called Asheville, all associated lands would be open to uncontested settlement. This treaty reinforced a nation-to-nation relationship and was negotiated in good faith by forty-one Cherokee leaders and the governor of Tennessee at the time, William Blount, to enforce the boundaries and sovereignty of the Cherokee Nation. Without the cession of land and the brutal years of conflict with Cherokee that preceded it, the Asheville we know of today is unthinkable. The 1791 Agreement designed to end war between the two nations was not unique in that it was one of over four hundred treaties with Native Nations that would not see their terms lived up to by the US government. This broken treaty would culminate in another decade of intermittent war and further theft of native lands.

It was only within the lives of our grandfather's grandfathers that the forced Cherokee Removal, *Ge go wo o dv nv i*, from these lands was an attempt by the US government to consign a people to oblivion, resulting in the genocidal march westward. Within the time of our grandfathers, policies were made to disassociate the Cherokee from their language, their faith and their identity as a people; schools being a primary weapon used. That the *Anikituwagi* persist as survivors, warriors, diplomats, mothers, doctors, aunts, teachers, artists and grandmothers is a testament to their resilience. The Qualla Boundary, the home of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, situated a mere fifty miles away, presents a reminder of this region's history.

The Eastern Band of Cherokee and UNC Asheville recognize this long history and seek to affirm our work together to ensure a strong relationship rooted in relevancy, responsibility, respect and reciprocity. UNC Asheville acknowledges that an act of recognition is not enough to overcome the settler-colonial history that we are all a part of. Therefore, as an institution UNC Asheville commits its efforts and resources to the health and priorities of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, students who attend this university and all the varied Indigenous people who live in and around the lands this university is situated on. As these words are spoken and heard, we renew and reaffirm this campus as Cherokee homelands."

Marietta Cameron thanked Andrea Martinez for her words and reading. She affirmed that Trey Adcock wanted to be here with us today. He is already scheduled to meet with IDC to look at ways to actively live up to these words. Faculty Senate want to make sure this is not the

only reading. The Executive Committee believe we need to hear this reading often and frequently in different spaces.

Questions and Comments. John Brock commented that “Finally. It is past time.” He wanted to express he thinks the folks leading this are doing a good job and he would like to support them.

Ann Dunn made a suggestion to consider Cherokee names in the renaming of buildings since we are on their land.

Chancellor Cable said that once the task force she has been asked to convene by the Board of Trustees regarding a survey of campus symbols that might be seen as racist, oppressive or bigoted. She would hope the renaming would include consideration of various Cherokee symbols that represent the life of the Cherokee.

Discussion of UNC Asheville Senate Commitment to Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Statement. Caroline Kennedy presented the drafted statement. She is proposing this be read at each and every meeting as a reminder that as we move through our work together, we stay focused on racial equity work.

For Faculty Senate Meetings:

“In keeping with UNC Asheville’s Mission, we must take action to support racial equity and appropriately encourage frank and honest conversation. Our commitment to racial equity and inclusion demands that we work towards a future where all UNC Asheville students, faculty, and staff know they belong, and are treated equitably, regardless of their race or ethnicity. This work is best accomplished by keeping these goals in the forefront of our deliberations.”

For FWDC meetings:

“In keeping with UNC Asheville’s Mission, we must take action to support racial equity and appropriately encourage frank and honest conversation. Our commitment to racial equity and inclusion demands that we work towards a future where all UNC Asheville students, faculty, and staff know they belong, and are treated equitably, regardless of their race or ethnicity. This work is best accomplished by keeping these goals in the forefront of our deliberations. We are committed to working towards increasing opportunities and participation in racial equity Faculty Development.”

Marietta Cameron thanked Caroline Kennedy and FWDC for their work on this statement.

The idea came from attending Board of Trustees where they read an ethics statement before each meeting. Caroline Kennedy asked not to be credited with ownership for she did not create it. She just modified what was already our value statements. Marietta Cameron relayed the plan was to discuss the statement at this meeting and to vote on it at the next meeting. When EC planned the retreat, we had hoped our Senate retreat would be more an interactive workshop on racial equity. There are other racial equity sessions and learning circles happening on campus to give a shout out to colleagues hosting these sessions and to encourage people to participate. Faculty Senate wants to go beyond listening and words.

Discussion. Volker Frank appreciates the idea, though and intention behind this statement. He would like to request that Senate use what they recently heard from the

Chancellor and the Provost for he sees the difference between what they said and what ours in Senate can become “a lot of bark and very little bite.” The chancellor and the Provost both very wisely used ideas and concepts that included accountability. Historically, this has happened many times where it could turn into a ritual. He suggests we include a little bit more promise to the degree where the statement not states we support racial equity, but we help produce racial equity so that we hold ourselves as a body much more accountable than the statement might reveal now.

Jessica Pisano suggested that we might also add language to make it more actionable, not just supporting or producing racial equity but also eliminating institutional racism.

Caroline Kennedy thanked Volker Frank and Jessica Pisano for their comments and asked to send any modifications for making it more action-oriented to her.

- III. Approval of Minutes: April 30, 2020 3:15 p.m. (two sets of minutes)
Both sets of minutes passed without dissent.

- IV. Executive Committee: Faculty Senate Chair Marietta Cameron
[EC 1](#) Discussion of Resolution to Decline Review of New Programs including
but not limited to majors, minors, and certificates for Academic Year 2020-2021

Since Senate Chair Marietta Cameron asks to speak in favor of the resolution, she turned the gavel over to First Vice Chair of Faculty Senate Sonya DiPalma to facilitate the discussion regarding EC 1.

There is not going to be a vote on this resolution so a motion did not need to be entertained. Sonya DiPalma opened the floor up for discussion by letting Marietta Cameron provide an introduction.

Introduction by Marietta Cameron. During the global pandemic, the UNC system is declining proposals for new majors and programs as well as certificates (although their definition of certificate may not coincide with ours) due to budgetary constraints. Due to this and our own budgetary constraints, there are concerns about funding new projects as well as discerning policies that make the process accessible, stable and consistent across disciplines as well as address faculty workload and self-care during the pandemic. This resolution was created to address the needs of faculty asking what proposals will be processed and when and making sure there is no confusion especially dealing with tight resources since part of our Senate duty is to consider the resource ramifications of proposals that are coming to us.

Discussion. Regine Criser thanked Marietta Cameron for putting this together. As a member of FWDC, she is in support of prioritizing faculty self-care. She has one question is she knows creating new programs was part of the UNC revitalization plan that she understands the Board of Governors and the System Office remains interested and invested. She wants us to remain in line with what is expected from us at UNC System level so plans at that level are not set back. There may be work we need to be doing so can we can be ready when the UNC system is accepting applications or proposals for new majors. She wanted to know if the Senate Chair, Provost or Chancellor could speak to how this goes together.

Marietta Cameron said she would speak regarding the Senate body representing the wishes of the faculty and looking towards the faculty desires and priorities. She asked if the Chancellor wanted to speak regarding expectations at the system level. She explained that we

are in a position right now where there is talk of some staff forced into furloughs and layoffs right now. The optics of people losing their jobs while at the same time we are allocating money elsewhere for new programs does not say that we care about our community.

Chancellor Cable said she needed to ring off and she apologized to everyone and thanked them for their work.

Tiece Ruffin relayed her understanding is work may continue on proposals that they are not reviewed by IDC, APC and Senate. She understood the proposal is not stopping work just stopping the expanding and proposing. She said she is in favor of the resolution. People may keep working on proposals and have them ready in the future when we are ready to begin.

Jessica Pisano asked whether it would be possible to add a clause to the proposal that acknowledges that this does not preclude the important work of continuing to prepare proposals that address the needs of the university.

Provost Campbell, in response to Tiece Ruffin's comment, said he thinks that we can continue to work, and he wants to encourage us to continue to work on some things. It is true that he feels the mood of the Board of Governors is that only things related to COVID are being considered right now. There is a system-wide recognition that there are tremendous stressors on every one of the institutions and anywhere that there might be a financial implication preparing for and fortifying to the extent that they can against what might come. COVID is certainly is hit the bigger institutions a little harder already and they are going to experience the financial ramifications of having to send folks away from campus. He thinks the idea is that we could not propose a major right now if we wanted to for he thinks it would almost surely be denied. There certainly will not be any consideration at the next Board of Governors and she believes there is a moratorium essentially through January. He thinks that it would take an extraordinary act to get something even on the docket for them during this time period. He believes it is right to be ready to propose ideas as soon as we are able to do so.

Provost Campbell also understands there is some attention about two minors in particular regarding this resolution. He wants to call attention to the fact that we have a large number of minors for the size of our institution. He is not speaking about any specific proposal, certificate, or minor, but at some point, we have to begin to ask the question what do we have and how do we think about the whole and any one instance concurrently to decide what we are going to add and not add. Sometimes we think a small change does not have consequences until we see the costs as a sustained reality to make sure that continues into the future. Again, he is not raising this in the context of any particular idea. He is saying these questions will be important for us to consider whenever we begin to discuss programs.

Jake Butera wanted to echo Regine Criser's comments regarding the impact with the revitalization plan, but to raise up that major and minor certificate proposals also tie into many of the other goals that have been outlined already in this meeting. He believes these are worth considering. He gets a little bit uneasy when we have a proposal that says what we would not do as opposed to what we will do. Saying something like, "We will prioritize these other things" over something, he thinks is useful and helpful. Saying that we absolutely will not do something that is often in the purview of the Senate he thinks is maybe taking it a step too far. As Tiece has said, while we cannot make a formal proposal to the Board of Governors at the system level, why does that preclude us going through some of the necessary steps that we would do for these proposals within the university so that if and when the system decides that they will be accepting new proposals, we are ready for that to happen. After looking over it briefly, he has a concern that we might be going a little too far with this proposal.

Marietta Cameron agreed that we could read proposals put before us that is part of the Senate's responsibility, and especially in terms of IDC, is to look at questions about resources. However, how can we answer questions about resources right now when we are told there are no resources, and the resources we do have are so tight that there are implementations in order to save people's jobs. Although resources are primarily part of IDC's review, APC as part of good stewardship have to consider resource implications in the proposals that come before them. As part of good stewardship, why continue to take the energy of our current committees right now with the current demands on our faculty as well as our institution. This might not be the most elegant or comfortable answer, but the underlying part in this is the blunt truth is that we are looking at trying to save people's livelihoods and protect them.

Jake Butera added that he thinks the need is to consider what sort of changes have to happen on a broader level in our current environment. A proposal to strengthen University, the curriculum, and the education being offered requires that we look at it carefully and consider in context of the current difficult environment. He serves on IDC and he would rather start to address and look at those things now as they come rather than wait because you are right, it will be a decision for next year, but we still do not know what the situation will look like next year or the year after. Conceivably, we would never look at it.

Linda Cornett said she thinks it is disingenuous to make this a choice between people's livelihoods and the possibility of adding some new programs. The language of new programs encompasses a huge range. Clearly, we are not adding new majors and maybe not new minors, but it is possible to add new minors within existing systems. There could be curricular changes that would strengthen the university without significant resource implications.

She feels in the weirdest strangest position ever because two or three years ago, she went to every single person on this campus who would listen (Chair of IDC, Chair of APC, the Provost) to speak about her concerns about the proliferation of the various minor certificates, etc. We had a Provost meeting about it. It was not because she did not think these things could be good, but because she thought precisely that we were not really thinking about the resource implications. We were always just kind of saying, "There are no resource implications," and we were looking at them just one at a time. On their face, each one was great, but there was a fear that they would just keep adding and adding without any clear relationship to one another. It is not clear to anybody whether the proposals were looked at specifically in relation to our priorities or our missions. Again, every one of them looked good to me, but it did not seem like there was a rational way for considering them on a broader scale and with somebody having oversight about the big picture that we are looking at, and nothing happened there. It was about two years of talking about this.

She went by the rules that we had made, which basically ends up being whoever puts together something first and gets it through, gets it. She was fearful at some point, it would become untenable and then we just cut it off for no reason without looking specifically on the criteria for inclusion or exclusion. She feels like that is what is happening. She thinks it is true that we need a more rational process for both submitting and reviewing programs over not just a semester, but maybe over a couple of years and then making decisions.

However, to cut it off overnight, and this really does look kind of overnight to her, is problematic in part because we do have a program that has been in the works for a couple of years. If we just cut it off now, she does not think that option would be available again two or three years down the road that would devalue the work that we did. Under the instructions, we thought we were getting to do innovative and interesting things, maybe with master's

programs and other proposals related to our mission like in the past Political Science's focus on human rights. Now the possibility of innovation seems to be cut off.

She understands the resource restrictions and the potential that these kinds of programs can have on our resources and I think we ought to look at it. However, to cut off tomorrow is not fair to the work that we have been doing to develop some of these programs in good faith because we thought this was something that we were being encouraged to do.

Marietta Cameron asked to respond. First of all, in terms of being disingenuous, that is not her character. She does not do anything disingenuously and certainly with no disingenuous intent. It was made very clear yesterday in both sessions of the Town Hall what is happening as far as our budgets are concerned. Again, it might have been very pretty words to make it more palatable, but it was clear that the budget reductions that we are looking at in our departments are helping towards saving jobs. The way it was worded was continued employment. It is very clear that when we are not fulfilling positions when there are open positions that that savings is to save jobs. It is very clear when we are not having tenure-track position requests being accepted that it is a matter of savings. We are trying to save and make sure that we are continuing to help support jobs. It is not disingenuous to recognize that when it was said yesterday, so yes, it was overnight.

Things happening and coming to Senate overnight is not new. As far as the process is concerned, we have received new items overnight before. She has been on the Faculty Senate long enough to know that and to have been a part of that. She is not presenting a Sense of the Senate resolution that is somehow out of the world on that.

She acknowledges meeting with Linda Cornett and Ashley Moraguez and thoroughly encouraging the program of which she spoke that is currently on the Faculty Senate agenda under APC items. That proposal will stay on the agenda that will come through to Faculty Senate. Perhaps a proposed friendly amendment could be suggested to state that proposals already in the pipeline will come through to Senate.

Considering consistency, if I tell one set of colleagues that this is a matter of resources that your proposal is not being accepted, then there is another set come through, we definitely need something clear to say why we are saying to the other one why theirs is worthwhile to come through. She is trying to be as frank as possible.

Linda Cornett appreciates Marietta Cameron's comments and is absolutely in agreement with that last part, especially the need to have criteria and a process as opposed to just kind of the ad hoc, haphazard process we have had in the past. She was not suggesting Marietta Cameron was being insincere.

Marietta Cameron relayed the word used was disingenuous.

Linda Cornett continued that she is also not saying that we do not have serious resource problems. This is a small part of a much bigger thing. Nobody is going to say we have new programs at the expense of jobs. She hopes it is not that stark of a choice and that we can recognize some possibilities for new programs is not inconsistent with caring for the employment of the people and our faculty who we know are in danger if our financial system situation gets worse.

Tiece Ruffin asked to clarify her remarks for she believes there was a misconception in what Jake said I relayed. I did say people could keep working on proposals. She and Jake Butera both serve on IDC. When these proposals come to IDC, she does not know how in good conscience we can review proposals that have resource implications that are clearly not going to be met. In good conscience, we cannot approve them. Tiece Ruffin is in favor of the resolution because does not want to approve new programs that may not be implemented. In

addition, she is not going to approve a proposal with gross resource implications, and the alternative is to approve the proposals now and then have to reapprove them when the resource implications are known. This resolution is saying while people can keep working on proposals that these proposals are not submitted this year for Senate to make decisions.

Jessica Pisano suggested to add a clause that while no new proposals could be voted on or looked at by faculty senate this year, we acknowledge that work needs to continue to address these important initiatives allowing faculty to make that decision for themselves how to progress.

Jessica Pisano also reminded that [IDC did propose and Senate passed some guidelines for new majors/minors](#) last year.

Melissa Himelein said she was glad to hear of Marietta Cameron's willingness to modify the resolution to consider anything that is already in the hopper. When they talked about this yesterday, it did not sound like that was a place that she was willing to go. She really appreciates that. She wonders if that is worth a clause. Also, like many faculty, she completely empathize with the problems of the proliferation of minors and the resource implications of those. Her only other comment is she felt as if the wording was just a bit unnecessarily broad, "new programs including but not limited to" worries her a bit. For example, the program that Linda just referenced, she would not have seen that as even in consideration at all because it neither is a major, minor nor certificate. It is essentially a Study Abroad program. She would hate to think that if another institution came along and offered us a really prestigious 3 plus 1 opportunity this year that had absolutely no resource implications for the institution and could really enrich our recruitment of students that we badly need that we would have to say, "No, we can't consider that this year," and then lose that opportunity. That would be a really bad consequence. She would like to just see us consider a somewhat more limited or narrowed wording of this. Otherwise, she does fear that all of the committees will spend a good bit of their time trying to decide what is and is not a program. If we could just narrow it to majors and minors. She thanked Faculty Senate for allowing her to speak.

Regarding Melissa Himelein's remarks, Marietta Cameron explained that the "including but not limited to" was intentional since we are not always aware of loopholes. At this moment, she may not know what the loopholes are that may create a situation where one proposal worded one way from a group of colleagues is not allowed to come through while another similar but worded differently is brought through on a technicality. She believes we need to be fair in treatment of proposals. However, regardless of how we view it, there are budgetary constraints to be considered. In this pandemic situation where people could possibly lose their jobs, why are we taking the resources that could be helping them to maintain their jobs in order to do something new here that actually could be requiring more resources.

Marietta Cameron originally hoped this resolution could be voted on and distributed so colleagues can make decisions on how to proceed. Hearing the different responses, having a vote today probably is not the wisest thing to do. Although we have had votes on different things that has come to us overnight where we were asking to waive the Comer Rule [editor's note: Sense of the Senates like this resolution are not subject to Comer Rule]. However, there is time to revise the resolution or it can be completely withdrawn.

Laura Bond asked if the UNC system has sent an official edict that there are to be no new majors or certificates. If that is the edict, then why are we to look at minor proposals differently when on our campus certificates and minors are approved in similar manner although they have different requirements. It seems to her wise to align with what the UNC system is passing as an edict for the year and not waste faculty and staff time to attempt to

review or approve something that is against the UNC system declaration. She asks for is clarity on the edict from UNC system for she believes that would help us all have less confusion and loss of extra workload. If the edict is no approved majors or certificates then we need to clarify whether we align for generally we do not treat certificates differently than minors. Laura Bond has not seen in writing where minors are mentioned in the edict. She could be wrong and may have missed something in her reading. That is the biggest question for us. She believes all these questions are very, very helpful because there are faculty out there who have not come forward yet working on proposals. Upon returning to campus is the time faculty start collaborating. If Marietta has learned something that she is trying to communicate out to us and inform us, I think it is important for us to listen and then ask ourselves, "Are we in alignment? Are we going to run into trouble? Are we going to be encouraging faculty to present things or to do work that maybe is not going to get approved down the line?" All she is asking for is clarity in what the edict is from the UNC System and communicate that out to our campus so everyone knows the edict.

Jake Butera has concerns about the saying that we will not review. No one is saying that we are going to approve programs for the system is not currently going to allow that to happen. The review process is extremely important. IDC has already had one minor proposal come in for first discussion where they sent back a tremendous amount of feedback. As written, EC 1 says that we will not review proposals. He has problems with this because it is in the review process where scenarios are developed further to get more perspectives and address concerns such as budgetary issues. We are not in a position to approve proposals because of budget, but that does not mean that we cannot provide useful feedback that will pay dividends as the process moves forward. He is a bit unclear about how process of review has an impact on resources and job security when review is a question of giving feedback on proposals.

Marietta Cameron responded that most people when they come before our Senate they are expecting that the proposal will begin the next academic year. Usually when reviewing these documents, there is an implementation date stated. How can a review look at resource implications when there are no resources to look at and honestly approve the proposal with the implementation date of the next academic year? That would be very disingenuous.

Jake Butera disagreed that it would not be disingenuous if in reviews IDC makes it clear what the budgetary situation is because not everyone would be privy to that necessarily the same way. We make clear what the challenges will be as they move forward on those proposals. That is something that we as a deliberative body and as a committee do and do that well. He does not believe a review as written is the same as approval. He believes the language of this proposal is troubling.

Marietta Cameron replied that she is open to a friendly amendment regarding that word.

Faculty Assembly Executive Committee member Melodie Galloway said she has not seen anything to this effect from the System Office, but it is a reasonable assumption that the Board of Governors would not be taking up issues of new programs at this time.

Provost Campbell wanted to commend Marietta Cameron for he believes in crafting this resolution (without putting words in her mouth) she was trying to be protective of the whole community to safeguard the faculty time and energy, particularly at a time when we are asking so much of it in other ways and other spaces. He is hearing that there needs to be a statement that relays that there is a moratorium from the Board of Governors on majors. He does not remember the exact language of the edict nor which Board of Governors meeting this was raised. They laid to rest the consideration of new programs at Bachelor's, Masters and PhD

levels is roughly the language that was used. He will have to search for the exact language. If there are things that normally do not rise up to go to the Board of Governors, those are those are still campus decisions.

His understanding of the UNC System's edict is that they will not receive anything that will have to go to the Board of Governors unless it is COVID related. This is the context that we are currently operating. We do not know when the edict be lifted. There was a little bit of an out where there was a sense in a subsequent meeting, that they would be open for very particular cases. He thinks Laura's suggestion to find the excellent language and exact parameters are good suggestions. He believes as long as someone understands that context, and we are clear about what that context is he believes people can make decisions about how they want to expand their time. That is what he has to offer regarding the protection of time and energy component of the resolution.

The second component of the resolution is the resource implications. He agrees with Linda Cornett that we have to figure out how to have discussions regarding resource implications and how to determine whether a proposal is resource dependent or is independent of resources to make sure there has been a good analysis that includes indirect costs. In addition, as Linda Cornett said, we not only have to look on a one by one basis, but how does the proposal fit in the context of the whole. This includes being able to determine when adding can do we absorb the costs or do we need to discontinue something in order to add. In a way, the Provost wonders if we do not necessarily need a resolution as long as we are committed to really doing this kind of really hard, deep analysis work.

John Brock asked, "Why didn't we have IDC discuss this and come to some consensus on this before bringing it into Senate? If we are to be a productive deliberative body, resolutions should go through the proper committees. This should have gone to IDC first."

Marietta Cameron responded that her experience serving on Senate for quite a few iterations is that the Executive Committee (EC) has put forth resolutions before pretty quickly because EC can do that. She will concede that less than 24 hours turnaround time is a problem, but we have turned around in much less time in some other instances. In terms of being a deliberative body when EC puts forth a resolution, you can approve it or not approve it. We are still within the constitutional rights as far as in terms of the protocol, as far as the operation of this deliberative body is concerned.

He stated he felt like it was pre-emptive not to give him a chance to comment before answering, John Brock asked for opportunity to respond.

Marietta Cameron replied of course, but she was trying to be honest and was not trying to be preemptive and her comment was not an intentional insult.

John said he appreciates the intention of the resolution. He thinks that Marietta Cameron has a good heart that is in the right place where you feel passionate and strongly about this. He acknowledges that EC has the right to present resolutions. What he questions is, in the past and in this situation, he thinks that it would have been a lot more efficient to take it to the committee. In this case, let IDC work through it and then come back with what they see as the issues. He thinks what we were doing now is committee work that is taking an enormous amount of time where we are doing the fact finding in the Senate meeting, which he does not think is a good use of our time. This has happened in the past and agrees this is not the only time this has ever happened. It happens repeatedly. He believes we have to go through the process where we get the information from the committees and start to build a resolution that takes into account that information. What we have been doing sounds like getting fact finding from the committee in the middle of the Senate meeting. He does not think that is good use of

our time. He appreciates the effort and agrees with her that she has the constitutional right to do it. He just does not know that it is effective.

As IDC Chair, Jinhua Li wanted to emphasize that IDC does have the priority or duty to look at resource allocation. When they look at programs, they do make sure new proposals align with our core values and the mission statement. She wants to echo what Marietta and the Provost has generally said where the intentions are generally several fold. One is to make sure that if we review the program, the program has a fighting chance to be a viable thing for it to move ahead. She does agree with Jake that IDC can review a proposal and give feedback. She questions why we would do this if we do not know whether it can move forward and become implemented in the foreseeable future or if it is going to be implemented but not in the way it was proposed because of the volatile and quickly changing situations.

Her second point is she believes this resolution tries to strike a balance between protecting the time of our committee's work, faculty workload and the additional pressures put on faculty at this time. When minors or other proposals are passed, we want to know they are sustainable and fits to the high quality of liberal arts education that we hold ourselves. At this time, Jinhua Li agrees with what Tiece Ruffin has said that we are not asking people to stop working. We are simply saying that we will wait and see if we need to make an adjustment in a situation where everything is uncertain, especially with the resources that we are supposed to look into with the planning as well as the suspension from the from Board of Governors. Of course, we want to encourage people to continue with their work on their proposals. We are just saying that maybe we will wait a little bit and see what is going on before we start reviewing. Maybe we also need to review the guidelines to review programs and proposals. IDC would be happy to take the resolution and discuss it at our upcoming meeting and possibly make a recommendation to change some words. That would give people more time to think about it and be ready to talk about it and vote on it in an upcoming meeting.

Volker Frank expressed that we are making this too complex for our own sake. He suggests adding to the statement, "to the degree to which it will be possible given....." since this is not all or nothing and is much more pragmatic. This might be a case where pragmatism might be better than conversations on principles or issues informed by principals. Volker Frank also said he looked up Robert's Rules to see if he could call for a vote. If he could he would call for a vote, but he cannot. He agrees partially that this conversation has been helpful to the degree that it has anticipated the conversation that we must have at a future point. To another degree, this conversation has not been helpful at all. It has not been helpful to the degree to which we want to move towards some kind of decision or solution what to do about it. He believes we are making it excessively complicated because of the wording. With some slight change in the wording, we could say that we continue to do this to the degree to which this is possible and we will also hear from the different committees whether this is indeed possible to do or not. He thinks we are putting the bar excessively high for ourselves and need a compromise.

Tiece Ruffin wanted to relay that our lack of relationships are apparent. The Faculty Senate needs team building and healing. She believes in healthy debate dialog. She suggests we also need to be cognizant to how we talk to one another. Maybe that should be part of our goal this year. She is sensing a lot of tension that does not seem very positive or helpful for the relationships that we must maintain on campus. She understands this is difficult work, but she thinks thinking maybe the tension is due to poor, unhealthy relationships. Some of the conversations today is signaling to her that we need to build healthy relationships so we have a safer braver space for this type of dialogue.

Sonya wanted to say as APC Chair that for documents that receive IDC approval and their next step is to go through APC this fall; she would like to see those continue to APC.

Marietta Cameron wanted to close the discussion by saying that she has served on the Faculty Senate quite a bit. She has seen items come in rather quickly for discussion. Her whole motivation was to look out for the workload of our colleagues seeing the reality of the demands of their time during the pandemic. Many faculty are putting in well over 12 hours a day and she understands their concerns and trying to as quickly as possible to be responsive to both faculty and staff colleagues needs.

She hears the comments like “you have a good heart” as well as “bless your heart” type of comments. Her motivation was not only emotional was also objective and was made out of considerable reasoning. She was trying to react to some of the comments that she has heard in the past about senate moving too slow and not coming through, and she was trying to address that. She hopes we can take all these comments to edit this particular Sense of the Senate because that is what it is a sense of the Senate. We have a discussion, get some feedback, and come through with something that is more informative and helpful to colleagues. She thanked everyone for this feedback.

Regine Criser thanked Marietta Cameron for crafting this resolution and her care for everyone on this campus. She thinks we learned a lot from this discussion.

Laura Bond agreed with Regine Criser saying this discussion has been helpful and thanked all

Tiece Ruffin also thanked Marietta Cameron for her resolution. This has been the practice of many Senates that have gone before. Our lack of relationships is apparent. We need team building and healing.

Staff Council:

Chair Emma Anderson

Alex Barber, Secretary and a member of the Executive Committee of Staff Council reported on behalf of Emma Anderson Staff Council Chair by introducing the Executive Committee to Faculty Senate.

Staff Council looks forward to working with Faculty Senate this academic year.

Staff Council has been reviewing their bylaws by working closely with Human Resources, Heather Parlier and her team, to make the bylaws more succinct and adding a section on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion. They also have been working on migrating their website along with the university to WordPress. They are all looking forward to launching a new Staff Council website this term.

As an announcement for the group, The Janet B. Royster Memorial Scholarship is a system wide staff scholarship that is now accepting applications and the deadline is September 30. Staff Council has been promoting that to staff through the staff listservs. The \$500 scholarship is for degree-seeking staff members and is awarded to at least one institution in the system.

Upcoming initiatives Staff Council Initiatives:

- Staff Council Endowed Scholarship
A scholarship that was originally endowed by the Chancellor Staff Advisory Committee that is currently now Staff Council. They are working to with General Counsel and Admissions to update some of the parameters around that very old scholarship so that more staff can qualify.

- Staff Council's Working Group around Diversity, Equity and Inclusion
They look to partner in initiatives with other groups that have been formed on campus to be part of these conversations.
- Staff Assembly Equity Task Force
They are working with the system wide task force feedback form that was sent to each campus' Staff Council. They are looking for concerns, instances of experiences of racial inequality or oppression.
- Staff Council Forum in the Fall
- Focusing on employee appreciation, especially in these times of COVID and low/no budget
- Working with Human Resources implementing ombuds representatives and support for our fellow staff members.

Faculty Assembly Executive Committee:
[Executive Summary from August 7](#)

Representative at Large Melodie Galloway

Melodie Galloway briefly went over the Executive Summary linked in the minutes. At the beginning of the August 7 meeting, UNC System President Peter Hans introduced his new Chief of Staff Norma Grant who will be heading the COVID response. Regarding the budget, Peter Hans said he would welcome any recommendations from Faculty Assembly. He wanted to assure delegates that he during budget cuts and any budget proposals that is going to be listening for he is our advocate. Kimberly van Noort applauded all the digital workshops. Melodie Galloway is proud to say our own Dr. Ellen Pearson has been so active in these well-attended and well-received workshops. Kimberly van Noort congratulated the Adaptive Learning Platform as showing "spirit of collaboration."

Their Executive Committee has worked hard on and are particularly proud the mission and vision statements. Those are now very close to being sent out to the Faculty Assembly delegates for a vote.

Marietta Cameron thanked Melodie Galloway for her work representing us especially in this time.

Melodie replied she is honored to serve.

V. Academic Policies Committee:

First Vice Chair Sonya DiPalma

First Reading

*[APC 1](#)

2020-2021 Academic Calendar (Revised as of 8.27.2020)

**Note: A motion to waive the Comer Rule to discuss as well as vote on APC 1 will be made.*

[APC Memorandum 2020-21](#)

Sonya DiPalma introduced APC 1, which is a revised academic calendar. The calendar has been revised in light of COVID-19. A motion was made to waive the Comer Rule to discuss and vote on APC 1, which was seconded. No Discussion. The motion passed without dissent.

Sonya DiPalma then presented APC 1 for discussion and vote. The revised calendar represents the January term, May-meister and through summer semester.

Jake Butera asked about the affect pushing these dates back will have on the Study Abroad program.

The Provost relayed that the academic officers were discussing this today. Most places have not made a decision about summer yet in part due to the many borders that are still remaining closed to us and the financial implications that we have. At this point, anything that commits us to something that might be unrecoverable is almost surely going to be something we cannot do. Right now, we are just unable to say either way. We need more time to get a little more information and see where we might be. The short answer to your question is the calendar dates can be flexible. The longer answer is there is tremendous uncertainty about those programs right now. We are going to have to wait before making some decisions.

Linnea Linton just wanted to mention to the Senate that there is our joint engineering program between UNC Asheville and NC State where under the best of times, these calendars may be possibly off by about a week. She is very concerned about the potential to be off by a month. At NC State, she asked today and they said they have absolutely no idea what their spring schedules are going to look like. In no way is she asking UNC Asheville to shape their calendar based on NC State's calendar for that is completely unfair to ask. She is asking for an awareness of the fact that every engineering class in our joint program is dually registered at UNC Asheville and at NC State so there is the potential that students in our program (which we have about 230) could need to start taking engineering classes in early January. She would ask them that part of this conversation be around how do we house those students and feed those students. She hopes there is planning to support a large number of students with a UNCA schedule that starts so much later than normal now, albeit nothing is normal,

The Provost relayed that most of the institutions are pushing back and eliminating Spring Break as we are or they simply have not decided. NC State is in a quandary because they are not sure they will come back in person at all although he thought he understood from their Provost that they are looking at a later start. Provost Campbell does not think it will be off by a month. Also, since we are talking about having a January term, it would be given that we would be a lot easier for us to incorporate housing for that size of the student population if we had to if we were off by two to even three weeks,

Linnea Linton thanked the Provost for the information and happy to hear there is thinking around these issues.

Sonya DiPalma asked the question about whether the Undergraduate Research Symposium will go forward and have a virtual symposium and will there still be a day dedicated to the virtual symposium where we do not have classes.

Provost Campbell said we could not dedicate a full day where we do not have any classes, in part because we are essentially doing what we did this semester in the next semester in terms of the number of days of classes. In order to complete the semester in a timely fashion, we cannot spare any days. That is the bottom line.

Linda Cornett asked a clarifying question for she understood that we would only be having the Undergraduate Research Symposium in the fall for students graduating in December who needed the presentation for the university research scholar designation.

Provost Campbell clarified he was answering in terms of whether we can we spare a full day of no classes for the Undergraduate Research Day, and he does not think we will be able to do that. We will have to be more creative and figure out how to do the full spectrum of undergraduate research presentations since the call has to be made now. At this time, it is hard to imagine we would be in a position of being able to do it in person so regardless we are always going to be talking about holding it virtually. He proposes that we figure out how to do

virtually as fully as possible, and at the same time, not give up a day of classes. He and Linda Cornett can talk about this further. One of the determining factors putting this calendar together is Alicia Shope's timeframe from final exams and final grades to her having to crunch all that stuff for graduation including honors announcements.

Sonya DiPalma further explained that APC's thinking was there was not a lot of time in between January terms as well as at the end of the spring term. They were trying to give a break between finishing the spring term and the start of the first summer. As she explained to someone in an email earlier in the week who asked about the lack of a break in spring semester like we have in fall. APC recommended pushing that towards the front of the semester so that those teaching January term would have a little bit of a break. This also would allow the Office of the Registrar to have time to not only getting grades in and calculated, but also processing prerequisites that someone might need in order to take a course in the spring term. We have very short turnarounds and we do not have a day for undergraduate research nor a day off somewhere in the middle of the semester.

Jake Butera asked whether students would be able to receive financial aid in order to take classes in January term.

Initially, Provost Campbell relayed in email that the answer was no. However, they are exploring whether or not there can be institutional aid. This may be problematic for state and federal aid recipients, but perhaps institutional aid can be found for students. They are exploring the possibilities there are for the master terms.

Lynne Horgan mentioned that if a student is only in Maymester, they are not eligible for state or federal aid. Students can get federal aid for the whole summer semester.

Regina Criser said she thinks the availability of financial aid would make a huge difference in what kind of classes we can offer and whom we can request or invite to participate.

Provost Campbell agrees but the issue is how giving resources in this moment impact aid later. Unfortunately, there are realities of how state and federal aid works that that we are up against in that regard. We have to be really careful and thoughtful for it can be tough to navigate.

Shannon Earle relayed we should know something more in the next week. The Provost said he would relay that out when they have confirmation.

Jake Butera wondered would it be better for us to wait to vote on the academic calendar until we have more information.

Sonya DiPalma relayed we have passed the motion to waive the Comer Rule. She is not sure Senate would want to overrule that passed motion. The other issue is we have the core schedules that are in play and we need a calendar with course schedules to move things along. We need a calendar in which to do our work. We have looked at many different options and scenarios about what would happen if we started before January that does not work because we bump into holidays. Prolonging the vote until October does not improve the schedule and takes away the nimbleness that we need in this crisis.

A motion was made to vote on APC 1, which was seconded by Jake Butera.

APC 1 passed without dissent.

Sonya DiPalma concluded her APC report by referring everyone to the annual APC Memorandum noting that the deadline for submitting catalog changes is Monday, October 12, 2020. If anyone has questions, please email Sonya DiPalma.

Provost Campbell relayed his need to leave the meeting, but he has already shared what he would have in his remarks section.

Marietta Cameron thanked Provost Campbell for his time and efforts. Faculty do appreciate the work.

- VI. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee: Third Vice Chair Caroline Kennedy
New Standing Committee Appointment by Senate

Caroline Kennedy presented an appointment to the vacancy on the Transportation Committee. FWDC recommends appointing Adam Whitley. The appointment was passed without dissent.

- VII. Institutional Development Committee / UPC: Second Vice Chair Jinhua Li

Jinhua Li welcomed the IDC members and thanked them for the work they do. IDC had their first meeting last Thursday, August 27 where they reviewed the proposals and documents that they know will come their way this semester.

- VIII. Old Business / New Business / Adjourn

Marietta Cameron thanked Sonya DiPalma, Caroline Kennedy, and Jinhua Li as well as the Chancellor Cable and Provost Campbell for their hard work especially the additional work this summer. She also sent a special shout out and appreciation to our Administrative Assistant for the Faculty Senate, Lisa Sellers, who puts up with a lot in trying to keep us all together and informed.

Jessica Pisano asked whether there were senators attending the Staff Council meeting.

Faculty Senate Chair Marietta Cameron announced that she has been attending the Staff Council meetings throughout the summer. The Executive Committee has worked to see that a member of the Executive Committee or a senator attends to give a report as they give a report at Senate meetings.

Marietta Cameron wanted to also thank and acknowledge the service as senators of Ashley Moraguez and Amanda Wray.

Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 6:38 p.m.