

**THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA ASHEVILLE**  
**FACULTY SENATE VIRTUAL MEETING MINUTES**  
**April 30, 2020; 3:15 pm; Last Meeting of the 2019-20 Faculty Session**

Members Present: M. Cameron, S. DiPalma, P. Bahls, A. Rote, J. Brock, J. Butera, S. Clark, D. Clarke, R. Criser, V. Frank, C. Kennedy, T. King, M. McClure, A. Moraguez, C. Oakley, J. Pisano, T. Ruffin, A. Wray; G. Campbell.

Visitors: N. Cable, E. Anderson, C. Augustyniak, T. Beldue, L. Bond, E. Boyce, S. Broberg, B. Butler, J. Cone, D. Diefenbach, S. Earle, M. Galloway, B. Haggard, G. Heard, P. Hester, L. Hewitt, M. Himelein, H. Holt, L. Horgan, L. Johnson, S. Kaplan, K. Kessarlis, J. Konz, K. Lawlor, L. Linton, J. McHargue, M. Mahoney, M.L. Manns, A. Maxwell, S. Meyer, L. Newton, H. Parlier, G. Reynolds, A.M. Roberts, N. Ruppert, S. Shephard, A. Shope, E. Spence, M. Stratton, W. Strehl, R. Tatum, C. Tomberlin, E. Tomberlin, J. Rhode Ward, S. Wasileski, C. Whitlock, J. Wilcox, K. Zubko.

I. Call to Order

II. Chancellor Nancy Cable / Provost Garikai Campbell

Chancellor Cable thanked everyone for a great year. A sincere thank you to the faculty for their work to put courses online as well as staying attentive and continuing to reach out to students. The Chancellor had fun bragging about how hard all have worked to keep the academic program going given the short notice of necessary change.

The decision about whether the institutions in the UNC system will open or close will be made toward the end of May. She, John Pierce, and Provost Kai Campbell were included in one-on-one conversations with Interim President Roper about the best and most fitting practices for our academic program and for the faculty, staff and students. They will extend every amount of energy over the next 20 to 30 days to allow us to gather in person in the fall. They are looking at all kinds of financial models, most importantly retention especially in regards to the first year and transfer enrollment projections. The Board of Governors has just agreed not to raise tuition and fees for the coming academic year. They have also signaled that they may take only 5% off our state appropriation or at worst case to 10%. Keith Krumpe, John Pierce and David Todd are figuring out the seating in classrooms.

Our institution along with six other local institutions are collaborating with MAHEC and Mission to get training on best practices. None of the faculty and staff at MAHEC or Mission have gotten ill. Thus, if we use their same protocols, we will have a strong chance of keeping our community safe from the virus. They are also meeting with the County Manager Avril Pinder and the City Manager Deb Campbell. They will be meeting eventually with the Dogwood Trust leaders to see whether they could help buy some of the material that we will need, particularly our cleaning and personal protection equipment devices. The process is broadly consultative. We are trying to include everyone in this process and promise to keep everyone posted.

Marietta Cameron thanked Chancellor Cable for all she is doing. The Faculty Assembly delegation definitely heard in meetings downstate about how Chancellors and Provosts are very firm and vocal advocates on behalf of their campuses. Both Chancellor Cable and Provost Campbell were named as very protective of our institution.

Provost Kai Campbell circulated the Chair Stipend Table. They are also moving forward with an online annual faculty record for each faculty member this year. The main difference of these annual records in comparison of annual records of the past is they allow for some more specificity and better understanding of the equity issues around workload.

In regards to addressing the ways we can come back to in person instruction, obviously safety is the primary concern. What is the timing and the format? They are looking to work to come back in August early with the idea to finish the semester by the Friday before Thanksgiving. Another option is to combine that with block scheduling, potentially doing something like 3 five-week sessions or 4 four-week sessions, where students take one or two classes each session similar to the 3 sessions that are run through the summer. The system is now looking into the boundaries, parameters, and flexibility to allow for the various institutions in the system. They know that one size does not fit all and do not want one system-wide way. In exploring the earliest and latest that schools may start, they project the earliest August 3 and the latest September 15. They are also exploring not having a fall break. In addition, study abroad may not be permitted in the fall, without at least some very special consideration and exception made by the Chancellor for very particular programs. For our campus, Provost Campbell would like to collaborate with faculty in this work.

Volker Frank suggested also surveying the students. Provost Campbell does think it is very important to know what is going on in the minds of our students. Shannon Earle and her team as well as Regine Criser, Lynne Horgan, Alicia Shope, and others are doing this work. Incoming first year students want a safe, in-person experience. Anne Marie Roberts has been tracking returning students who did not register and is reaching out to them. Alicia Shope confirmed there are 2311 students who have registered for the fall semester. Regine Criser has articulated the idea of centrality of community, it absolutely will not be enough to simply come back and think we can return to business. We are going to have to think about what is going on and acknowledge the moment. Engaging students and redeveloping ourselves as a community is going to be important, even in a different mode to maintain social distancing and wearing masks.

Volker Frank also relayed it is very important to reflect back on this period of time. In terms of an overall societal transition, online learning/online teaching might be the normal thing to do in 30-40 years. While now it might be very difficult for us, we need to acknowledge we are in a transitional moment in terms of how education is produced. As a liberal arts institution with important themes such as inequality, suffering, and health, it would behoove us as an institution to look back on that what this COVID virus did to us as a society and contemplate these issues and these themes together, perhaps with a perspective on planning for the future. It is both a crisis as well as a tremendous opportunity that we can certainly benefit from years down the road.

- III. Approval of Minutes: Special Session March 26, 2020 1:00 p.m.  
April 9, 2020 3:15 p.m.

A motion was made to accept the minutes for the Special Session on March 26, which was seconded. The Special Session March 26, 2020 minutes were approved without dissent.

A motion was made to accept the minutes for the Faculty Senate Meeting for April 9, 2020, which was seconded. The minutes for April 9, 2020 were approved without dissent.

- IV. Executive Committee: Senate Chair Marietta Cameron

A. Senate Chair's report from Faculty Assembly

Marietta Cameron reported there has not been a Faculty Assembly nor a Senate Chairs meeting since the Senate's last meeting on April 9. There has been much activity. There was a Senate Chairs meeting for today that Lora Holland was asked to attend in Marietta Cameron's place and she appreciates Dr. Holland for doing this for her. Lora Holland and Melodie Galloway are the Faculty Assembly representatives for next year

B. [Senate Chair Year End Report](#)

[Annual Athletic Report:](#)

Janet Cone and Jeffrey Wilcox

Director of Athletics Janet Cone thanked Dr. Wilcox for being a wonderful faculty athletic representative. She also thanked faculty for the great work with the students that is

evident by the high GPAs of our athletes. Although due to the pandemic we were unable to finish our season, overall, we felt like our athletic performances were at their usual high level.

Senator Amanda Wray and John Brock relayed praise of the UNCA athletes who are so remarkable. Faculty Senate also expressed gratitude for the leadership of Janet Cone, Jeffrey Wilcox, and others. She concluded that it is a pleasure to work with these students where they out-perform in and out of the classroom.

Student Government Association: President-Elect London Newton

Marietta Cameron introduced the newly elected SGA President, London Newton who is a rising junior majoring in political science with double minors in mass communication and legal studies.

London Newton introduced Sam Shephard as her Executive of Internal Operations who has proposed a mentorship program. If President Newton is in a meeting or class during a Senate meeting, Sam Shephard will be here to give the SGA update.

Chancellor Cable said that London Newton will be sworn in by Judge Calvin Hill as SGA President, and she will serve on our Board of Trustees as an ex officio member. The Chancellor is thrilled that we will have her skill although those are big shoes to fill of Isaiah Green. Isaiah Green was chosen to be the President of Association of Student Governments statewide. We are in good hands, both at the state and campus levels with Isaiah and London's leadership.

London Newton thanked faculty and staff for all their hard work this semester. The students understand that faculty had to make the biggest adjustments and they really appreciate the faculty for their reasonable accountability and flexibility. She is excited to work with the Faculty Senate in the coming year.

Sam Shephard is a rising sophomore majoring in chemistry. Serving as London Newton's Executive of Internal Operations, she will be compiling data about how things are working for students in different departments, and trying to institute a school-wide peer-mentoring program. She intends on attending all the Faculty Senate meetings in the coming year.

Faculty Senate members congratulated London Newton, Isaiah Green and Sam Shephard on their election and appointment.

[Staff Council:](#)

Chair Erin Spence  
Chair-Elect Emma Anderson

[Faculty Assembly Delegate Report:](#)

Professor Melodie Galloway

[Faculty Assembly Executive Committee Meeting with President Roper and Chair Ramsey, with Kimberly van Noort, Tom Shanahan, Pete Brunstetter, and Chris McClure, April 24, 2020 Recommendations for addressing the COVID-19 pandemic dated May 6, 2020](#)

Student Affairs Update:

Vice Chancellor Bill Haggard

Vice Chancellor Bill Haggard thanked faculty for their great work keeping our students connected. Since the decision made on March 11, Student Affairs worked with students to return home. They started out with about 1435 students before spring break. With that many students, our staff did a tremendous job in their first round of listening to our students. They did not do this by email; they did person-to-person conversations, in-person for students on

campus and by phone for those who were gone on spring break. They listened to student concerns who requested exceptions. Right after spring break was over; we had about 130 students to whom we granted exceptions for them to stay because of unique circumstances. After that, 64 students stayed and enrolled in summer classes.

When those who stayed are dining, social distancing was practiced with servers giving out the food. The students/faculty/staff would then take their food back to their rooms or offices to eat. As the state tightened the rules, they moved to a model of pre-orders and pickups like most of the off-campus restaurants have been doing. Dining staff have done a terrific job.

Regarding the Health and Counseling area, although learning has been remote, health visits have not slowed. Since March 16 the first day after spring break up until this past Monday, April 27, they had 434 health visits. Many of those were telehealth visits. Students are still using us for their health services. Not surprisingly, in that six-week wait period, we had 908 counseling sessions so counsellors continue to be busy each day. Other student development areas such as student activities in Highsmith, Multicultural Affairs, and Campus Recreation have continued to keep our students connected remotely with as many remote activities as possible or as desired by students whether that be fitness videos, online workouts, or a creative thing like Bulldog breaks - where you get a text message at certain times during the day to remind you to get up and get some exercise. We have had 45 students continue in coaching relationships that has been a huge success. Another very successful student activity was 105 students participated in a virtual crafting project. We sent supplies and students came together in a synchronous environment and worked on a craft project together. It is important to keep our students together and connected with a sense of community as much as we can.

Another area that has been very busy and successful is our Care and Crisis team that is led by our Dean of Students, Jackie McHargue. For years, we have had a student emergency fund for a one time, financial crisis that might cause a student to drop out. The emergency fund helps prevent that. Since mid-March, forty-eight (48) individual students were helped through that program.

Although they have had to cancel this summer's programs and conferences at the recommendation of the System Office, they are planning for next year's offerings. Vice Chancellor Haggard ended his report with a shout out to faculty for their great work on their first time effort at pre-college programs that they look forward to scheduling next summer.

Many attendees praised Vice Chancellor Haggard and Student Affairs for their hard work this year.

- V. Institutional Development Committee / UPC: Second Vice Chair Patrick Bahls  
**Second Reading**

[IDC 4](#) Guidelines for Proposals for New or Substantially Revised Undergraduate Majors, Minors, and/or Certificate Programs (with friendly amendment from Alicia Shope added)

Patrick Bahls said this document was originally designed with the intent of addressing preemptively some of the issues that were consistently in the documents that came before IDC this past year, particularly concerning cohesion of the proposed program and concerns

about the workload. The intent was to create a document that would parallel the existing language in APC procedures. If you go to the faculty senate website, there are guidelines that help frame conversations for the documents that come before APC. IDC incorporated some of the language in those existing documents to create complimentary guidelines for bringing proposals before IDC.

A motion was made to accept IDC 4, which was seconded.

**Discussion:**

Patrick Bahls recognized Alicia Shope's concern about the sunset clause language where any program (major, minor, or certificate) not completed by any students for two consecutive years will automatically be discontinued. This would not be possible if someone is actively enrolled in the program. Patrick Bahls replied that this was language initially placed there as a placeholder for they were unsure of the language to include. They were hoping to address the matter of programs that continue without any activity from students in the programs. Since the language does not take into account the details that Alicia Shope has indicated, he was open to a friendly amendment that elaborates upon that issue to be in line with current practice.

Alicia Shope expressed she thinks IREP might be able to give us an idea of the number of programs that have not had anyone graduate in a certain amount of time or do not have anyone enrolled. To discontinue a major, you have to actually send it down to the system office and go through their process to actually be discontinued and taken off the books. Minors and the certificates are not the same way, but we cannot discontinue a major without sending it down state. Perhaps say we would look at those programs that have not had anyone graduate in two consecutive years to see if they should be discontinued or not, instead of saying they automatically will be.

Patrick Bahls thanked Alicia for her friendly amendment. No further discussion.

IDC 4 passed without dissent and 1 abstention.

Announcement and updates:

1. [IDC 5](#): Letter of Intent to establish a B.A. in Elementary (K-6) Education

IDC has received a letter of intent to establish a new major degree program in the Education Department, a Bachelors of Arts in Elementary Education. This is a ten-step process outlined in the Faculty Handbook, [Section 5.4](#). Faculty Senate first comes into the process at step four of this 10-step process where the request for authorization to plan is submitted to the institutional Development Committee for approval and announcement to the full Faculty Senate. At this point in the process, IDC has read and approve the document without dissent. It was a unanimous support for this letter of intent from education department, and we gave them a good deal of feedback. Faculty Senate will take the matter up again, this coming academic year, when the planning process has reached the next stages.

2. Update on the establishment of an Institutional Biosafety Committee

The update status on the establishment of a Biosafety Committee is the planning is still over in Phillips Hall and the Provost Office. David Clarke, the most recent addition to IDC, was able to fill us in on conversations he has had with Kevin Gibson regarding the request for

faculty names to be appointed to that committee. Since the committee membership is from among the community at large as well as faculty, it is not entirely within the Faculty Senate purview to oversee the Constitution of that committee. The process is ongoing but is not currently before Faculty Senate.

[IDC Chair's Year End Report:](#)

Second Vice Chair Patrick Bahls

VI. Academic Policies Committee:

First Vice Chair Sonya DiPalma

[Decision Summaries](#)

**Second Reading**

[APC 37](#)

Remove Remaining a Chemistry Major for the B.S. and B.A. Chemistry degrees;  
Update graduation requirements to include a grade of C or better in foundational Chemistry classes for the B.S. Chemistry degree  
(Sally Wasileski, CHEM)

[APC 38](#)

Academic Alert Name Change and Expansion to all Courses  
(Brad Petitfils, Anne Marie Roberts)

[APC 39](#)

Revise the policy on limiting double majors to the receipt of a single degree;  
Remove the Limitation on the number of baccalaureate degrees  
UNC Asheville will award

[APC 40](#)

Change description and prerequisite for MGMT 428

[APC 41](#)

Change the title of MGMT 489  
(Mary Lynn Manns, Deena Burris, Patrick Hester, MGMT)

[APC 42](#)

Delete ECON 101 and 102, replacing with ECON 103, Introductory Economic Analysis;  
Add new course, ECON 104, Microeconomic Principles for Engineers

[APC 43](#)

Change the Economics Curriculum from 3 credit hours to 4, revising course descriptions as necessary

[APC 44](#)

Change the requirements for the Major in Economics;  
Change the requirements for Economics with Teacher Licensure;  
Change the requirements for the Minor in Economics

[APC 45](#)

Revise the Economics Credit for Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate Exams;  
Add Economics credit for Cambridge International Exams  
(Kathleen Lawlor, Melissa Mahoney, and Don Diefenbach, ECON)

- [APC 46](#) Department of Art & Art History Petition for Exemption to SD2015F  
[Appendix 1](#) [Appendix 2](#) [Appendix 3](#)
- [APC 47](#) Revise the course descriptions for ART 264, 364, 366, 367, and 464
- [APC 48](#) Add new courses to the Art History curriculum:  
ARTH 313, Art and Archaeology of Ancient Italy;  
ARTH 314, Art and Archaeology of Early Christianity;  
ARTH 315, Egyptian Art and Architecture;  
ARTH 382, Contemporary Art in Latin America;  
ARTH 387, Islamic Art and Architecture
- [APC 49](#) Delete ARTH 330, 340, and 350, replacing with ARTH 335 and 345
- [APC 50](#) Change prerequisites for ARTH 410 and 460  
(Tamie Beldue, Cynthia Canejo, Eric Tomberlin, and Carrie Tomberlin, ART//ARTH)
- [APC 51](#) Change the title of MATH 155  
(Sam Kaplan, Cathy Whitlock, MATH)
- [APC 52](#) Establish Hardship Withdrawal Policy  
(Jackie McHargue, Lynne Horgan, Student Affairs)

Sonya DiPalma relayed that all APC documents were unanimously approved by APC. Marietta Cameron asked for APC 37 and APC 38 be removed from the bundle to be considered separately. Jake Butera asked for APC 40 to be removed from the bundle as well.

A motion was made to accept APC 39 as well as APC 41 through APC 52, which was seconded.  
No discussion. APC 39 as well as APC 41 through APC 52 passed without dissent.

Lynne Horgan said that deans and some of the May graduates raised the issue whether APC 39 could be implemented for this May. They do plan to implement this May, and there will be 13 students who qualify.

In regards to APC 42, Linnea Linton said the Engineering Department would officially like to thank the Economics Department for working with them to find a solution for the engineering students. They are deeply grateful and fully support the course change.

A motion was made to accept APC 37, which was seconded.

Discussion:

Marietta Cameron explained that she unbundled this document to call attention to the rationale given in the decision summaries because it does set a standard. For the record, she wanted APC to explain their rationale regarding this. She is doing this for transparency and so it will be in the minutes as well as the decision summaries to reinforce so in the future people will know why they are being denied versus another department because the record will be available.

Sonya DiPalma said that APC found most compelling that if a student did not meet the

requirements for a Bachelor Science degree they were not removed from the major, but could then earn a Bachelor of Arts degree.

Jake Butera asked for clarification whether this concerns those pursuing the accredited degree, Bachelor of Science.

Sally Wasileski confirmed the Bachelors of Science degree is the one that is certified by the American Chemical Society. She made it clear that the ACS does not require a specific GPA that would be inconsistent to monitor and prove across institutions, but they do require a demonstration of a standard of rigor for our major.

Jake Butera asked whether that means a student not receiving at least a C could still pursue other courses within the program but only for a B.A. degree.

Sally Wasileski confirmed that is correct with no delay to graduation.

Jake Butera said this is related to APC 40 that he asked to be unbundled as well. That distinction is a really important one - the distinction drawn between what is working towards accreditation and what is working towards a degree from the University.

Marietta Cameron for the record warned about opening Pandora's Box of having disciplines establishing a GPA that is higher than the degree requirement of the institution. If we allow too much of that to happen, we will have majors become tiered and considered more rigorous, and other majors considered second class.

Sally Wasileski pointed out that the GPA requirement of a 2.3 was approved by Faculty Senate in 2006. The difference here is the foundational coursework C or better requirement, which correlates to student success in the long term. Being able to do well in the early coursework will enable longer term success than the rule to complete the major with at least a 2.3 GPA approved in 2006.

Jessica Pisano let Marietta Cameron know APC definitely talked about that whole bandwagon effect at length. In this particular situation, APC did not see a tiered major. This major gives two different options for students. This allows student choice and a way for students to continue being chemistry majors. APC felt in certain situations like these where there is still a path for the student to pursue a particular major is okay.

Marietta Cameron also wanted to point out there was consideration given to advising these students with so many C-wall courses in the degree on what their options are and to make sure that there is advising happening early. In response to decisions that were made previously, we see this all the time in Faculty Senate of decisions that have been made in one era, and then gets overturned in another era and then gets reinstated somewhere further down. No further discussion.

APC 37 passed without dissent and 1 abstention.

A motion was made to accept APC 38, which was seconded.

Marietta Cameron also unbundled this for transparency reasons. For sake of discussion, she actually is strongly in favor of this document, but she wanted to acknowledge the concern from a colleague and make sure that his voice is heard. The colleague was concerned about the amount of workload that is coming to faculty on the expansion of academic alerts to academic indicators. The colleague and other faculty see this as an increase of workload for faculty. Her response to this is that



UNC system policies say that we are to monitor and she believes someone has data that shows these indicators help in terms of retention.

Jessica Pisano believes that retention should be an important concern to all faculty. The payoff is that we continue to have students and we keep getting to do what we love doing, which is teaching and doing the research that we are really passionate. We need students in order to get to continue to do our work, and we need students to be successful and not leave the university the way they are leaving right now. The other issue is the current policy regarding academic alerts fall disproportionately on non-tenured and non-tenure track faculty who teach many of the first-year classes. This is amazingly unfair not to mention the fact that we are not complying with the UNC System mandate that we include academic indicators for a variety of students, including athletes and other students. She believes this is a really important issue for our students' success and for the health of the University.

Anne Marie Roberts wanted to speak to the workload issue. Since faculty do good work keeping track of how your students are doing in your courses, that it is simply a matter of data entry. Theoretically, this should only take an extra 30 minutes to an hour of work. She believes the benefit to the students, the university and retention rates are greater than that additional data entry time. There is not a formal report regarding retention rates at this moment. However, what she does know is in fall of 2019 there were 196 F grades from 155 unique students for which instructors had not submitted alerts. Deaver Traywick, Amanda Bell and IREP are very interested in a more robust study of how these alerts can relate to our retention efforts.

Regine Criser wanted to support everything that Jessica Pisano has said. She asked for the rate instructors are currently entering their alerts.

Lynne Horgan recalled that the rate is 97% on the 100 level courses. They enforce this sending many emails. They hope the rate would remain this high when expanding these indicators using the same tactic.

Regine Criser thanked the Office of Academic Success for their excellent work and for coming up with this document\* She believes this is an easy way for us to be at the front end of the work to reach out to our students. Even though we do not have data from our campus, we have research that exists that shows how important it is to connect with students one-on-one early on in their path throughout the semester to ensure that they can navigate some rough waters that they might encounter to give positive feedback to the student. Academic alerts will let students know they are doing a good job and making headway in their classes. This should be part of our duties as instructors and time well dedicated. [\*Secretary Note: for transparency, the author of the document was Dr. Marietta Cameron, who was Chair of APC at the time the document was created.]

Linnea Linton introduced herself as the Associate Director of the Engineering Department where she actually works for NC State University at UNC Asheville. Part of her job is to take the grades from NC State Engineering Classes and put them into the UNC Asheville system including the academic alerts. She has between eight to twelve classes to enter each semester and the entire process only takes her an hour. They have between 90 to 100 students in a class between 20 to 30 students. It is extra work entering the academic alerts but it is not prohibitive.

Laura Bond wanted to say two things. First, she appreciates the change in term from academic alerts to academic indicators for that seems to her to be going into the direction of positive language for our students and the message faculty wish to send. She sees this document as an opportunity to communicate to all students in all classes positively. However, she does not see the language saying this is required to do all the time with all our classes, but an opportunity. An opportunity to communicate some way to our students in a formal way. She applauds this change and thanks APC for the work that you have done with the Registrar's Office.

Sonya DiPalma thanked Laura Bond for her comments and echoed her sentiments that they are pleased that one of the outcomes is faculty get the opportunity to provide also provide positive comments that students are doing well.

Jessica Pisano said her understanding is that this would be required and not just an opportunity, but a mandate and expectation the faculty give their students an indication of how they are doing in class by midterm. She asked for confirmation of her understanding.

Sonya DiPalma said she had interpreted as an expectation. How that was going to play out and enforcement, she asked if Anne Marie Roberts could speak to this.

Anne Marie Roberts confirmed that Sonya was correct in that it is an expectation. Enforcement is through intrinsic motivation as well as knowing the reports do go to the Department Chairs.

Lynne Horgan clarified that the language in the document does say required and there is an expectation that faculty meet the requirement. Enforcement from the Registrar's Office will be the same set of email. They will programmatically look to see if indicators have been entered and the emails will go out to remind faculty to do so. The percentages and lists of who have not submitted indicators do go to the chairs and the deans. There was some discussion about it being in the faculty record, but she does not know where that landed though she would encourage it is placed there.

Sonya DiPalma relayed that APC mentioned this to FWDC. They felt the same enforcement would work where you get reminders and faculty know that if they do not do it then their chairs and deans will know.

Jake Butera wanted to point out for clarity sake, the document actually reads by the end of the six week instructors of all classes are required to tender academic indicators for students via their OnePort account.

Toby King relayed that faculty can follow instructions especially when it is as simple as cutting and pasting grades from your Excel spreadsheet into an online form. He really appreciates what Linnea Linton said but an hour is a generous amount of time of transferring this little amount of data from one format to another. He believes APC said if this were maintained on the faculty record, it would be explicitly valued.

Micheal Stratton asked, "How different is this from faculty having to get book orders in on time or getting grades in that are due by certain deadlines. Faculty need to step up to support these efforts.

London Newton wanted to relay that if her professors return work in a reasonable time, she could look at the syllabus and figure out her grade herself. She feels if she forgets to write down her

grades that is her fault because she is an adult. However, these academic indicators are a better way since Moodle does not always calculate grades correctly.

Ashley Moraguez thanked London for her comments. She wanted to note that it is a requirement in the UNC System for us to give feedback to students by the sixth week of class. This should not be much of a burden since we should have had at least one assignment, if not more, by that point. Students should have some indication by the fifth week.

No further discussion. APC 38 passed 17-1.

A motion was made to accept APC 40, which was seconded.

Jake Butera wanted to address some of the concerns that were brought up earlier with the Chemistry requirement for a grade of a C. He is looking for clarification here in this instance, if a student receives less than a C in the statistics course whether they would not be able to enter into pursuit of the major.

Patrick Hester emphasized this course is an elective. They do not have to take this class. They can get a degree in management without ever having to take this class. This is just an elective that they can take along the way. They can still get less than a C in STAT 185 and choose any other number of electives to fulfill their degree requirements. They never have to take this class.

Jake Butera relayed that they cannot take this course if they have received less than a C in STAT 185.

Patrick Hester confirmed that is correct.

Jake Butera said he has concerns why these distinctions are drawn and why we are drawing the line between what is a passing grade as recognized by the university and a non-passing grade. He is concerned about the precedent this can set in other instances.

Patrick Hester expressed his understanding is that precedent has been set in other courses and this is not the first course to do that.

Jake Butera reemphasized Marietta Cameron's point that just because something has been established before and not questioned, does not mean that it is not worth addressing and considering in future instances.

Patrick Hester concurs but his point is it has been done before and that is why they did not feel there was a problem putting it on the books this way. If you look at the numbers, we are actually increasing the number from the way that prerequisite was written before was significantly more restrictive. Between fall 2015 and 2019, only 202 students passed STAT 225. He opened it up to a C or above in STAT 185 or 225 and had it as instructor permission. The old wording was confusing to students who would send emails essentially saying, "Can I take this class? Shouldn't I take it? I got a D in STAT. What do you think?" Students did not understand what the clear expectation was of them from a mathematical fluency perspective. His rationale is the new wording makes the expectations of the students much clearer, which is to say it is a prerequisite. They do not have to take this class, and we have students of varying backgrounds in the Management Department, some are not quantitatively oriented and therefore might not be drawn to this course, which is perfectly acceptable. They have plenty of other courses available to them. In this case, he felt that in the course there is not a lot of time

to go back and reconstitute the background of statistics so the students need to have a minimum competency.

Sonya DiPalma relayed that APC thought this promotes student success in a course heavily based in statistics to require a solid foundation in statistics. There are other 400-level courses that have a requirement of C or better so in that respect, this is not new nor a precedent.

Marietta Cameron asked to answer Jacob's question about motivation for this in terms of the university saying that the D is passing for a course and then saying that you need a C as a prerequisite for another course. She wanted to make the case that some disciplines, including hers, see it is possible to take a course that you do not want as a major, and D is a passing grade. However, if the course is within the major and indicative of success within in this discipline that while the university says you have to have a 2.0 average in your major, lower grades are indicative, especially for the early courses, as a way of indirectly advising students about whether or not they should stay within the particular discipline or not.

Jake Butera expressed it is that justification that worries him in part the assumption that performance in one course equates to performance in another is somewhat problematic, especially in this case where the courses are offered through two different departments. He understands the suggestions, but he worries a bit about them and the potential to have these same kind of considerations more broadly applied to many courses.

Marietta Cameron replied that she cannot speak for all, but she can speak for some that before a C requirement was put on the course, there was a study done so it was data-driven that showed a correlation between a C in a prerequisite course and whether or not someone completed a major that was predicative.

Micheal Stratton relayed he did not believe this is a broad-stroke proposal for other curriculum across campus. This is about APC 40, and the question is, "Are students prepared for this upper level elective or not?" The faculty in the department need to be trusted that this is an appropriate benchmark. I agree with Patrick that it is a proxy. We could test students prior to this with some sort of exam, but do we want to subject students to additional competencies just to take an elective. There are plenty of precedents. The minimum C requirement across the catalogue is expansive. I think the Faculty Senate needs to be aware of that and take that issue up later to re-examine the entire curriculum for minimum C requirements. His commentary is just on APC 40. This course is an upper-level elective that students may choose. Upper level electives have had prerequisites.

Jessica Pisano said she shared Jake's concerns about a bandwagon effect. In addition, there was a conversation at the last senate meeting about this issue in general of the growing number of courses and programs that want C-walls. Faculty Senate does need to spend some time discussing this issue. One of the reasons that APC felt comfortable passing this particular document was because it was an elective, but also the way that they have re-envisioned the class so it is actually open to more students than it was previously.

Sonya DiPalma echoed that APC looked at this and reasoned this is not preventing students from progressing within the major. This says in order to be successful in this class, you must have

a sound foundation in statistics or it will be very frustrating for the student.

As a Management professor, Susan Clark agreed with Patrick Hester that the requirement signals to the student appropriate information about foundational competencies they will need to be successful. She also reiterated that this is essentially signaling to the student information, which it is ethical to relay a certain competency to be successful in this course. This is beneficial to the students and does not raise any kind of fairness or justice issues in terms of being elitist or holding certain students back.

Sonya DiPalma relayed that APC has recommended in the fall that discussions be held with chairs, program directors and campus community at large regarding requirements.

Patrick Bahls quoted the proposal, "...1,886 students received a C or above in STAT 185 or 225 from Fall 2015 to Fall 2019, while only 202 students simply passed STAT 225." The only question he would have is how many people are newly excluded; that is, how many got a D in 225 (who would now be excluded in the new formulation). He understands this number is small so the net access is hugely positive.

APC 40 passed 16-1 and 1 abstention.

[APC Chair's Year End Report](#)

First Vice Chair Sonya DiPalma

VII. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee: Third Vice Chair Aubri Rote

[Decision Summaries](#)

**Second Reading**

[FWDC 4](#) Revise Chair, Program Director, and Academic Affairs Compensation  
Faculty Handbook Sections [2.9.4](#), [3.1.2](#), [3.1.4.1.5](#)

Aubri Rote said all documents up for second reading passed FWDC unanimously.

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

**Discussion:**

Aubri Rote relayed that the senators and chairs / program directors have received Provost Campbell's compensation report.

Marietta Cameron appreciates the amount of work that FWDC has put into this document. FWDC and Faculty Senate have been discussing this document all year. The numbers that were received this morning in the spreadsheet does concern her. She would also like someone to address the equity issues because it seems that the inequities have just switched around where there is another group of disciplines among the favored versus another group of disciplines. Her concern is Faculty Senate will pass this, and in three years, we will still be dealing with inequity.

Aubri Rote said the fundamental question was what the gap should be between the lowest paid and the highest paid. With respect to the issue of the matter of equity, is it better to have pay determined behind closed doors or implemented as an objective measure? First, determine the baseline amount in terms of stipend and release time. Compensation grows as the department grows.

They had a robust discussion about the gaps and currently the gap is \$6,000 between the lowest and highest paid. After some discussion, FWDC decided this was an appropriate gap from the department with three faculty on average to a department that has 18 faculty members at the high end.

David Clarke said he understood the changes in pay, but regarding the changes in release time, he wanted to understand which departments have gained and which have lost release time. He knows the Biology Department would lose a course, but he does not know about other departments.

Provost Campbell said he would not want to release individual information. He asked if it was enough to know that there were 6 examples up and 2 examples down.

David Clarke replied that was good enough.

Patrick Bahls believes there will always be a flaw in the system, and we will never have the perfect solution. He appreciates the attempt to make this more equitable. He liked the fact that the inequity is based on, as Provost mentioned, workload and not on the faculty rank so we do not have the inequity of a junior faculty member making considerably less money, directing or chairing the same department and thereby suffering because of the one-ninth rule. He appreciates there was some reflection of the workload in terms of faculty oversight and student advising taken into account in the new system.

Ashley Moraguez had a question about the array across departments. She is curious to know what the formula looked like or what went into the determination besides faculty and student numbers and what determined the breaks. Why is the number of students being counted? She can see it in some ways, but she thinks that is almost double counting by counting faculty and counting students since presumably, faculty allocation is based on student population. Therefore, she just wants to know a little bit more about what went into the numbers.

Provost Campbell relayed that the formula applied was based on a point system. Here are some examples:

<b>Category</b>	<b>Points</b>
Full time faculty (tenure and non-tenure track)	5
Staff	3
Majors	2/10 of a point
Minors	1/10 of a point

There was a discussion at the chairs and program directors meeting about the introduction of a level of complexity. The worry was by introducing ambiguous requirements could be a way to reintroduce inequities. Education is highlighted because the original thinking was each department would get exactly this with no additional sets of resources. Education does have someone who spends half their time with licensure and accreditation. Other than that, there was no other consideration.

Regine Criser wanted to be clear that Senate is voting on the document that is up from FWDC and that document includes crucial recommendations to increase equity in the stipends detailing all the things taken into account. We also prefaced that document and explained in our rationale that the

compensation of chairs is solely the purview of the Provost. While we are lucky that the Provost worked with FWDC to develop this, we are not voting on his chart though it is nice that he shared the sheet with us. What we are trying to accomplish with this document is to have something in the handbook to hold people accountable for the recommendations made with faculty welfare in mind. We have language that we want transparency and we want this not to be a cost cutting measure, but that the same amount or percentage of faculty salary at large to continue to be awarded for chairs compensation. She appreciates what the Provost shared, but in the end, the only thing Senate will vote on is the recommendation to go in the handbook.

Tiece Ruffin relayed that they understand we are voting on the document, but the chart mirrors the document.

Aubri Rote explained that Regine Criser was saying that it is Provost Campbell's purview to decide compensation. Senate is making a recommendation. He is using that recommendation.

Jessica Pisano asked about subprograms within departments like first-year writing within English where the subprogram generates more than half of the student credit hours for that department. How does that figure into the way that we think about chair compensation? She also wonders how to think about the chair compensation document that Provost Campbell set forth without also being able to see the program director and coordinators stipends/compensation as well.

Provost Kai Campbell explained that eventually every single job would go through this process. In other words, he views this as an internal mandate. He is glad to have this in the handbook for there are many different types of coordinators with titles like directors, pro coordinators, etc. There are many things going on, some of them compensated, some of them not. Some of them get money, some of them get time and some of them get both while some of them get none. It is all over the map and an unfortunate landscape. His goal is to clean it all up. This was a step.

In regards to subprograms, all Provost Campbell can say is we know that there is work to be done and his goal is to look at the scope of each job and ask, "Does this make sense what someone is getting paid for this job?" He wants to ask that of every job and publish that so it can be scrutinized.

Micheal Stratton shared the only thing he recommends moving forward is to have very targeted discussions with department chairs. Since we do not have a school or college model, the complexity is going to exist and the workloads are going to be different because the role of a department chair differs so greatly across the different departments.

Provost Campbell made it clear he is not moving on this today. He wish he could have had the spreadsheet out earlier but it takes time to get accurate details. He welcomes this discussion and would take any feedback about this structure. It is true that he wants to implement this in the next iteration of chair appointments so he would like to resolve this soon. However, this is not the day.

John Brock believes that many have some reservations about this. He thinks that some of the complexity that is involved in the sciences is not necessarily in here. The question to ask is "Are we moving forward?" First of all, he believes this is much more transparent, and he applauds the fact that it is rational so he thinks this is moving forward. It is not perfect. There are some issues from different perspectives. He hopes Senate does not stop the momentum to move this discussion forward because

it is not perfect. He would rather say this is a step in the right direction.

Laura Bond said as a program director for a number of years that she understands all the different needs in departments as well as the different aspects beyond the number of students and number of faculty within the department. Many have studios, labs, productions, music ensembles, gallery openings, and events that they organize and run that take a huge amount of work. This model is a wonderful beginning as far as trying to establish a sense of equity to start with as a base. She concurs with Micheal Stratton that there needs to be more discussions to see what is missing for some items may not be captured in data concerning the day-to-day operations of the chairs.

Regine Criser wanted to note that FWDC has been working on this for over two years. In that process, they have looked at data and narratives as well as communicated with chairs. A lot of work went into this document where FWDC took all the available data and narratives into account.

Tiece Ruffin understands the highlight is not an exhaustive list, but she asks please consider a friendly amendment regarding complexity to include the number of programs within a department. For instance, Interdisciplinary Studies has several program areas, Asian Studies, Latin American Studies, TransAtlantic Studies, Legal Studies, American Indian and Indigenous Studies, U.S. Ethnic Studies, etc. She thinks program areas add to labor and complexity. Thank you.

Although she is not speaking for all of FWDC, Aubri Rote feels it does not seem quiet fair to call out specific items when other departments shared complexity factors also so they felt they should leave it since this is really Provost Campbell's decision. She asked if other FWDC members wanted to speak to this.

Tiece Ruffin said that as long as her comment is on the record this is okay.

Provost Kai Campbell concluded that this is really challenging. He echoed John Brock's thoughts that this is not perfect and they are absolutely right. It is not perfect. One scenario does not resolve all. Also, every time we solve an issue, we open up a new one. All that is done outside the norm is absolutely important and valuable. The original idea was to include a numeric component that captured complexity in some way. The challenge became, particularly when we talked about this with the chairs and program directors were the concerns of creating another layer of inequity. If equity is our primary goal, then there will never be a perfect solution because equity is always complicated. His hope is this is a little better, and maybe the next iteration will be even better

FWDC 4 passed 16-1 and 1 abstention.

[FWDC 5](#)      Revise Expectations in Faculty Evaluations  
Faculty Handbook Sections [3.3.2.2](#), [3.3.3.2](#), [3.3.3.3](#), [3.5.4.3](#), [3.5.4.4](#)

FWDC 5 is a revision to the expectations in faculty evaluations. A motion was made to accept FWDC 5, which was seconded.

Aubri Rote said she has received a friendly amendment to change the instances where it stipulates the workload. Lisa Sellers gave Aubri Rote access to make the changes since they were numerous.

Jennifer Rhode Ward appreciated the inclusion of our university core values. She is concerned



about diversity and inclusion being grouped with sustainability because she thinks that makes it seem that is an “either / or” choice where one could focus on diversity and inclusion or one could focus on sustainability. For folks who might interpret sustainability through an environmental lens, that grouping could be confusing. She would hope to separate those two things to make expectations more clear to faculty.

Tiece Ruffin is not exactly sure how best to address that in this document because our core values are diversity and inclusion, innovation, and sustainability. There is an assumption that since these are core values, we are all committed in working towards all of them, and we do not get to choose one of them. If you have a suggestion on how to make it clearer, they would definitely be open to it.

Jennifer Rhode Ward said listing them separately would make that clear. In her opinion, that in the history of this university, inclusion and equity get buried and are the first thing to go when times get tough. She believes two bullets to show that they are equal.

Aubri Rote made the friendly amendment changes.

Mark McClure relayed in several spots throughout the document he is confused on how workload / wage should be factored. In particular on the scholarship expectations, talking about teaching workload and all the other types. He is curious about the intention. Is the intention to any extent to separate out different types of tracks without really specifically saying that. For example, is the intention for tenure track and lecture type positions to be distinguished? Is that what is really going on in the background?

Aubri Rote replied that is definitely not the intention of this document. The intention is to take workload into account when we are evaluating faculty members.

Mark McClure expressed for tenure track positions, he certainly hopes that the teaching load never reaches the point where there is not an expectation to do scholarship. That is his concern from reading what is written.

Aubri Rote replied that the teaching load is full right now for many faculty members with 24 credits. What point would it reach where you would not be expected to do scholarship?

Mark McClure responded that when he read that, what he sees is when scholarship is evaluated, teaching load will be taken into account, correct? As a university, his anticipation is that we have scholarly expectations so he is confused by that.

Aubri Rote explained there are faculty members who have endowed professorships that have teaching labs. There are also faculty who teach 24 credits. Are they supposed to have scholarship also to match?

Mark McClure replied he would not say so since in the very few cases of endowed professorships, clearly we have a higher scholarly expectation, but as somebody who has just read this document recently, he gets the impression that the idea is to say, “We are teaching so much that we have less scholarly expectation.” That is the impression he got from reading the document.

Regine Criser replied that the overall attempt was to respond to some of the insights we gained from the listening sessions in the academic year 2017-2018, especially from conversations with tenure track and junior tenure track faculty. Those conversations made it clear that expectations and resulting pressures are quite intense and seem to be multiplying in the perception of junior faculty. It is a challenge for some faculty with a full teaching load to also be efficient in publishing and in service. While we say that teaching is most important, the handbook language did not necessarily allow for the flexibility to give faculty some leeway to say in the semester I had two new preps and therefore, I could not also publish one paper this academic year. It is an attempt to improve campus climate by improving faculty welfare in removing a little bit of the pressure. She does not believe any faculty member

publishes just because they have to. She believes we all do this work because that is part of our identity as a teacher scholar. This attempt was to treat everybody more humanely than they are right now.

Tiece Ruffin wanted to go on record to thank Aubri Rote and FWDC for the invitation to comment on the document before first reading. Both Heather Parlier and herself chatted about this, as well as consulted with members of the university-wide Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee that Luke Givens and she co-chairs as well as consulting with our Diversity Intensive Committee that consists of Jen Rhode Ward, Landon Ward, Sonia Kapur, Anne Jansen, Reid Chapman, Lyndi Hewitt and a couple other people. They are grateful that FWDC included the language under teaching because it is important for us all to recognize that teaching excellence should be our core value, but specifically the language that you have there. Under the candidate has demonstrated excellence in teaching, it would be her hope that all of us would be teaching in a diversity intensive manner where we look at our curriculum, pedagogy, and materials in a decolonized way. A way that is inclusive and has equitable pedagogy where people know that this is about them, not just one-sided or myopic, that is about all the different types of people that we have at UNCA and all dimensions of diversity. She is elated that we have now taken this step beyond rhetoric to say that this should be a part of teaching excellence as well. She likes seeing that in yellow.

The other piece that was added had to do with the inclusion of diversity intensive courses, service learning, arts and ideas that came out of this preconsultation with others. That is significant to beyond teaching load for many people put in work for DI-designated classes for service learning classes that should be considered in terms of complexity. Applications are submitted, and there is a peer review that is vetted for accountability purposes to make sure we center on these issues. She thinks it also recognizes more of the labor that may go into some classes due to these special designations. She believes we have captured some great things. This is better than where we were originally and it will now be in our handbook. She still thinks the How is missing that she relayed in two emails. It is one way to say yes and people feel like they can check off a box and say they do it. Do they articulate AND provide evidence of actually doing it? With diversity inclusion as one of our core values, I think we are long overdue for having this acknowledged in our Faculty Handbook. Thank you all.

Regine Criser thanked Tiece Ruffin for her email suggestions that were very helpful and they were able to incorporate the majority of them. The How not being included in this document was not willful ignorance, but a challenge to see how can we bring it in here in a manner that is most effective and really serving the purpose. They were not able to make that happen in this document.

Aubri Rote also thanked everyone for all their suggestions. Provost Campbell's draft of the annual faculty record specifically asked about these and she thinks that is great. She thinks faculty will be pleased with some of the changes that the Provost has made in this area.

FWDC 5 passed without dissent.

[FWDC 6](#)      Revise Merit Evaluation Categories  
Faculty Handbook Section [3.4.3](#)

A motion was made to accept FWDC 6, which was seconded. No discussion.

FWDC 6 passed without dissent.

[FWDC 7](#) Revise Governance of Committee and Service Appointments  
Faculty Handbook Section [10.1](#)

A motion was made to accept FWDC 7, which was seconded. No discussion.  
FWDC 7 passed without dissent.

Faculty Election Update/Senate Ballot Approval Associate Professor John Brock

John Brock asked for a motion to approve the ballot for Faculty Conciliator. The FWDC recommended names are William Bares, Sarah Judson and Mahmut Reyhanoglu. A motion was made to approve the ballot, which was seconded.

Aubri Rote announced the ballot passed and will be forwarded to SGA and the Vice Chancellor to Student Affairs.

[FWDC Chair's Year End Report](#)

Third Vice Chair Aubri Rote

- VIII. Old Business: None.
- IX. New Business: None.
- X. Announcements  
Marietta Cameron recognized Micheal Stratton who asked to speak.

Micheal Stratton wanted to speak since this is probably my final time serving on Faculty Senate for he is leaving. He wanted to thank this body in particular since it has been a governing body that he has been part of since he was a junior faculty member. Honestly, he learned so much so many of those present. Looking at the Zoom "Brady Bunch" like screen, brings some tears to his eyes to think of all the faculty who he has learned and served with for the faculty are there. The leaders, we have seen, unfortunately, come and go in the many years. He is really confident in Chancellor Cable, Provost Campbell, the Board of Trustees and our Senate Executive and the senators who will help lead this institution through this unprecedented time (Coronavirus pandemic). He has had an amazing time that is almost 10 years at UNC Asheville. He just want to say thank you all so much.

Marietta Cameron thanked Micheal Stratton for his service.

Jennifer Rhode Ward suggested that Senate retains a Zoom option for Faculty Senate meetings when it returns to in person meetings. Marietta Cameron said that Faculty Senate Executive Committee would consider this option.

- XI. Adjourned at 7:15 p.m.