

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA ASHEVILLE
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
September 1, 2022; 3:15 pm, Laurel Forum, Karpen 139

Members: D. Eggers, A. Laughlin, J. Butera, B. Sanft, B. Butler, D. Clarke, A. Cossette, B. Hook, S. Kapur, L. Kloeppel, J. Li, R. Tatum, E. Tomberlin, L. Ward, C. Whitlock, S. Williams, J. Zunguze.

Members M. Bettencourt.
Excused:

Visitors: N. Cable, M. Acker, J. Beck, R. Bell, A. Boakye-Boaten, C. Boone, M. Burchard, M. Cameron, R. Chapman, S. Clark, J. Cone, G. Conheady, R. Criser, M. Culbertson, J. Cutspec, J. Dougherty, G. Ettari, M. Fox, M. Halll, B. Hart, M. Harte Weyant, J. Head, H. Holt, L. Horgan, G. Hyde, S. Jameson, A. Kaur, T. King, J. Konz, K. Krumpel, L. Kuykend, S. Ligo, L. Linton, J. Liposchak, C. Lynch, M. McClure, M. Mattox, P. O'Brien, M. Orkoro, S. Patrick, J. Perkins, E. Pierce, G. Reynolds, T. Rizzo, E. Roubinek, M. Sarris, A. Shope, D. Todd, D. Traywick, C. Williams, L. Withrow.

I. Call to Order and Welcome by Faculty Senate Faculty Senate Chair Dee Eggers

II. Election from Among the Alternates to fill Senate Vacancy
After hearing from the alternates in person or through their written statements, Eric Tomberlin was elected by acclamation.

III. Interim Provost Kimberly van Noort Remarks

Ellen Pierce and Jeff Konz gave remarks in Interim Provost van Noort's absence. They wanted to say a few words about the Interim Provost and Vice Provosts arrangement that we have right now.

While Kim van Noort is here at UNC Asheville, she has an interim in her place in the system offices, and Provost van Noort will be moving here. She will be focused on UNC Asheville and on the campus to help us through this time. Ellen Pierce expressed she could not say enough good things about the Interim Provost. Ellen Pierce worked with her for three years at the System Office. She believes her to be very strong in the areas that we need right now. Ellen Pierce wanted to assure everyone that Provost van Noort truly is here for us and with us in this interim time. Ellen Pierce and Jeff Konz has taken on Interim Vice Provost roles to support the Interim Provost to give her institutional knowledge, histories and context about the campus. In those roles, they have complementary skill sets. Ellen Pierce brings the perspective of a faculty member into the Provost Office that she takes very seriously. She is also going to be assisting Provost van Noort with Academic Affairs as a conduit as well as for some external projects.

Jeff Konz added that Ellen Pierce and he would be taking on some of the direct reports. In particular, he will be working closely with the Registrar's and Academic Success Offices. These are all areas that he has already done a lot of the work in his day job as the Director of Institutional Research. Both of them had some reservations and misgivings about taking on a role and are working out the details of exactly what their responsibilities are and how their roles fit.

Jeff Konz wanted to emphasize that they are not replacing in any way or not acting as another player in between the Deans and Provost. They are here in support and both are keeping their regular jobs, as the Vice Provost roles are very time-limited appointments that are meant to be temporary support in this transition.

Ellen Pearson reiterated that these roles were not currently part of our previous structure, are temporary, and are very time-limited until December 31, 2022 is what her letter says for her to support and give context for the Interim Provost.

Jeff Konz understands that the proposed administrative structure has not been implemented at all and their scope is to support the provost during the transition. They are not on a glide path to become Associate Provost.

Scott Williams asked given the temporary nature of these roles that end December 31. What happens if in spring semester there is work that still needs to be done?

Jeff Konz replied that it remains to be seen currently. However, there is not a hidden handshake deal or something of extension.

Becky Sanft relayed she had received a note from a colleague to ask how their positions were created and how they were selected without input from faculty governance.

Ellen Pearson replied that the Chancellor asked them directly to do this. The colleague would have to ask the Chancellor the process by which she arrived at her decision.

Jeff Konz understood that there was some consultation with Senate leadership, although he may be mistaken on that for he was not in the room.

Ellen Pearson said that was her understanding also.

Dee Eggers replied that the Chancellor spoke to herself and Becky Sanft.

Becky Sanft replied that the Chancellor spoke to her in regards to considerations of an Interim Provost without discussion of Vice Provosts.

Dee Eggers agreed with Becky Sanft about the discussion held. She also added regarding the Interim Provost discussion, they just discussed candidates from within our campus community.

Dee Eggers thanked Ellen Pierce and Jeff Konz for their service.

IV. Student High Impact Focused Time (SHIFT)

Agya Boakye-Boaten asked to speak in order to give an update regarding SHIFT. The working group has been put together, and they have been working through the spring and summer. They started with focus groups on campus. The initial charge from the Provost was to look at the First Year experience to discern how to build the First Year experience and community on this campus for reasoning is if we get students through the first year then they are more likely to graduate. With that charge, they did several focus groups with different constituencies on campus. Based on the results of the focus groups, they came up with a working title: IGNITE from peer to peer connection to community engagement. The short term is IGNITE: finding your spot. This is to help students to build skills and competence in order to be successful in college and building meaningful connections to communities on and off campus. Ignite will accomplish this by engaging incoming freshmen students in a structured peer core experience in which leaders facilitate structured conversations every week during the fall semester around topics such as interpersonal skills, personal skill development, and growth mindset. His job here today was to give a quick update. Both this week and next, they are looking to hire an evaluator and they are currently working on that position's job description. Once the working group makes their decisions and submits their report, their job is done. If anyone have any questions, contact Dr. Boakye-Boaten as well as watch for the information coming from the group via email.

Brian Hook said that this sounds great and he looks forward to it. There is no question that sense of belonging is important. We want to cultivate that, but Brian Hook asked Jeff Konz whether students are leaving because of that or is it more about money. He does not have a sense nor has he seen information to have a sense of what the current retention issues are.

Jeff Konz replied that we have an abundance of exit surveys in particular that point to sense of belonging, talking about relationships with faculty, and relationships with each other. They have abundant evidence that this is one of the many factors that is contributing to our retention issues. One of the challenges is that there is no single narrative to explain our retention issues. It is financial for some students. For others, there are mental health challenges. For some students, they changed their mind on what they were interested in majoring, and we do not have that major. A sense of belonging, community and campus identity are all elements that have shown up repeatedly on the exit survey.

Dee Eggers relayed that Faculty Senate needs to have a Senate Representative for the SHIFT selection committee. To be the representative, of course you cannot be an applicant. She asked if anyone is willing to serve.

Marietta Cameron relayed this is an opportunity for elected faculty leadership to give input. It is a wonderful opportunity to see what type of projects are out there and to be informed on what has been started. You will have the opportunity to give direct feedback for they do not intend for this to be a one-time opportunity. This is an opportunity to be involved from the start while things are still taking shape. They are trying to announce those selected by September 23. They would have a meeting to look at a rubric and the criteria on which to judge the applications. The applications are due by 11:59pm on September 11. They hope the committee would meet before that deadline. Once they have all the applications, the committee members would have a week to review the applications. They would have one more meeting to make decisions and bring forth the announcement of the projects that have been selected. This is about two weeks of work.

Senate appointed Sonia Kapur as their representative on SHIFT.

V. Approval of Minutes: April 28, 2022 (first meeting and second meeting)

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes for both Senate meetings held on April 28, 2022. The minutes for April 28, 2022 passed without dissent.

VI. Approval of [Standing Rules and Rules of Order 2022-23](#)

A motion was made and seconded to approve the standing rules. Standing Rules and Rules of Order 2022-23 passed without dissent.

VII. Introductions and Reports to Senate

[Presentation of Current Budget:](#)

Vice Chancellor John Pierce

[Presentation Notes](#)

John Pierce, Vice Chancellor of Budget and Finance at UC Asheville, has been here for 14 years. In May of this past year at the Board of Trustees meeting, he announced that he was retiring at the end of September and then extend it for a few weeks until the middle of October. This comes with mixed feelings for this is a great place. This past year he has passionately spoke about what has become clear to him regarding UNC Asheville's finances. In this two-part presentation, this first presentation today has been done for Campus Operations, Board of Trustees, UNC System Office, and various Board of Governors members. This is the background of our revitalization plan. Next time he will talk more about the specifics of the budget, which he also will be presenting to the Board of Trustees.

UNC Asheville has been known historically as a distinctive, nationally ranked, public liberal arts and sciences university with a great reputation in undergraduate research as well as highly dedicated faculty that chose UNC Asheville for its distinctive mission. Considered a gem of the UNC System, like a diamond in the jewelry store that you cannot buy for 50 bucks, UNC Asheville has to be properly funded, period. Expectations cannot be way up while funding is way down. That has become clearer and clearer to him as we move forward. We have had some major institutional challenges. We have the highest employee turnover in UNC system and are underfunded compared to benchmark and UNC System schools and our peers. UNC Asheville has failed to advocate for critical needs since 2012 with no requests of the state and have lived in a culture of scarcity. Advocacy is absolutely critical for the future of this university.

He has worked very hard on implementing multi-year forecasting and budgeting utilizing new software. This software has been proven in private sector where a company went from zero in 2011 to 10 billion in market cap in 2021. The presentations Chancellor Cable has done based off that software to Board of Trustees, UNC System and various legislators has really helped us to have success in securing funds. John Pierce then presented the graphs of 20 slides (see links above for that information).

Key point that John Pierce made regarding spending per student, we are 19% below our peers. Economy of scale when you are small is harder to cover the costs as well as the issue that exacerbates our situation is the high cost of living in this area. The appropriation in orange is the state appropriation per student. UNC Asheville funding from UNC System is the same as two schools that are much smaller than we are - one about 60% of our size and the other is a third of our size. In addition, there are four schools in the university system that are NC Promise. Western Carolina is right in our backyard with \$1,000 a year for in-state student tuition compared to our \$4000 a year.

Marietta Cameron asked if we had the opportunity to be a NC Promise School.

John Pierce answered that we did have the opportunity to be a NC Promise school. That decision was made under Chancellor Grant. Part of her reasoning was a concern that it would affect our reputation and make us seem like a discount school.

Marietta Cameron thanked John Pierce for making transparent the reason why we did not become a NC Promise school.

Jake Butera asked how much of an impact did NC Promise make for those schools.

John Pierce believes their enrollment improved by several thousand students although recently their enrollments have flattened.

Marietta Cameron replied that there is not a silver bullet.

John Pierce agreed.

Dee Eggers asked whether it is fair to say that we are able to function only because of lapsed salary from the 115 open positions.

John Pierce replied yes.

Dee Eggers added that we are below critical threshold in terms of the percent of vacant positions. She asked how many positions are empty in "normal times."

John Pierce said probably 56-60 range.

Becky Sanft asked about staff positions.

John Liposchak reported staff numbers are down to 420 or down 25%.

John Pierce added that our salary per employee is down compared to the UNC system. In fiscal year 2022, our average salary is \$60,000 while the UNC system average salary is \$78,000. Thus, we are 23% below.

Scott Williams added the cost of living here is definitely a factor.

John Pierce agreed and they have pointed that out to those downstate. He thanked Mark McClure for his great work starting this process in one of the faculty committees. Housing is one of the factors in trying to recruit folks and is a factor in the voluntary staff turnover where we have the highest voluntary turnover in the UNC System. The current model is not well designed for special focus institutions. This means that while the proposed model seeks not to perpetuate funding inequities, it does not solve historic differences. The issue of historic funding levels is a separate issue outside the scope of the current conversation. This comes back to the fundamental issue that we have not been funded adequately over the years.

Dee Eggers concurred saying this is a key takeaway that we basically need to ask for an exception to address a historical problem, because the new funding model would not address that historical deficit.

John Pierce said that when we look at the legacy of underfunding we see this in the breakdown of our student credit hours within the various disciplines. He drew attention to the current funding rates and the proposed model rates. The current funding model before the change was \$14 million and the new model is \$26 million dollars. That is a difference of \$12.3 million or 86%. What that means is that if we grow our enrollment back, our reimbursement will be 86% higher than what we have been getting. This clearly shows how unfunded we have been.

Marietta Cameron brought up the trend of land acquisition while buildings are in need of renovation.

John Pierce explained how property acquisitions are done is through our foundation. The foundation buys the property and then we go to the state and they fund us through a special appropriation for they do want schools to make strategic land acquisitions. The key point is if we were to sell the property that money goes back to the state. If we do a ground lease to be able to create value with that as a millennial campus, we keep that money on the property. This money for the property could not be spent on academic programs.

John Pierce said that last fall was a great win receiving the biggest special state appropriation ever in UNC Asheville history. Before the biggest appropriation was a million and last fall's was 7 million. They have to look at that new funding applied to an infrastructure that spending has been 50% of what our peers are spending, and therefore, a part of this is going towards shoring up some key infrastructures. They have to spend a lot of time in advocating. Regarding salaries, across the board two and a half percent raises last year and then three and a half percent this year. They advocated for the UNC Asheville special state funding designation, and we got 5 million of the 10 million we asked for. They did ask for support for the renovation of the key academic facilities. We got 7 million, but we need the other 8 million of the 15 million that we originally asked for. However, the money that was asked for was predicated enrollment increasing to 4000 students. Stepping back, realistically given the market, enrollment may be flat. There is that gap that needs to be made up.

That brings us to the last slide. The key thing is UNC Asheville has to focus on spending the recurring money as well as we possibly can, and we have to focus on enrollment attracting new students as well retaining our current students.

Dee Eggers asked if we do not have any additional adjustments, does he think we will be able to keep our doors open 10 years from now.

John Pierce said anything is possible. However, this is not the way North Carolina has been historically as a great higher education system. This is not the way to treat a school. This is a special school within the North Carolina system that is worthy of support. John Pierce explained one of the factors is around 2013 there was big concern within the UNC System about student debt and the cost of higher education that led to resident tuition being set so that in-state undergraduate students have the same tuition for all four years. Small schools like us have started to suffer from the impact of that. The key thing is we have to show real progress on the money that we receive as well as make the case that we have been underfunded. This is a strong case and important to us.

Scott Williams noticed about 79% majors are in STEM. His question is are we going to be marketing our university to get more students by pushing the sciences and implicitly not promoting what used to be called liberal arts? The humanities division is very concerned about that.

John Pierce said that is a great question. We are going towards new leadership and marketing communication to do a branding and marketing study that will involve deep conversation with the faculty regarding who we are and where should we be going. This is really important for these are the core questions that we have to answer.

Lise Kloepfel relayed that she thinks part of the messaging is that disciplines like engineering within a public liberal arts setting is a unique thing. That means that you have to have STEM colleagues who recognize the value that humanities and diversity bring to the student's overall education.

Jeff Konz relayed that every one of our majors is a liberal arts major, with the exception of engineering, management/accountancy, and computer science. Most of the basic sciences, social sciences, and mathematics are all within the liberal arts according to the Carnegie Classification.

Marietta Cameron asked what happened to the philosophy that this is a public institution, and that taxpayer's money is supposed to support a public institution for all citizens of this state. What happened to that argument?

Dee Eggers replied that we forgot to keep saying it and advocate for ourselves. She thinks it is something that we constantly need to be reminding people and declaring to be the truth.

John Pierce agreed that those messages are really important.

Dee Eggers thanked John Pierce for his candor and appreciated his presentation. She further relayed that Senate looks forward to his second presentation next month.

Student Government:

Vice President Miracle Okoro

Miracle Okoro introduced herself as the Vice President of SGA. Their first meeting will be on September 6. They will be going over their budgets for the year and meeting weekly with the new Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, Meghan Harte Weyant. They also have been working on student enrollment and there is serious concern for the students of color here. Feeling like you do not have connection within community can be a contributing to the increase in the student transfer rate.

They are holding a faculty and staff mixer on September 13 from noon to 2pm. Also, the week after that there will be a LGBTQ faculty and staff mixer at the same time in the same room.

In regards to the Ignite Program, she asked that faculty encourage students to go to their professional development classes through the Pall Program. SGA would greatly appreciate faculty support. These classes are important for students' academic and personal development as well as their ability to survive and succeed. How it works is freshmen are split into different cohorts with a Pall mentor who is an upperclassman. They have class every week with students where they work on professional and personal development. SGA is hearing reports of faculty telling students they do not have to attend these classes; however, it is part of the freshman's class schedule and they get reminders every week. She would appreciate faculty support of this program.

Regine Criser mentioned that they have been in conversation with the First Year Seminar instructors whose classes have an Ignite session attached about those class meetings. They had a luncheon last Thursday and followed up even with those who could not attend with information specifically about what the Ignite curriculum entails. She is following up with Miracle Okoro and Alex Hollifield in Highsmith and Student Affairs, who is running the program, to make sure she gets more information about what was communicated from faculty so she can see what repair can be done. She does not know if that addresses the question. The students that have an Ignite session have received communication throughout the entire semester.

Lynne Horgan confirmed that it is on the students' schedules.

Lise Kloepfel has had students say to her that their instructor told them it was optional.

From Jake Butera's understanding that there has been tons of communication. The students met with their instructor during orientation, and they have received emails from them about what they should be doing. There has been loads of communication about staying actively involved. He has his normal class meeting that they have when they register for the class. When they look at their schedule, they see the additional meeting as part of his class. Jake asked to receive a report every now and then on what students are showing up so he has a better sense of class participation.

Staff Council:

Chair Kim Kauer

No one present from Staff Council to speak.

Faculty Assembly Representative:

Christine Boone, Toby King

Christine Boone and Toby King introduced themselves as the representatives to Faculty Assembly for Fall 2022 semester. If anyone has concerns or items of consideration, let them know for they represent the entire faculty of this university.

VIII. Academic Policies Committee:

First Vice Chair Andrew Laughlin

[Academic Policies Memorandum 2022-23](#)

Andrew Laughlin reported that APC met last Thursday for their first meeting and passed the APC memo that goes out every year. The memorandum is the general procedures for submitting documents to APC. Although the memo process has not changed from last year, they did do some edits before sending the memo out on Monday. He thanked APC and especially Alicia Shope. If anyone has questions please see him and Alicia Shope.

[Global Studies Center Discussion](#)

Andrew Laughlin has received some questions about the Global Studies Center. He invited Jake Butera to talk with us. Seth Ligo was also in attendance.

Jake Butera started with the history saying a little over a year ago, the beginning of last summer, there was a committee of faculty, staff, and students called together by the Chancellor to discuss the possibilities of starting a Global Studies Center on campus. This was largely the product of a couple of funding sources. One is part of the state-appropriated funds that they are using for rejuvenation planning that consisted of a payment a year for 2 years set aside for a Global Studies Center. In addition to that, a private donation came in specifically for the development of Study Abroad Programs. That committee met three times and what came out of that was a request for Jake Butera and Seth Ligo to take over this process to try to get these things underway. As part of that last spring, they started a research campaign on campus by reaching out to representatives from every division and most departments. They spoke twice at IDC, Staff Council, Student Government, Finance Office, Career Center, Athletics, Provost, and the Chancellor – basically, anyone they could think of that might have had some stakes or interest in this program. They held a public forum that was open to the entire university and sent out a questionnaire to get further feedback and essentially developed a series of projects and steps to undertake to establish the center and the physical space after the spring. That process started about a month ago with converting over the Red Oak Room and the Whitman Room. They started to try to use some of the funds because it was recommended to them that they start spending money. They launched a couple of different grant programs. UNC Asheville became members of the American Council on Education Internationalization Laboratory. Their first meeting is next Thursday and is part of a two-year process. Basically over the next two years, UNC Asheville will work with other universities, and the Council's advisors will work within Global Education at UNC Asheville to help with the implementation of the center here on campus.

Seth Ligo gave more detail to the timeline. They were asked to coordinate this discussion in the middle of January (2022). Regarding process, they have gathered a lot of information and asked everyone they talked to who else should they reach out to and that is how they extended their network. After gathering information, they would come up with an idea that they thought would fit the general trends and pass that along to Provost Kai Campbell and Chancellor Cable asking if the idea looked like a good provisional startup to try. If they received the green light, they would try it. They have tried three pilot programs where they received applications and made decisions over the summer. There will be three pilot programs more coming out soon. They gathered information, interfaced with those to tell them whether or how they should act, and then they follow those pilot programs through.

Jake Butera opened the floor up for questions.

Agya Boakye-Boaten thanked them for their work. He asked if they have any founding documents that would be available for the whole campus to see and understand how the center works. Based on that document, there is a wider discussion about how this setup fits within the scope of the university. A founding document is presented officially to the Chancellor, and the Chancellor presents to the Faculty Senate and Board of Trustees. That is the structure of the procedure, as he understands the process.

Jake Butera answered there is a document drafted that gives the steps that have already happened and the projected steps that they would like to see happen. There is a drafted mission statement. They have notes from all the meetings they have done, and most of them are handwritten. They are available if people want to see them. Jake Butera and Seth Ligo are not directors of the center so when they are told those documents are ready to be released they will be released. However, he cannot send the document out unilaterally. Items are still being looked at, edited, reviewed, considered and will be shared.

Agya Boakye-Boaten relayed that he has worked with several universities in setting up centers and has done consultancy work with them. There are founding documents that show what was found out and how the center is going to be. That is first step. From Dr. Boakye-Boaten's point of view, because the Chancellor commissioned this, the documents go to the Chancellor. The Chancellor will make the document available to the rest of the university before the center becomes official. That is the process, as he understands it.

Agya Boakye-Boaten relayed he hears that "they" said that they should spend money. Who said they should spend money? How are they spending the money? How was the expenditure of money related to the curriculum? The importance of founding documents is to have them for evidence that is part of our institutional identity.

Jake Butera relayed that the initial process will continue probably for the next couple of years before the center is fully functioning and operational. For example, as part of the American Council of Education Program, there will be a committee that is going to involve 10 to 15 faculty and staff that will become an integral part of analyzing what the university needs, is capable of doing, and how best to implement those things that Dr. Boakye-Boaten was talking about. He agrees with all that Dr. Boakye-Boaten said, but that takes time to develop.

Jinhua Li asked if Dr. Butera could put together a slide presentation to show so the campus can understand what came out of the talks and discussions they held as well as show how those discussions determine requirements and steps that have to be taken.

Jake Butera replied they did much of that last spring when they held the open forum. They are willing to do that again. As far as the foundational documents, the next phases, and hiring of personnel, all of that goes through other channels. They have drafted and submitted their documents, and those documents are constantly being edited, questioned, and altered by the tremendous staff in the midst of this staff turnover. As soon as he is told the documents can be made available, they will absolutely make those documents available.

Lise Kloepffel said from her understanding that Faculty Senate does have an International Program Standing Committee. Is there any reason why that committee has not been charged to collaborate with them?

Jake Butera replied that they have been asked. They were asked over the summer if International Programs Advisory Committee (IPAC) would be interested in expanding their role. Their charge specifically says only study abroad. They were asked to see if they would be willing to expand that to include Global Studies, not just study abroad. IPAC's first meeting is not until September 20.

Lise Kloepffel followed that asking due to the scale of this initiative; she was curious why this has not gone through this body.

Jake Butera replied that it is not under their purview and it is not written into their description right now. He said they went to IDC twice last semester to get feedback. The way that IPAC's charges vary is that they deal specifically with study abroad questions. One of the questions to be answered is whether they should seek to create a new committee altogether or whether they should try to operate within the existing committee by having their charge edited.

Jinhua Li clarified to be exact that Jake Butera and Seth Ligo came to IDC meetings twice to talk about once this center has been established, what faculty representative body moving forward would oversee the Global Studies Center. When she was approached by the Global Studies Center over the summer in July as the Chair of IPAC, they asked her if IPAC would consider extending their charge so she deferred to Becky Sanft, the Chair of FWDC. Jinhua Li feels Lise Kloeppe's question is about the beginning, and IPAC is not that correct body for IPAC only oversees Studies Abroad not Global Studies.

Lise Kloeppe affirmed Jinhua Li's summation. She asked for an answer to her question regarding the process of institutionalizing the center.

Jake Butera replied that it is in the process of being set up, it has not yet been institutionalized and that is an important distinction. They also sent an email out to IPAC last spring asking if they would meet to talk about the Global Studies Center. That meeting could never be organized because there were too many moving parts for people to meet together. It is not that they did not reach out, but the meeting never materialized.

Jinhua Li replied she went to a meeting as an IDC representative where they discussed what might the Global Studies Center look like.

Jake Butera said that meeting was called to meet with the International Studies Department. There were two separate calls for meetings where one was to meet with IPAC and one was to meet with International Studies. They did hold the International Studies meeting; they never had a full meeting with IPAC.

Jinhua Li agreed.

Lise Kloeppe replied that she does not think IPAC has the authority to change their charge. It needs to start at the top...

Jake Butera injected that one of the things they are often told is that we do not necessarily want top down decisions being made. The reason that they asked IPAC first was to see if the people on that committee would be willing to expand their charge before they went to FWDC. That was "the ask." If the answer were that IPAC does not want to expand, then they would pursue creating a new committee with a different charge. That is why they asked the faculty members of that committees for their feedback on that.

Dee Eggers recognized Marietta Cameron, who raised her hand several comments prior. Marietta Cameron yielded the floor to her colleagues to finish their inquiry.

Jinhua Li responded that IPAC does not have the authority to respond to that ask. They have to defer that to FWDC because FWDC appoints the members of IPAC. She relayed that she does understand the intention of "the ask," but IPAC is a committee whose membership changes annually. She remembers pointing that out and recommending that this should be brought to FWDC in order to follow procedures.

Jake Butera replied that the intention was never that they were going to dictate to IPAC.

Jinhua Li replied she did not say that.

Jake Butera continued that their intention is simply to get feedback from the stakeholders before they moved forward on processes.

Jinhua Li replied that the stakeholder was not IPAC. It is FWDC.

Jake Butera said he would argue that the stakeholders are both. The argument that the stakeholders are both parties because there are staff members also on IPAC like the Director of the Study Abroad program. He understands the question of process, but he does think that the intention was asking for feedback. That is how they have approached all of these questions from the very beginning is to start with stakeholders and participants if they exist and then to go through the steps that need to be done to do that. Asking the question of whether they should try to start a new committee or operate with an existing one is an important question [Jinhua Li agreed] and that is why they started with the IPAC committee. Jake Butera then recognized Marietta Cameron.

Marietta Cameron asked to clarify what she thought she just heard about what the jurisdiction of the Senate is when the question was asked, "Why did it not come before this body?" As the former chair of the Faculty Senate, she knows that it never came to the Executive Committee (EC) of the Faculty Senate. If it had come to the Executive Committee, it would have been allocated to the correct subcommittee(s). She made it very clear that, as far as the process is concerned, FWDC, APC and IDC are all subcommittees of the Faculty Senate. She relayed that the EC is the subcommittee that determines the direction and the appropriate subcommittee as to what is to happen with proposals. If anything should be going on in this campus that involves Shared Governance, in terms of the faculty representation, this body represents the faculty and should be approached. Otherwise, she asserted that any of us could get together, find the right donor, get the Chancellor to support, and bypass this body. As far as authorization is concerned, since there is a Global Studies Center in the library right now that means that some parts of the Global Studies Center have been authorized. The Academic Affairs Office should be involved in this because it has a curriculum part. The Faculty Senate should be involved because they represent the will of the faculty and should not be bypassed in matters of Shared Governance. She does not know how much clearer that needs to be made. She has been saying that for a really long time. She is sorry if her colleagues have not been trained to know and understand that. When Faculty Senate is bypassed, she explained the faculty's will and authority as far as being part of Shared Governance is eroded. She stated further that the Faculty Senate has a constitution and she invited everybody to read it in order to know the jurisdiction of Faculty Senate. Faculty Senate is supposed to advise and consult. If faculty do not demand that, then that means faculty abrogate its right to do that.

Jake Butera replied that he does not understand the part where they bypassed the Senate necessarily.

Marietta Cameron responded this Global Studies Center did not come through the Senate.

Jake Butera relayed you mean the idea to start it.

Marietta Cameron relayed that there already have been solicitations that went out to begin funding for things that have happened. That is authorization that has happened. Before that happens, a proposal for the center should have been on the desk of the Senate. She does not think it has even

been through Academic Affairs. From her view, this is a problem because what it says is all a person to do is go find the right donor in order to control the curriculum. To her, that is what this implies.

Dee Eggers recognized Chancellor Cable via Zoom.

Chancellor Cable first was relayed she was sorry she was not there in person at the Faculty Senate meeting for she was in Chapel Hill for meetings today. She thanked Jake Butera and Seth Ligo for the work they have done. This idea emanated out of the listening sessions when she first arrived and came directly from faculty about extending our global work, whether it is Study Abroad, recruitment of more international students, or providing more opportunities for faculty programs, short or long. This idea emanated from statements of faculty and some staff in Fall 2018 and Spring 2019. It also was included all the way along in every Common Grounds that she did when they first thought they would be growing in students after recalibrating our market strength. That has not yet happened. Faculty have been told this in small committee meetings that once numbers rebound where we could keep the average class size and the student/faculty ratio the same that we could send between 75 to 100 students study abroad every semester on programs all over the nation. She stated specifically to Marietta Cameron that this was discussed several times with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate last year.

Marietta Cameron stated that she was sorry but she disagrees with Chancellor Cable.

Chancellor Cable continued that she is sorry that the process has not been all of what had been hoped and expected. Chancellor Cable took full responsibility for that. When an opportunity to begin this work during the late months of COVID, she was grateful that for what Jake Butera and Seth Ligo could do during that time. The Chancellor emphasized that there was never any intention to bypass the Senate of this university for any part or parcel of the Global Study Center. It was exactly around building in global work and standing on the shoulders of our faculty, including Agya Boakye-Boaten and many others who have done such good work in this area. The first meeting was held in Summer 2019 and they have built forward. She is sorry if she has disappointed procedurally, and they will make it right. It will not go any further despite the expectations of a number of people. It will not go any further until Senate has a full briefing and an opportunity to weigh in on every aspect of this idea, but this originally came directly from faculty request so that there would be synergies around all the component parts of deepening and broadening our global work together as an academic and co-curricular community. She apologized saying she certainly had never hoped that this would get to this place and be so misunderstood. She takes responsibility and will do everything she can with the Senate to make it right.

Chancellor Cable had other comments and asked Senate Chair Dee Eggers whether she wanted the Chancellor to do those now or do those later in an email to the organization.

Dee Eggers conferred with Jake Butera. He relayed he is willing to answer any questions that people have.

Dee Eggers discerned that Faculty Senate should continue this discussion of the Global Studies Center before moving on. She asked Chancellor Cable if she could do that.

Chancellor Cable replied she is due to be at another event at 6:00 pm, but will hang on as long as possible.

Jake Butera reopened the floor for questions.

Jeremias Zunguze asked how they observe diversity, equity, and inclusion in their decision especially to allocate funds or money, either for developing classes or for Study Abroad. He asked that question because someone emailed him who applied for Study Abroad or Scout Abroad program in the summer. He believes they used LA 378 as the class that they were proposing to teach...

Jake Butera said that they did not approve any classes or courses. What they approved was if that program were to go through IPAC and get approval. In order for IPAC to approve it, they would have to have signed off on Arts, humanities, DI - all of it. Once a program was approved by processes already in place concerning a new Study Abroad opportunity, they would then offer funding to support those faculty involved to go ahead of time in June to do research on the ground and to prepare their programs. They did not approve any curriculum. In fact, if IPAC turned down the application then their funding was not dispersed to the faculty involved.

Jinhua Li made a clarification that IPAC does not have the power to turn down any application. They give feedback and then the application goes to the Provost. As the Chief Academic Officer, the Provost has the ultimate decision-making powers. IPAC gives the Provost advice and feedback.

Jake Butera replied exactly and thanked Jinhua Li for the clarification that until the Provost actually approves none of the funding is given. In addition, the only money approved has been money for faculty developing new Study Abroad Programs that had been approved by the process that already exists.

Seth Ligo spoke regarding the three initial pilot programs to shed some light on why they acted in this timeframe. They were hearing that downstate had said that they need to prove that they can spend money well. They were hearing that message repeatedly. They were also hearing that there is some money that can be used that was already starting to sit and stagnate. They were asked to come up with and design potential uses for those funds.

Agya Boakeye-Boaten asked who was "They."

Jake Butera answered John and John of Finance.

Seth Ligo continued that they call them pilot programs because they were trying ideas they gathered from their interviews and discussions as to the needs of faculty and staff on campus. They thought they would try a few with some early funding. If the pilot programs worked then they could design them for the eventual opening of the Global Studies Program. At this stage, none of the pilot programs is recurring. They are all contingent and exploratory. They are test cases to figure out what might work best as well as demonstrate putting this money to use in the short term. Although they are always mindful of the pilot programs potential to their eventual curricular integration in the future, they do not have the authority to make any kinds of predictive promises, modifications, or suggestions.

Jake Butera said that in every single interview that they did with faculty and staff, the first thing they said was that it would be helpful for there to be money for developing curriculum, research, and study abroad as well as money for the students. The reason they did what they did was it turns out getting money to students is extraordinarily difficult and has huge impacts on segmenting students as well as impacting their financial aid. Trying to get staff involvement worked out for many of these programs is actually very difficult as well. Another idea was to allow people to give professional development seminars. Regarding staff, it is okay for staff to help run a seminar but it has to take place outside of normal working hours. The best way for staff to receive money would be to pay for supplies

and not direct contributions to their salary. If people want to do another listening session, they will gladly do that.

Dee Eggers replied that is probably what should happen to get everybody clear on what has happened as well as lay out how the center will move forward.

Agya Boakye-Boaten suggested that the first thing that should happen is not a listening session. He believes founding documents for the center is needed so everyone knows what the philosophy and mission statement is as well as a concept paper that says what was done and how the idea was created.

Jake Butera said they do not have that authority.

Agya Boakye-Boaten replied that they are already distributing money.

Jake Butera explained that the draft mission statement and the phases of operations have been written for those who make the final decisions like the Chancellor, the Provost, and those in the Finance Office.

Scott Williams asked what the precarity of this was. He hears money for two years and wonders will the center go away after the two years.

Jake Butera replied that would depend on what John Pierce was explaining before about the recurring nature of funds and the continued appropriation of funds for the Global Studies Center.

Dee Eggers concluded that this could be an exceptional opportunity for our students.

IX. Executive Committee: Faculty Senate Chair Dee Eggers
[University Mission Statement \(Faculty Handbook Section 1.3.2\) Discussion:](#)

a. [2009 Faculty Handbook Mission:](#)

1.3.2 Mission Statement

(Adopted by the UNC Asheville Board of Trustees June 19, 2009)

(Approved by the UNC Board of Governors November 13, 2009)

UNC Asheville is distinctive in the UNC system as its designated liberal arts university. Our practice of the liberal arts emphasizes the centrality of learning and discovery through exemplary teaching, innovative scholarship, creative expression, co-curricular activities, undergraduate research, engaged service, and practical experience. Primarily undergraduate, UNC Asheville offers a liberal arts education characterized by high quality faculty-student interaction. We offer this challenging educational experience to all promising students who are committed to liberal learning and personal growth.

Our liberal arts educational approach emphasizes life skills including critical thinking, clear and thoughtful expression, and honest open inquiry. Students undertake concentrated study in one area while simultaneously developing an understanding of the connections among disciplines. We encourage students to clarify, develop and live their own values while respecting the views and beliefs of others. In addition, we cultivate an understanding of the dimensions of human diversity while recognizing the common humanity of all. We believe a quality liberal arts education enables our

graduates to be lifelong learners and to lead successful, flourishing lives as leaders and contributors to their communities.

At UNC Asheville, we respond to the conditions and concerns of the contemporary world both as individuals and as a university. We incorporate economic, social and environmental sustainability into our institutional practices and curriculum. With a range of associated centers, partnerships, and initiatives, we fulfill our public responsibility to address the needs of our community through a continuum of learning. We develop a commitment to continuing service characterized by an informed, responsible, and creative engagement with the Asheville area, the southern Appalachian region, the state of North Carolina, and a diverse and increasingly connected world.

b. 2014 Mission added the following sentence:

“UNC Asheville is primarily undergraduate, with all programs of study leading to the bachelor’s degree, with the exceptions of teacher licensure programs and the master’s degree in Liberal Arts and Sciences (MLAS).”

c. Current Mission Statement as it appears on the UNCA [website](#):

The University of North Carolina Asheville is the state of North Carolina’s designated public liberal arts university and one of the 17 excellent, diverse, and accessible institutions of the UNC System. UNC Asheville’s liberal arts curriculum and approach to teaching and learning emphasize critical thinking, clear and thoughtful expression, undergraduate research, community engagement, and free and open inquiry. Through small class sizes, close collaboration, and high-impact experiences, we are preparing the next generation of leaders and productive citizens to serve North Carolina and the nation. (Contained link to 2009 Mission Statement in the Faculty Handbook until August 28, 2022, when the Faculty Handbook was updated to reflect the 2014 language.)

d. Recently introduced Mission Statement considered by the Board of Governors:

The University of North Carolina Asheville is North Carolina’s designated public liberal arts and sciences university and one of the 17 excellent, diverse, and accessible institutions of the UNC System. UNC Asheville’s relationship-driven education prepares students for lives of leadership and service with an emphasis on critical thinking, clear and thoughtful expression, applied research, community engagement, free and open inquiry, and undergraduate and graduate programs that address the most pressing issues of our time. Through small class sizes, close collaboration, and high-impact experiences, we are preparing the next generation of leaders and productive citizens to serve North Carolina and the nation.

Jake Butera gave context for discussion by giving the recent history of the University’s mission statement, explaining how it appears now, and pointing out how it relates to SACS. As a basic timeline, in 2009, there was a mission statement that was implemented by starting with IDC that then led to a

special meeting of the Senate for approval and then to the Board of Trustees and then the Board of Governors for approval. That is essentially the version of university admission that appeared in the Faculty Handbook until about a week ago (see (a) above). There was an amendment made to that mission statement in 2014 that included a line (see (b) above) about the MLAS. If you were to look at the university website today, the current university mission the third one on this agenda (see c above). That is what appears on the actual university website.

Dee Eggers explained further that we needed to update the handbook to reflect the current mission statement because of the SACS review but what the current mission was not at all clear.

Jake Butera rejoined that brings us to letter (d) that caused some questions to arise. In the last Board of Governors Meeting, in mid-July, there was a discussion of our university mission and a vote, and we are waiting on approved minutes to see if (d) is the current mission.

Dee Eggers goes over the timeline to the July BOG meeting. Back in January or February, the Board of Governors said to the institutions if you would like to change your mission, now is the time. The language that went to the BOG that was called the current mission is actually from the strategic plan and is not the official mission statement language (from item (c) above). If you search on UNCA mission, there are two things you will find: the wording that corresponds with (c) above with a link below it to the 2014 mission language. However, what went before the Board of Governors was a significant procedural error that only included the language of c above without the 2014 mission statement.

From Dee Eggers understanding is that Provost Campbell brought the proposed change to Senate Executive Committee in the spring as a draft and would be getting back with Senate later. That is the only point at which Senate had any notification whatsoever. The proposed change in final version never did come to Faculty Senate nor the Senate Executive Committee before going to the Board of Governors. The Board of Governors she was told did vote on this, but because of the procedural error she is not certain what will happen now. Along with the procedural error, there is a question about communicating with faculty, staff and students about mission changes. The reason Dee Eggers brought this up is because when the Board of Governors next meets which is before the Faculty Senate meets again, they will be voting on their minutes, which includes this mission change. Approving the minutes will enact the proposed mission statement (d).

Dee Eggers is not certain if the Chancellor is aware that the language that was listed as the current mission is not actually the current mission nor if the Chancellor has a plan for how to communicate this to the Board of Governors.

Brian Hart thanked Dee Eggers for walking him through what has happened since 2009. He reported that essentially, what happened with the recent change was the mission listed in (c) was the "billboard" version of the mission statement. Annually, the Board of Governors review all their UNC System Institutions' missions. This involves communicating with various stakeholders on campus about these possible changes early in the year around January/February because the deadline was in early June to make any changes to mission statements during the Board of Governors July meeting, which they did. What happened on our end was the change we submitted was that shortened version, which was certainly an error, but just an oversight, because on the website there is a link to the mission statement that was approved in 2014. They are reaching out to the system office to make sure they are

aware of our error and then determine from them how they want us to proceed. They have not heard yet. They do have their process to accept institutional mission statement changes by June 1 of every year to be reviewed and passed at their next board meeting in July. Depending on how they respond to our admission of the error is what will determine how we proceed, whether it is something that they feel that we need to address immediately or if we move forward having the deadline of June 1 of next year to work through the process to engage everyone on campus regarding any changes to the full mission statement approved in 2014.

Dee Eggers thanked Brian Hart for his update.

Dee Eggers and Brian Hart confirmed that the current mission statement is the one from 2014 until the Board of Governors approve their minutes from their meeting in July. Once the minutes are approved, the mission statement in (d) above will be the official mission statement. Due to this timing, Brian Hart said the current 2014 mission is the current mission they are using for accreditations like SACS and ABET.

Dee Eggers relayed that the Board of Governors next meeting is on September 21 and 22. There is more to talk about in terms of what happened on this campus and what should have happened on this campus, but the Senate Chair would like to give everyone time to look at the language and reflect.

Lise Kloepfel asked for clarification that if the Board of Governors approve the minutes then that (d) becomes our new mission statement.

Dee Eggers said technically that is true since technically the Board of Governors owns our mission. However, we could say there was a procedural error for we could agree there was at least one procedural error, if not more.

Brian Hart added that we need to get clarification from the System Office and the Board of Governors about how they want us to address the error, because he does not think they are aware of it either. The error could have been caught in different steps along the process. It was not caught in any of the steps along the process.

Dee Eggers replied that if we had actual shared governance, this would have been caught immediately.

Scott Williams asked whether the System Office knows now.

Brian Hart replied they have contacted them and are awaiting their response.

Agya Boakye-Boaten asked what the process was in revising the mission statement.

Dee Eggers there is a process identified in the UNC System Code.

Jake Butera relayed that basically you shall consult with students, faculty and staff. It does not say how many or who in particular. IDC in its stated functions is supposed to talk about the mission statement. The last mission statement that came through Senate was in 2009 and it started in IDC then went to the full Senate for discussion.

Dee Eggers explained that in the Faculty Handbook where the mission is, there are substantive documents there and she suggests clicking on the links to see the history of changes because 2009 went through the Faculty Senate first, 2014 did not involve faculty governance and she thinks it was approved by the Board of Governors before the Board of Trustees. If a prior process is followed, she suggested that the way 2009 mission statement was passed should be used moving forward.

Jake Butera added that the 2014 precedent is not the model hoped for and suggests a better idea would be to establish or reaffirm the process that Senate would want to follow.

Agya Boakye-Boaten suggest a process that makes Brian Hart's work easier.

Dee Eggers said that code is open to interpretation. When you say "in consultation with," a person could say they showed a draft to Senate Executive Committee and there was not a lot of uproar so we check that box. She remembers learning in one of her law classes that sometimes judges will look at something where it is presented that they checked the box. However, the judge might say that you did not substantively meet the criteria intended by that requirement and so you did not actually check the box. That distinction is an important one to keep in mind.

X. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee: Third Vice Chair Becky Sanft

Becky Sanft reported that since every proposal for handbook changes come through FWDC and FWDC is willing to help draft policy changes and resolutions, they have had a number of visitors coming in beginning this semester. If faculty have ideas or concerns, please bring those to her attention.

XI. Institutional Development Committee / UPC: Second Vice Chair Jake Butera

Jake Butera said the only other thing they had to report is that they have taken up the discussion again about program reviews because our university does not do any systematic reviews of either majors, minors, or the core curriculum. They want to present this to the Faculty Senate to get their impressions on what priorities might be.

David Clarke relayed he is in his second year on IDC in his current term on Senate. They went around and around last year like riding a merry-go-round. This year he hopes IDC and Senate will develop consensus.

Jinhua Li asked when he says program review, does that mean a little formal self-study, external review or a review depending on what the program is.

Jake Butera replied that the external review is harder since we may not have the funding to do that. Currently, they are throwing out ideas of an internal/external review where they prefer the external review would be a representative from the other UNC Asheville divisions. For example, if Interdisciplinary Studies was being reviewed, representatives from Natural and Humanities would be involved as well as those ordinarily involved in reviews from the Social Sciences. They are looking at resources that could be used internally. Senators and entire faculty could email him with their feedback for IDC is looking for feedback before going much further.

XII. Chancellor Nancy Cable Request for Input and Remarks

Dee Eggers invited the Chancellor to make remarks at 5:55 but she was no longer on the Zoom. Dee Eggers apologized for misunderstanding the time the Chancellor had online until her next meeting. She understood the Chancellor wanted to make some statements and ask folks for ideas and input on what could be improved on campus, what people would like to see changed, etc. However, the Senate Chair did not want to assume to speak for the Chancellor.

Scott Williams asked if the Chancellor would like their suggestions via email or with a verbal response.

Dee Eggers asked Brian Hart how to relay suggestions.

Brian Hart said there was a need to start to elicit ideas and they decided to create a form that would be easy for people to relate their ideas.

Scott Williams said he had a very specific suggestion regarding the \$5 million.

Dee Eggers relayed that she had heard also that we have to demonstrate that we are using the extra funding to improve retention. Of course, the pandemic has made the timing of receiving the money a little bit difficult. They received a pot of money last January and many decisions have been made already. One of those is the Civatas software that some faculty have been piloting. Regarding Civatas, she asked are there plans for any training.

Jeff Konz relayed that faculty should have an email coming from Regina Criser regarding training and advising.

Brian Hook said there was a video in an email that Regina Criser sent out. He was able to get into the software that he found to be more specific and nuanced in what faculty think the issues are for students. If you have not gotten in the software yet, he suggest they try it. He feels he is one of the least technologically perceptive persons, and yet, he has found his way. If he could do it, anyone could.

XIII. Old Business / New Business / Adjourn: Faculty Senate Chair Dee Eggers
Senate Chair adjourned the meeting at 6:09 pm.