

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA ASHEVILLE
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
April 27, 2023; 3:15 pm, Highsmith, Blue Ridge Room
Last Meeting of the 2022-23 Academic Year

Members: D. Eggers, A. Laughlin, J. Butera, B. Sanft, J. Beck, V. Bradbury, B. Butler, R. Chapman, D. Clarke, A. Cosette, B. Hook, S. Kapur, R. Tatum, E. Tomberlin, L. Ward, C. Whitlock, S. Williams, J. Zunguze; H. Holt.

Visitors: K. van Noort, A. Batada, R. Berls, C. Boone, K. Boyle, J. Brown, M. Cameron, R. Criser, S. Dittenber, J. Dougherty, B. Felix, L. Horgan, K. Kauer, J. Konz, D. Killian, T. King, A. Lanou, M. Mahoney, T. Meigs, I. Rossell, T. Ruffin, A. Shope, A. Strickland, G. Trautmann, S. Wasileski, H. Ward.

I. Call to Order / Welcome Faculty Senate Chair Dee Eggers

II. Approval of Minutes: March 30, 2023

III. Heather Ward, [Associate Provost for Global Affairs at UNCCH](#)

Jake Butera introduced Heather Ward who is the advisor for the American Council on Education internationalization Lab, which UNCA is participating in through next academic year.

Heather Ward said she is here for a site visit for the next two days to get to know UNC Asheville better. She relayed a few brief words about the American Council Education Internalization Laboratory and her role. She is the assigned advisor to UNC Asheville. She is the advisor assigned to working with UNC Asheville through this process. She has spent five years working at ACE developing resources and programming to help with internationalization of higher education institutions. Part of her background is working with small liberal arts colleges and public universities in Virginia and North Carolina. She is happy to lend her experience to helping UNC Asheville achieve its internationalization goals. Her primary role of being here is representing the AC lab process. What is this lab process? An 18 to 22 month process that is a framework of strategic planning for internationalization that is really customized to suit the goals of each institution because internationalization or global engagement looks different for each institution, depending on what is their core mission, and strategic goals.

IV. [Promoting Faculty Equity and Mitigating Inequity](#) Sally Wasileski

Sally Wasileski, Chair of the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, gave a presentation on a project to promote faculty equity and mitigate inequality funded by the NSF through COPLAC, the Council of Public Liberal Arts Colleges. The attached documents are her presentation and findings.

When Dr. Wasileski completed her presentation, Ashe Cosette asked her to speak more to how the data was gathered.

Dr. Wasileski said through their work creating affinity groups, they have the contact information for women STEM faculty in the academic departments across all COPLAC institutions. They sent an email and included the survey where they are only sharing aggregated data and will not share disaggregated data about individual institutions because that was very important for the

participants to be able to have confidence to share. Similarly, the administrator survey was sent to predominantly Provost level administrators and a subset of departments.

Herman Holt asked what is the expectation for what's happening after the grant is over?

Sally Wasileski replied the grant will likely go through summer of 2024 and the goal of NSF is to create institutional change as well as mechanisms that can be sustainable. For example, the Department Chair training materials that they are creating, they have a mindset that those should be available and utilized beyond the grant and an easily accessible way so that institutions could continue having equity training for department chairs after the grant. The mechanism for how they have facilitated affinity groups can then be continued independently of their team's facilitation. This was funded in January of 2020 and they started March 2020 when the pandemic happened, and the priorities of our leadership was to get through the pandemic. They have lagged and thought institutional change could have happened by now. They are extending the project by a year.

Herman Holt asked how many provosts that were surveyed are still in place and how do we keep going with this regardless of the leadership change that happens?

Sally Wasileski replied there are because there is up to 28 COPLAC campuses where there are 14 new leadership roles. Provost level leadership change is 50%. Institutional memory gets lost in terms of initiatives and data so they are trying to spread the word as much as possible. They themselves can only facilitate change through information and resources.

Dee Eggers asked how could Faculty Senate help to facilitate some of this moving forward?

Sally Wasileski said some of their recommendations is to make sure faculty expectations really aligned where faculty, evaluation expectations line up with our faculty work expectations, not just on paper but in process how chairs are evaluating faculty. Faculty Senate could develop rubrics that align with our handbook expectations so that is clearer so a less biased evaluation can occur and teaching about the student teaching evaluation reform because of known bias and teaching evaluations. These are real low hanging fruits to help mitigate some bias. Training is critical for new chairs, Committee of Tenured Faculty and Faculty Senate best practices and evaluation processes avoiding bias. This does not exist here and at most COPLAC institutions. There are many things to do. It is really about fairness because there is an imbalance in workload and how we reward the work that faculty do that is critical to the mission of our institution.

Robert Tatum asked whether institutional research at each of these institutions can keep this going or was this about getting a snapshot.

Sally Wasileski said the data presented especially the institutional scorecards are snapshots from 2017. This is the baseline data. And now this is six years later, so we need to evaluate what the data means and provide support to the bodies that can implement change such as the Faculty Senate. Their project leaders and facilitators are willing to support the Faculty Senate in their work next year. Please rely on them and do not hesitate to reach out for support. They have given this same offer to all our COPLAC institutions.

Scott Williams asked if there are plans to do another survey limited to find out about promotion to full professor?

Sally Wasileski said they are working on a 2023 snapshot to make comparison to understand progress of rank. Data presented is the pre-data and the post-data has not yet been collected but is coming soon.

Dee Eggers said she looks forward to Faculty Senate supporting this important work on campus as well as coordinating where this data is appropriate for Senate subcommittees' work

V. Interim Chancellor Kim van Noort Request Remarks

Interim Chancellor Kim van Noort talked about the Board of Governors meeting where in their planning committee they discussed the upcoming faculty workload policy revisions. One of the guiding principles for that revision is to promote greater equity within the determination of faculty workloads and greater autonomy for the universities. She thinks they are moving to a model that would eliminate the Carnegie Classification as our determiner, leaving it up to our universities and their Boards of Trustees to develop the faculty workload policies that could be flexible enough to provide equity but be responsive to the university's fiscal needs and the number of students that we need to teach. This signals a tremendous amount of work in terms of determining what types of categories of work constitute what part of the faculty workload. She has done this in a couple different ways at a couple different institutions. It can be incredibly liberating and incredibly controversial to iron out the details on the front end. It can be very, very useful, particularly as it recognizes individual faculty members' workloads. She looks forward to having those discussions.

She knows Toby and Christine will talk about the work of Faculty Assembly in their report, but she has spoken with Wade Maki the Chair of Faculty Assembly from UNC Greensboro about the work they are doing. She thinks there is going to be incredibly productive work going on at the same time.

She knows there are lots of questions and lots of tensions around the fact that we are in "inning three" of the long session of the North Carolina General Assembly. There have been a lot of bills that have dropped that have provoked a lot of anxiety and concern among all university communities. This was what the Chancellors spoke mostly about during their time together at the Board of Governors meeting. They are tracking the General Assembly's work very closely. For those of you who may not know, there is a group comprised of all the government relations liaisons in the system along with the government liaisons at the system office. These liaisons are in almost daily contact about where bills are and where they are going. She and her fellow Chancellors have been personally speaking with legislators to educate them about how their policies/proposals actually work on the college campus and what are the ramifications.

The bill regarding participation of transgender women in athletics was extended to universities last week. That is a major concern. Also, House Bill 715 is the modernization of the university bill that included past tense provision for eliminating tenure. We are going to see a version come out probably Monday after some more work that will have a different approach to thinking about faculty and a lot of discussion about the various components of that bill. You may have noticed that there are a lot of House Representatives signed on to that bill. The bill was filed by one person and 15 had signed on by Wednesday. Signing onto a bill does not mean endorsement. One of the reasons people sign on to bills is so that they can assure its amendment or that they can ensure that it does not make it off the House floor.

It is unusual that we have a house budget this early, but we do. Most, but not all, of the UNC system priorities are in that budget. Our funding for Lipinsky is in that budget and she is sure that will go through. The provision for the voluntary retirement incentive program is not in the House budget does not mean that it is dead. It may come back in the Senate's budget. We are expecting the Senate's budget probably by mid-May or end of May with a conference to follow shortly thereafter. We could have the fastest budget in a long time. However, sometimes we wait until October or November for this all to be over. Predictions are we will be done by July or early August. There is money in there for student completion. There is a two-year biennium across the board salary

increases in the House Bill: 4.25% the first year and 3.25% the second year. We are expecting the Senate to come in higher. The good thing is these raises are for all state employees. That is what we want. We do not want the universities to be pulled out and put into a separate pot because that usually does not work to our benefit.

There are lots of other provisions in the budgets for specific universities. It is a bit disheartening because there is a whole list of appropriations for other universities in the system. We are not there, but we will be next year. A goal is to get the legislators to support and champion some projects that we have here. We have to make sure that we here at UNC Asheville maintain and preserve the culture that we have, the respect that we have, and the voice that we have that we give to our students and to each other.

We have to find ways to make things work the Asheville way. We have been talking about what it means to have academic freedom and curricular control. That is very important. We do have that, and we will hold on to that.

The Board of Trustees met today regarding a couple things that are looming - things that keep us all up at night. We have a significant signal. We have a non-insignificant budget shortfall this year. She does not want to downplay this serious situation. It is not an existential situation at this point; we are going to be okay. We are not going to close, and we are not going to merge. We are going to have to make some selective cuts in what we do for the next couple of years. We have heard good enrollment projections. The freshman class in particular is very strong in numbers. We are a little worried about transfers, but we hope to hit where we were last fall. It is going to take us a couple years to build back up from five years ago pre-pandemic numbers. That is normal.

She thanked everyone who came out for the Admitted Students Day last week. Ten additional students committed by the end of the day. We are also getting students committing after they have individual meetings with you all. There has been a very enthusiastic response to attending classes with the faculty program. All that faculty are doing with that program, First Year Success, Student Ambassadors and IGNITE - they see a major uptick in projections for retention. The UNC System Office is watching the work we are doing, and they are like whatever you are doing is working in Asheville - not what I'm doing, but what you all are doing. Congratulations on that.

She knows Faculty Senate is taking up the creation of a task force to look at the Liberal Arts Core. She applauds and thinks it is very important that you do that. She thinks one of the hallmarks of this institution is our liberal arts foundation. It is the Humanities sequence, which is unparalleled. It is one of the first in the country and longstanding. When we think about what we are doing, we think about the student experience, outcomes, and how those outcomes are achieved for there are more than one way to achieve and outcome. Students are very critically interested in sustainability, technology, skills, and competencies they need for their career. You have an opportunity to really shape that liberal arts core into something incredibly important without losing its foundation. She thinks it is helpful for our students to think about how they move through their majors, how much of it should be core, how much of it should be a major, and how much elective or internship room should they have? She wishes you the best of luck on that. She will help in any way she can. I'll help in any way I can.

Ashe Cosette asked respectfully, as she has before, "Where is our respect from the State? Where is our support? Are we not at the forefront, as our system peers?"

Kim van Noort replied that she does not think that we can say that we are not at the forefront of our system peers. There is tremendous support for this university that she hears all the time. You may not hear it as much. We have had legislators and board members on campus recently. They have all been blown away by the conversations and interactions that they have had. Some of them were

difficult interactions, but they came away with a deep appreciation of how we are teaching our students to show up, to be, to care, and to have a voice. She thinks the distance geographically causes insularity that we do not hear that she has heard from folks at WCU and ASU as well.

There is incredible work that is being done right now to amend and modify and work on some of the bill legislation right now is testament to trying to protect and support our faculty, and all of us across the system, knowing that the protections afforded by tenure are critically important to our ability to deliver instruction and to our ability to feel safe in an ideological, pedagogical, and intellectual space. Financially, she does not think we have been neglected as much as people might think we have. Part of our issue has been decisions made over time. The way the funding model worked, decisions made here not to add graduate programs or not to add professional programs have made an impact. She is not condemning those decisions, but those decisions had a direct impact on the amount of funding we were able to get from the state. Without those programs, we would inevitably, despite how good we were at everything else we did, mathematically, we were not going to get the kind of funding that say Winston Salem State got now. That is a good example. That is a good comparison because Winston Salem State, and this may come as a surprise to some of us, is the other designated liberal arts university in this system. They were founded as a liberal arts institution and they maintain that identity. Their main unit that they have is the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. They added Nursing and Health Sciences a long time ago so they actually have been able to get more appropriation than we have because of that. Now, they have been historically underfunded for other reasons as an HBCU. That story goes back a long time, way before the founding of UNC Asheville. They just made some different decisions that changed the way that they got funding. Our funding commensurate with the choices that were made here. We have made some different choices that have improved and changed. We did get a \$10 million infusion two years ago, and that was a general infusion for stabilization and for enrollment. It is very rare that institutions get that. She does think there is a sense that we are important, we need to survive, and we need that help. She would really take that as a good sign.

She also wants to get more people here to see how great this place is and talk to you all so they can understand what we are doing. I think we are fighting some misperceptions because of where we are located and the misperceptions of what is heard when you say Liberal Arts and Sciences. The only way really to combat that is to actually have those conversations with people that you might not otherwise have a conversation. Those are always difficult but incredibly productive because there is a lot of myth breaking that can happen in a very short time when you can have cordial working relationships because they have been able to have those conversations.

Kim van Noort relayed they are working on hiring a legislative director of state and federal government relations. This person will not be on campus. We do not want them on campus; we want them in Raleigh and in Washington to help us get our line items in the next budgets. This person will be responsible for getting the Chancellor appointments with everyone she needs to see as well as a strategy that happens off cycle. She needs to meet not only with our legislators here, but travel to meet with Chairs of the major education committees and appropriations committee. Most of the work is in Raleigh though we need to be also in Washington because we are starting to see earmarks coming back from there. There is a lot of federal money out there. We to work to get it.

Dee Eggers relayed that legislators and board members in interviews said that they did not know that UNC Asheville existed and why not included in discussions. It is good that we are going to actually have a presence. That lack of advocacy was not a problem for many years, but now we are really feeling the effects of it.

VI. Interim Provost Herman Holt Remarks

Also being part of those interviews, Herman Holt wanted to clarify that UNC Asheville not being mentioned or recognized that that is nothing negative about us. Just nothing.

We are also doing a good job with admissions as well by getting out there and visiting various schools so that we can get more students here. It has been very, very good over the course of the semester, for sure. Hopefully, we are turning a corner. This is his 17th week as Provost and since July 1, 2022, we have had two Chancellors, three Provosts, three Vice Provosts, and four Deans. The word he would use to describe the institution is resilient. We continue to turn forward. I appreciate all the efforts of everyone on campus. The plan is to start July 1, 2023, with one Chancellor, one Provost, X number of Vice Provosts, and four Deans. He wanted to mention that.

Amy Strickland, who is the Chief of Staff, and Herman Holt are talking about the various organizations and structures around that have some disconnect. One of those is community engagement. They are going to talk a lot about community engagement over the course of the summer. They are going to try to figure out what community engagement is and try to bring it together to make sure we have a good understanding of its place and function and the reporting lines associated with community engagement.

Herman Holt announced Kimberly Nava Eggett will be the Director for the Center for Diversity Education. That role starts on Monday and will report to the Provost. He also announced that we have a new Study Abroad Director, Laura Dobson. She has already started work. Deaver Traywick will help to onboard her through this study abroad session and then turn it over to her to lead. She is from Lenoir Rhyne and has built a program there and feels very confident about her abilities to enhance our study abroad program here. She will work with Sara King in the office. As you know, we have the ACE international lab occurring. Heather Ward talked to you, and we have various subcommittees such as the Diversity Equity Inclusion, the Data Planning, and the Outreach Subcommittees for the Internationalization Lab.

The Provost wanted to announce the closing of the center Pisgah Astronomical Research and Science Educational Center (PARSEC) here. Back in 2013, faculty in Physics who were overseeing our center retired and it has not been uplifted any further. He is working with Dean Cameron and the chair that decided the center that needs to be closed. This came to us because the system office says there needs to be a report of centers every so often. There was a lag because of COVID. This year we were to report out on PARSEC, OLLI, and NEMAC during this cycle.

This leads to the next topic: The Faculty Handbook. There is no statement in the Faculty Handbook regarding the closing of centers. It is not something we do on a regular basis or is probably something that we have not considered putting in a Faculty Handbook. More to the Faculty Handbook is in this role, you try to look for and use policy as a guide. Sometimes there is no policy, or it is vague. He would say there is a need for a comprehensive review of the Faculty Handbook. Whether that happens, probably not annually, but more often than he thinks what happens, and more often than what say FWDC takes up. He thinks FWDC takes up various things that someone brings to them and finds them important, but I think the whole handbook needs that review. This body should take that up.

As you know, we are not stopping, we are continuing, we are moving forward regardless of who is in the seats of leadership. As Chancellor mentioned about the curriculum, if we use the timeline that is provided in IDC 2 then it might be five years before we get a new curriculum, as opposed to having this in place by next Fall 24. That is ambitious, but is our curriculum attractive for students to come here? He thinks that is something that we are needing to look at - what students

are doing now, what they are doing in eighth grade, and when they come here, what are they going to want to do. Do we have those things? Keeping to the mission of the institution, but also looking at those topics and explorations that advance the curiosity of our future students, as well as the faculty we have here currently.

The Provost thanked those who participated in and provided mock lectures and being there with the students who have been admitted. This will continue over the summer for we need to continue advocating for UNC Asheville and trying to get as many of those students who have been admitted coming to UNC Asheville. While you are away, making sure your away messages are clear and appropriate so there is someone around. If a student is interested in your program sends an email that that they get an away message and no response as the reply, that could mean that the student does not show up. We need to be cognizant of that so we are always attracting students, and we are always performing in some ways to try to get students here.

Finally, regarding remote work, we will use remote work as a flexibility tool, but not as the main mode of teaching. John Dougherty confirmed there is a new policy coming, but currently the policy is instruction will take place in person.

VII. Reports to Senate:

Staff Council

Chair Kim Kauer

Kim Kauer said she forwarded a proclamation from Staff Council Chairs to Dr. Eggers today. I know Lisa Sellers has that. As a delegate, she gets a copy of it. She went ahead and forwarded it to you for the work that we were doing on the DEI and compel speech to keep you in the loop. That was part of what Staff Council was working on in cooperation with Staff Assembly, we talked about in March. Also, the nominations for Staff Council already in. They have sent out emails to all those that have been nominated to ask if they would wish to proceed as a Division representative to be put on the ballot, which will be mid-May. Once they confirm, we will proceed with the voting process. We had a lot of nominations, and a lot of people have accepted so we have quite a group. The voting will be brisk, she is sure.

Also, she announced the second annual Staff Awards, which are provided by the Office of Provost and the Chancellor's Office. We are very excited about that. On May 1, we will be given the 10 people who were selected as winners that is always a fun thing to do, and she hopes everyone will attend. Also, Kim Kauer's term as Staff Council Chair ends and Tim Burns' term begins.

Since this is her last meeting, she would like to say she has appreciated the opportunity to be the Staff Council Chair, but also to work with the Faculty Senate. She certainly did not expect to be serving on the Staff Council much less being the Chair. She has learned a lot and treasure the interactions with faculty that she would not have had otherwise had she not served on Staff Council. She and Staff Council has benefited from these interactions that helped her understand things from a perspective that she was not usually familiar. She thanked everyone for the opportunity to serve. As the council representative on Faculty Senate, she thinks it is important that we share our ideas and support each other. She certainly appreciated the support and the efforts the faculty puts forth to help our students succeed. She sees how incredibly important and hard your job is to do. She appreciates the things that you do and how you do that. She has great respect for all the faculty here. She is thankful that you are here to do the work you do.

After Toby King and Christine Boone gave the Faculty Assembly Report, Dean Marietta Cameron asked to speak and was granted the floor.

After Toby King and Christine Boone gave the Faculty Assembly Report, Dean Marietta Cameron asked to speak and was granted the floor.

Dean Cameron thanked our faculty assembly representatives, recognizing that they both stepped up from several resignations, including her own. She also congratulated those who are representing our institution on the Faculty Assembly Executive Committee, Toby King and Dee Eggers, who are both very influential in representing our community. She also recognized Lisa Sellers, who is on the Staff Assembly Executive Committee and is a voice for our institution on that assembly. Dean Cameron noted that Lisa Sellers has worked with the UNC Asheville Faculty Senate for a very long time and demonstrates how there can be a collegial, effective, and productive relationship between faculty and staff. Dean Cameron noted that Lisa Sellers has very much been an advocate for the faculty, steadfastly and quietly working behind the scenes, doing a lot of the tasks that go unheralded. As a former Senate Chair, Dean Cameron wanted to publicly recognize Lisa Seller's continual efforts.

In terms of the current legislative bills, Dean Cameron underscored her need to speak as a faculty member. As a member of a group that is very much underrepresented, she notes that her style of engagement is different but no less effective. She noted that "all of us are needed and all of us are working towards the same goals." Upon hearing the Faculty Assembly report and on-campus conversations, she believes there is a mistaken impression that just because someone speaks out and speaks truth to power, that somehow that makes them less strategic. She submits that some statements and advice have been weaponized against our community. She believes that collegiality has been weaponized against us so we are paying more attention to "how things are said" rather than "what action needs to be taken."

She appreciates hearing that some of these bills regarding faculty tenure are not going forward, but it is difficult to believe such reports when one sees similar bills that have passed at least one chamber in other states. She contends that there are people who are very much poised to change higher education. She warns that some power-wielders in our state and in Washington, DC are very much poised to make sure that white supremacy is maintained. She stated "they are very strategic and just as smart as everyone in this room. Some are smarter than us and some of us are smarter than them." She thinks that we in higher education underestimate those whose agenda is to maintain white supremacy. "They have a strategic plan to change America and to change higher education to keep certain groups in their place. They are very much aware of how things can trigger and appeal to most people in this room. Those of us who are the minority know that their tactics are not for us [the minority], but are directed at the majority to keep us divided."

Dean Cameron states that when she hears someone telling her to speak a certain way, she gets concerned because her manner of speaking is direct. "If someone steps on my toe, I would say 'get off my toe please.' If you do not get off my toe, then I would get a little bit louder. If you stay on

my everliving foot, then I will tell you to get off my everliving foot.' Dean Cameron has a problem with those who would take her analogy and present it as "being out there." To her, the focus on tone rather than action causing the tone is analogous to an abuser saying to their victim that they need to be polite to them. In other words, "Let me tell you how to speak to me so I can stop abusing you." She continued: "That is how a number of us who are in the minority see what is going on." She pushes against legislators telling us how we are supposed to engage them, especially since we vote for them and they are supposed to work for us, the state's citizens. She states: "As faculty, we work for the state, but we still are citizens and have a right to speak our mind and to speak truth to power. If we have academic freedom and freedom of expression, it is an insult for someone to try to intimidate any of us to be quiet. It is an insult to toss narratives out to keep us at odds with each other." She heard the criticisms of our colleagues at Chapel Hill for their actions. However, she again warns, the criticism and denigration of their actions is a tactic. "All of us are in the same boat trying to do the best that we can. When we start fighting at each other by saying 'you are not doing this in the best possible way,' that allows our opponents to win."

Toby King did a quick follow up to Marietta Cameron's words from Faculty Assembly. He chose his words of advice very carefully, and he does not think there is anything in there that would conflict with anything Dr. Cameron just said. Explicitly, more voices, including that [her] voice. When he goes to Faculty Assembly, he literally, without exaggeration, imagines Marietta Cameron sitting next to him at every meeting. From a personal note, not a faculty assembly note, he would like to say that he cannot think of a time when Marietta Cameron has uttered some principle that he disagrees with.

Marietta Cameron replied that could recall.

Dee Eggers thanked them both very much saying diversity of perspectives is good. Also, she wonders where she is not seeing her unconscious, embedded racism. She invited everyone to be open to exploring or noticing or considering or discovering unconscious biases because we all have them in many areas.

VIII. Executive Committee: Faculty Senate Chair Dee Eggers
Given the agenda length, Senate Chair Dee Eggers passed the floor to Andrew Laughlin for the Academic Policies Committee proposals to present and vote for passage.

IX. Academic Policies Committee: First Vice Chair Andrew Laughlin

[Decision Summaries](#)

Second Reading

[APC 32](#) Revise the course titles & descriptions for DRAM 121 and DRAM 122

[APC 33](#) Delete DRAM 145, Play Reading;

Add DRAM 150, Theatre-making in the 21st Century

[APC 34](#) Change the requirements for the Drama Major and Theatre Arts with
Teacher Licensure

(Rob Berls, DRAM)

[APC 35](#) Change the title and update the description of AMS 260
(Greta Trautmann, Jake Butera, Brian Hook, AMS)

[APC 36](#) Add, delete, & change courses and requirements for the Place-Based
Public Health Concentration in the Master of Public Health degree

(Ameena Batada, Amy Lanou, MPH)

[APC 37](#) Change the major and minor requirements for German
(Greta Trautmann, Doria Killian, LL/GERM)

[APC 38](#) Clarify that Major Competency must be completed in residence, or
overseen and monitored by UNC Asheville faculty if completed elsewhere
(Alicia Shope, Lynne Horgan, Registrar's Office)

Andrew Laughlin presented the seven documents that APC brings to Senate for Second Reading and vote. These were approved unanimously by APC and are presented as a bundle to be voted on all at once. He asked whether any senator wished to pull any documents from the bundle for discussion. There was none pulled.

A motion was made to approve APC 32 through APC 38, which was seconded. APC 32 through APC 38 passed without dissent.

[APC End of Year Report](#)

X. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee: Third Vice Chair Becky Sanft
[Decision Summaries](#)

FWDC recommended Heidi Kelley and Pam Laughon to be forwarded to SGA as Faculty Conciliator Nominees. The motion was made to accept these nominees that was seconded. The motion passed without dissent. Confirmation of the Faculty Conciliator Nominees to be forwarded to SGA.

Second Reading

[FWDC 9](#) Faculty Athletic Representative
Revision Faculty Handbook [Section 10.5.11](#)

[FWDC 10](#) Enhance Annual Evaluation of Chairs and Program Directors
Faculty Handbook [Section 3.4.4](#) ([SD3508S](#))

[FWDC 11](#) Establishing the Classroom Committee

FWDC 9 was presented for second reading. This document removes the limit of length of service for the Faculty Athletic Representative, and as a mechanism, put out a call for interest every four years. A motion was made to accept FWDC 9 that was seconded. No Discussion. FWDC 9 passed without dissent.

FWDC 10 adds a mechanism for departmental colleagues to provide annual feedback of shares and program directors on the job of chair/program director as part of the annual evaluation process. This provides an important opportunity for personal and professional development. A motion was made to accept FWDC 10 that was seconded.

Discussion:

FWDC Chair Becky Sanft gave background and context for FWDC 10. The motivation of this proposal was to implement a process that ensures the annual evaluation is a useful tool that

promotes growth in our department chairs and program directors as well as empower the faculty to provide clear assessment and feedback on the chair's leadership. This came up as Sally Wasileski stated earlier using a bottom up to top down evaluation process. We initially drafted a proposal that did not include an improvement plan. However, someone raised the question if there are major concerns raised by the department, what is the next step. Chairs' contract states, at least in mine this year, this assignment may be revised or ended at any time at the discretion of the provost. There is always that process a chair or program director can be removed. This develops an improvement plan with the dean providing an opportunity for the chair/program director to discuss the feedback with the dean and outline actionable steps to address the concerns. I also just want to emphasize the goal was the need for an improvement plan would be in extreme cases. Typically, the chair/program director receives this feedback to reflect and improve. The improvement plan is really for those cases where there are major concerns. Why did we include to share the plan with the department? If the plan is not shared with the department, our worry was that this will be another example where people share their concerns and then feel as though no action is taken. We have heard this in multiple conversations this semester. We felt if a leader does not take responsibility for their errors, that could have a negative effect on department morale. She believes good leaders are willing to be vulnerable and say to their colleagues here are the mistakes they have made or room for growth and work on those. This builds trust. Also, admitting to mistakes can really set the stage for an open dialogue with the department. She does understand there are concerns around this document.

Irene Rossell, Chair of Environmental Studies Department, will not be affected by the changes for her time is ending. However, reading the document, she has concerns that she raised with the department chairs and program directors. She thinks that the concept of evaluating chairs is great and an annual evaluation by faculty colleagues is terrific. She wished she had that over the last eight years and probably could have been a better chair had she had that annual evaluation. However, she believes the wording surrounding the improvement plan, though well intentioned, is very vague. When you put vague language into the Faculty Handbook, problems can happen down the road due to that wording. The FWDC Chair said the improvement plan might be only in extreme cases. When that extreme case comes up, somebody is going to look to the Faculty Handbook to see what we do, and she believes there are things not in there. The Chair will work with the Dean to develop an improvement plan, and they will have one year to carry out their actionable steps. At that time, their faculty colleagues will give feedback about whether they achieved the goals that were set in the improvement plan, and then it ends. It does not actually say who makes the final determination that the improvement plan has been met, what happens if the improvement plan is not met, and no appeals process if a chair feels wronged by this. These important things that are lacking. Another thing to keep in mind is that chairs only serve a three-year term, and they step into these positions without any training like conflict resolution or dealing with various personalities. Faculty go into these positions thinking they are putting schedules together and write evaluation letters. Suddenly, they often find themselves embroiled in things they had no idea was coming. She suggests just let the Dean handle it with the Chair, and they can be handled through the annual administrative report as opposed to setting up an improvement plan that is vague and might not actually be helpful.

Jake Butera asked about what goes into an administrative report. He wonders whether faculty members' voices from the department have a place to express concerns in that administrative report that the deans are currently doing with the chairs.

Irene Rossell said that like when faculty are reviewed, their chair writes an annual performance review that include voices from your classrooms from the SFIs that the chair sees. If

students are complaining about you or praising you, in your annual performance review, your chair can share positive and negative comments from students. The Deans do an annual administrative review of the chairs, which is similar in a lot of ways. They could put the comments from faculty colleagues similarly.

Jake Butera asked where the information is collected that the Dean incorporates into that report. Where and how is that information created? Like in faculty analogy, there are SFIs. To him, it sounds like we are trying to establish a similar SFI process to provide this important feedback. Is there a place that already exists where faculty can do that in a formal, anonymous way?

Irene Rossell replied that there is not a formal place right and believes that is what this document could create. She believes the details need to be spelled out more how this works with the current administrative review.

Herman Holt relayed that there is a list of items that a chair is responsible for in their role some observable like managing budgets and funds appropriately while others are not like how they are leading the department. What they base how they are leading are the interactions over a course of a year that we observe working through things. It takes a year before you have anything in terms of their performance as a leader of a unit.

Becky Sanft relayed that this does leave a lot of discretion up to the dean whether an improvement plan is needed and actual actionable steps.

Eric Tomberlin said he is very pleased with this document and this idea. Since he arrived at the university, he has noted a lack of checks and balances between chairs and faculty. The document may have issues, but he thinks it is a good step forward and will help his department.

Judy Beck asked if what Irene Rossell was suggesting was to keep the part that the dean will solicit feedback but delete the part about the improvement plan.

Becky Sanft clarified that she believes Irene Rossell is suggesting either delete the improvement plan, or if we keep it, add more clarity on the process.

Jake Butera wondered if the punitive part is in the chair's contract along with an appeal process.

John Dougherty replied the first place regarding personnel decisions of a chair is the Faculty Grievance Committee as well as the Faculty Hearings Committee although that only addresses demotion, suspension, and separation of a faculty member. Anything lesser than that is within the broad purview of the Faculty Grievance Committee. He would want to think about the difference between a grievance arising from a non-chair faculty member and a chair who has an administrative post. He is not currently giving the legal advice that a chair who is separated from that position may go to the faculty grievance committee, but he thinks that option exists. Likewise, disagreements over the results of an evaluation and the placement or discontinuation of an improvement plan may also fall within the Faculty Grievance Committee. If not, he is confident that there would be a review mechanism for the administrative aspects of the chairs position as opposed to the EHRA faculty position.

Herman Holt asked what does it mean to be "at the will of an administrator."

John Dougherty said this was a great question. He thinks that this document probably does more to help a chair than it appears. Without the presence of an administrative process like this, a chair could be discontinued in their role as chair at the whim of the provost with almost no for cause showing necessary. The proposal in front of you does not establish for cause requirement for a separation of a chair. If this proposal were passed, if he were advising the provost about separating a chair from their chair appointment, he would suggest that it would probably be a good step to engage in an improvement plan prior to separation of a chair. It seems like a reasonable

expectation and would mitigate any allegations that the separation was based on impermissible reasons, such as retaliation or bias.

Herman Holt said they were trying to do more for chairs by offering development opportunities internally and externally, to help them be better leaders. Feedback is helpful for the chairs' advancement in their role as a leader of the unit. Herman Holt asked if it was possible to approve this with the expectation of a development plan in the next iteration of FWDC to be implemented prior to May 2024.

Becky Sanft said she believes that could be done.

Rob Tatum agreed with John that he thought this process could actually protect chairs in more ways than they may ought to be where a chair uses these to be evidence that they have done a good job due to faculty not taking these seriously. He also has an email from a constituent who has the same concerns as Irene Rossell. They also raised an issue about timing. He wonders if March or early April might be appropriate time when decisions are made by chairs that could be of concern to faculty if there is a concern raised like scheduling, but not right up against the end of the year evaluation process. Bring these to the chair's attention until after the Dean has looked at the administrative review that they do each year. Timing is important if this is going to go forward. He also has concern whether we actually have a mechanism in place that may be imperfect or can be improved upon.

Becky Sanft relayed that there is concern in FWDC regarding the timeline where faculty might be hesitant to fill this out before their faculty appraisal forms are submitted. They suggested moving the timeline so that the anonymized feedback is not shared with chairs until after those are submitted, but not after July one.

Tiece Ruffin asked if this includes associate chairs as well as department chairs. Do faculty and staff fill out the form?

Becky Sanft stated that it is written in the document that faculty and staff should submit the Google Form. They are all invited to fill out the form. The way it is written now the document only addresses department chairs and program directors. But she would hope this would start a bottom up trend to include others.

Herman Holt said his play is to implement a review process for deans and for himself. He would not speak to the review process of the Chancellor. For Deans and the Provost, he will have a review process that he would like to implement this year.

Regine Criser made a brief comment that a development plan that is employed by every chair would provide leverage for more professional development.

Jake Butera asked to change the timeline to make this more effective. He suggested to amend FWDC 10 to say the Deans will ask by March 15 and everything must be submitted by April 1.

Becky Sanft fixed the amendment with March 15 date and Faculty and staff should submit the Google Form to the dean by April 1 instead of May first. There was the additional amendment that anonymized results will be shared with the chair after the chair submits their faculty performance appraisal forms, but before July 1.

Andrew Laughlin wondered if those dates may be worse since that falls during advising and lead up to the end of the semester.

Becky Sanft made the dates March 15 to April 15. Another amendment is improvement plan is at the discretion of the dean.

Rob Tatum had one remaining concern about the reaffirming the will of the Provost.

Becky Sanft said we can explicitly add the language in the contracts, which reads this assignment may be revised or ended at any time at the discretion of the Provost.

Dee Eggers suggested wording that the chair's appointment remains at the discretion of the provost.

Becky Sanft concurred and said that leaves the last part about the chair must then demonstrate over the course of the next year that they have implemented the actionable steps and the improvement plan. At the time of the next Annual Review, colleagues will give feedback on how successful the chair was in implementing the improvement plan. Instead of that, her suggestion is to shorten to say the dean will use the annual feedback from departmental faculty and staff in the following year to assess progress on an improvement plan so it is clear that the dean is the one again assessing the progress based on that annual evaluation.

Herman Holt suggested that the Dean can evaluate the chair appropriately. Below satisfactory, the Dean can confer with the Provost.

Jake Butera supplied that he believes FWDC 10 is a mechanism for information, not a mechanism for punishment. This seems like a mechanism for progress and open discussion between chairs and faculty that may not be there. At the moment, any resolution or lack of resolution will be borne out by continued feedback and response from the deans.

Marietta Cameron believes Irene Rossell's concern is the culture regarding a development plan sounds like punishment. At the moment, the mentality of a development plan is seen as a penalty. Her concern is the UNC Code has language that is very explicit of consequences to faculty for not doing certain duties. If there are consequences at the system level, then why are there not consequences at the institutional level? There is concern that situations arise when there are no consequences listed.

Jake Butera believes we do not have the ability to put that language in for removal remains the decision by the Provost.

Herman Holt suggested removing the word improvement plan for that is part of the Post Tenure Review where there are listed consequences that come from the UNC System.

Scott Williams suggested replacing the word "improvement" with "action" as in action plan.

Brian Hook relayed that that the idea behind this is that the feedback cannot only result in a conversation between the dean and the chair, the faculty have to be involved in the discussion. He liked Regina Criser's suggestion that it is used to give assistance in learning. He believes a development plan could be transparent, practical, and informing.

Herman Holt said we are focusing on a very small number of cases. He does not believe we need to really focus on the plan. It might be good for the FWDC to look at what is noted in a PTR plan and perhaps model this plan after it, to be approved next year.

Marietta Cameron said they had concerns from the discussion that we had in their program area meeting. Chair contracts are only three years. What is the purpose of the plan? If something negatively happens in year three, the plan would be useful only if the chair is looking for reappointment. If the chair is not looking for reappointment, there would be no motivation. What if something happens in year one when the person is just learning the job. There is the question to have people in a position long enough to even warrant a development plan.

Dee Eggers suggested that Senate votes on this document with the minor amendments and consider more work in the fall.

Becky Sanft summarized the five amendments. Amendment 1 is to change the dates to March 15 and April 15 to give faculty a month to fill out the form. The second amendment is the anonymized results will be shared with the chair after the chair submits their faculty performance appraisal forms but before July 1. The third amendment is a plan if needed at the discretion of the dean. Fourth Amendment is to delete the last two sentences and replace that with the dean will use

the annual feedback from the departmental faculty and staff in the following year to assess progress on the improvement plan. Fifth Amendment is everywhere improvement plan shows up is to replace that with just plan. FWDC 10 as amended passed without dissent.

FWDC 11 establishes the Classroom Committee. This document establishes a standing Classroom Committee to make decisions about classroom infrastructure, renovations and allocation. A motion was made to accept FWDC 11 that was seconded.

Discussion:

John Dougherty feels like there could be a mechanism already in place. Is this a way to replace the current mechanism? In adding this new committee, will this committee solve the problems that we currently have?

Becky Sanft replied that the question did come up, “Do we need another committee?” We hate adding more committees, honestly. This felt like an important one. There were quite a few discussions that came about before this was proposed. Jeff Konz called Keith Krumpe, Lynne Horgan, and Becky Sanft from FWDC to meet in October to discuss their recurring concerns about classroom allocation, instructional technology, and classroom infrastructure. A lot of this falls on Lynne Horgans' shoulders, or Keith is getting requests and not everyone is in the discussion. This could offer more support to Lynne for she has to answer a lot of these questions and having a group that is dedicated to collaborating and getting feedback from campus wide on items such as bring your own device. There was some pushback on that and the process this would kind of formalize how we make those decisions for more people were out of the conversation. We had Dean Tracy Rizzo, IDC Rep Jake Butera, Irene Rossell and Leah Matthews (two department chairs) who were part of this discussion to support this committee.

FWDC 11 passed without dissent.

[FWDC End of Year Report](#)

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

[Decision Summaries](#)

Report to Faculty Senate of passage of IDC 3

[IDC 3](#) New Academic Degree Program

Request for Preliminary Authorization: M.S. in Climate Resilience

Second Reading

[IDC 2](#) Establishment of Task Force to Review the Liberal Arts Core

[Amended IDC 2 to be considered at meeting](#)

IDC 2 passed IDC 4-2. As is the custom, dissenting voices are allowed to address Faculty Senate.

David Clarke said that at the time he voted on IDC 2 he did not think there had been enough consultation. He was waiting for a strong consensus from the LAC Advisory Committee before really deciding on this. He has done some diligence on that, but perhaps not enough. He hopes going forward these discussions continue between LAC Advisory Committee and this task force so accommodations are made and people are valued in that process.

Brian Butler wanted to first say he thinks the committee was extremely diligent and worked hard to include pretty much everybody. If done at the right time, in the right way, it could strengthen everything. His one disagreement with Jake Butera's statement is he thinks it is an inopportune time.

He does not know why we are rushing to do this. It has been ten years, but there has been a pandemic. He does not disagree with anything that is in the document other than the timing. There are several reasons why the timing is inopportune:

While the LAC was put in a while ago, it has evolved. The new things are important and need to be given a time to develop and show their merit. Forming the task force this year rather than a year or two from now, we will make decisions using bad information. By giving time to do more assessment, the information will be better. He personally believes that bad information could be “garbage in, garbage out.” If we really believe in this, we should want the information to be developed correctly.

How many interims can we have at one time? He thinks we are going to set a record. Interims should be dealing with the most important things. We do not need them to be dealing with curriculum when there are fires to be put out.

There are some things right now that need to be focused on. LAC is really important and central to our school. However, given the moment and other challenges the campus has, this is a distraction in the sense that there are other things should be focus on first. We seem to be a make work. How many committees can we create? It seems like the minute we think of something, we create a new committee. If we are going to create a committee, maybe it is to start talking about how we are going to look for non-interims.

If we waited a year or two, with exactly the same format, we would get more good information. That is important. I think good information would make the process a lot better. If we know this is coming up, we would have the time to prepare the information. By waiting, we would be working with permanent administration (we hope) educating them of how we work. Before working on a task force regarding LAC, he would like to hear them have to articulate their image of the school because these roles are important here and downstate. They are the protectors of us. We should want a more permanent administration in place. This is not anything against the interims; however, the current status is these are interim positions. If we waited and implemented this a year or two later, the idea of having this committee is good and could strengthen everything, but we have to have the right people in place at the right time. From what he has seen, when new people come in, they do not want to hear from the people that are here. They do not want to hear about stuff that is already done. That is the dead hand of the past. By waiting, we can educate whoever is in the permanent position by having them work with us through this process because everything we do with the incoming Provost or the incoming Chancellor educates them to work with us. If we hand them a file, we are not educating them at all. They will look at it and go, “Great. Thank you. Now let’s do that again.” He thinks there is a good chance this will be a huge waste of time. We specialize in wasting time here, and he thinks we should try to break that habit. That is his reasoning for waiting to form the task force.

Dee Eggers replied if we do not do this, we are under the impression that it will be done without faculty leadership. In the handbook, a task force can be called by Chancellor, Provost, chairs of programs, and departments. Any number of people on campus can call a taskforce.

Judy Beck said her impression is there are plans by the current LACAC for assessment in the coming year.

Jake Butera relayed there has been delays in assessment due to turnover and said Reid Chapman chair of the LACAC might be best to speak on where we are on assessment.

Reid Chapman relayed that the LACAC are actively working to build an assessment plan that would actually catch us up on the four SLOs on which we currently do not have data. That is an ambitious goal to do in a year, but they are going to try. His nervousness personally around this is if

we are running assessment at the same time while we are reviewing the LAC, we may not have faculty buy in on this. We all know from our work with assessment, you have got to have faculty buy in and this process is not easy in any situation. He echoed Brian Butler's concerns around timing. He wonders what data we will actually use to review the LAC if we are not actually looking at assessment data. He has seen that IDC has pulled together some comparable numbers of hours for General Education requirements from other UNC System schools and other comparable schools. Beyond that, he is not clear what that data set might be. He thinks a year of assessment prior to jumping into this might give us a much sounder sense of where we are with our current LAC. He also wanted to reiterate what Brian Butler said in that the LAC has not been static during this decade. We have done a lot of changes including the most recent creation of the DIR requirements. There are advantages to the imperfect LAC that we have. He acknowledges its imperfections, and yet, the fact that we know where those imperfections lie, allows us to build an efficiency. If we create a new system, we are necessarily going to be building inefficiency into that system. He is nervous in a time when we have enrollment struggles of creating what may be a less efficient general education system.

Rob Tatum suggested that there is something to say in this interim world that we are living in and we may live in for a while. The faculty can be "a first mover" and that is a good thing. When administrations come in, they usually want and need a time of transition for themselves. To what degree will our voices be heard. One thing he appreciated of the Interim Chancellor's remarks is it is good to be clear on outcomes and that there are various ways to achieve outcomes. He likes that it starts with SLOs - what do we want as a campus for our student learning outcomes. He understands the need to wait for assessment, but the assessment might not be with SLOs that we actually want. He is not sure additional data than we have right now would lead us further down that path.

Jake Butera wanted to remind that this is a call for review and not necessarily a call for change. A review process can lead for suggestions for change or adjustments, or it could be an affirmation. Any recommendations will land back in this body and go through the processes that are established within this body where there will be ample opportunity to bring in additional data, additional perspectives, and even bring in additional administrators should we have no longer interim people in those positions.

Jake Butera wanted to address the notion of distraction. This is his fourth straight year on IDC, three and a half years of which have been spent talking about program review. There will always be reasons not to do something. Are there reasons to do it? We have not done a review of the whole full picture. This document is a way to move through our questions systematically and transparently.

Ashe Cosette spoke in support of this document. The taskforce is not meant to make policy. It is only here for suggestions and recommendations. It is not the goal of this taskforce to work in a vacuum, but to talk with other institutional bodies on this campus to understand the data and analyze and evaluate. In the interest of transparency, none of these decisions are even going to be made by this task force. It is all going to be through the Faculty Senate. It is not even the intention of the task force to work away from LACAC, but to work together. We all are interested in a better campus community. Quite honestly, after three years, she is kind of sick of it at this point because nothing is being done. We always find a reason not to do something. Always. We can blame COVID all we want. It is irrelevant for what we have known has been happening for a long time. We understand that there is stress upon our current students who come in as first years as well as transfers. They often find the LAC to be a little too rigid for they are not traditional students. They have several jobs for they must work just to get through this. We need to find a way to be a little

more amicable to how they get through this to graduate. This is one step in that direction. She has to be in favor of this because she is tired of not having a reason to review the LAC. It has been ten years.

Dee Eggers stated that by reviewing LACAC now shows that we are being responsible, proactive faculty in terms of looking at our financial situation, changing demographics and social factors that are going to affect us going forward. She supports the task force being formed now as well.

Andrew Laughlin has some points from faculty to bring up. One is the desire to have better representation from the LAC Advisory Committee on the task force. Currently, it is possible that someone from the LAC Advisory Committee could be elected to be part of the taskforce though specifically it is not mandated to have a representative. A second concern is that the optics and the timing of this. The optics of doing this after the creation of the DI-R [From course catalog, DI-R stands for "Diversity Intensive, U.S. Race/Ethnicity-Centric"] might look poorly on us. They would like us to reaffirm our commitment to DEI and Justice efforts.

Jake Butera said Andrew shared those comments with him yesterday. They have stated that the taskforce must consult with positions that make up the LACAC so it is explicit that these voices are being heard. For the question of diversity, equity, and inclusion, we have in the document now that these should be informed by the university mission. The university mission does not mention diversity, equity, and inclusion, but our value statement does. We can explicitly say all three of those values inform this process.

Tiece Ruffin thanked Andrew Laughlin for addressing the piece with optics after DIR. Although she has heard comments about it has been ten years when the LACAC has not even had a functioning Liberal Arts Core Committee meeting regularly to assess. She does not understand why LACAC is not leading the review. It does not make sense to create a task force when we have a group that was not functioning. Her other concern is that we are doing this before a new strategic plan [when a new Chancellor takes office, typically the university goes through a new strategic plan and master plan process]. The current strategic plan, that is old, has our values of sustainability, innovation, and diversity and inclusion. It does not make sense to revise or review our Liberal Arts Core with an existing strategic plan that is old. She also has concerns about instituting a task force that does not have any type of accountability to be worth taking up people's time. She also believes there should be greater student representation. She only sees one SGA representative.

Jake Butera said that he thinks most of us would be perfectly happy to add more student representation and asked Tiece Ruffin what would be a good number of student representatives. He suggested there be 3 students chosen in consultation with SGA. Regarding Institutional memory, he remembers when Provost Joe Urgo started external program reviews and several programs on campus went through those voluntary reviews. His department did, and Humanities Program did. And there may have been one or two others. At some point funding for external reviewers became a problem, and we had shakeups at the top so the priorities had shifted there. When we started this year with IDC, we started with program review until we had some initial meetings with IREP, IEC and the LACAC. In one of those meetings, Deaver Traywick said program review is actually in better shape than LAC review and that shifted the discussion a little bit for us in those meetings. At the moment, all departments and programs do assessment, we had started to develop documents about doing internal review since we could not bring in people from other universities, but we could bring in people from other divisions to help do some of these outside observations. As to the optics after the DI-R, his understanding is this discussion started because of the MLAS. That was really the what opened his eyes in IDC to questions of how much information we have on review to avoid situations

like what happened with the MLAS. He believes that led to the new guidelines for the proposals of undergraduate majors and minors that started this discussion.

Tiece Ruffin reminded that she served on IDC during much of that time also, and Jake Butera's narrative is different from her perception of that time. She also has issues with the timing forming this task force for the LACAC has not had an opportunity to reestablish itself and decide how it assesses the Liberal Arts Core. She wondered if anyone could tell her how or if diversity intensives have been assessed from IREP over the past five years past quantitative social science. Since Ed Katz was over ILS [LAC's general education predecessor], she cannot remember an assessment or a meeting, and she has served as DI Coordinator for seven years.

Rob Tatum said that from the talk with Deaver Traywick the part that feels most broken to him right now is our SLOs. As they stand, our SLOs are actually hard to assess the way they are set up. If nothing else comes from the task force other than establishing the SLOs, he will be happy. Establishing what we want from our general education curriculum would actually reaffirm what we have with diversity intensives in meaningful ways. He believes having a set of SLOs that can be assessed would lead to strengthening our values including DI. He hopes that along with adding students that the taskforce can conduct listening sessions and consulting the campus. He would think any taskforce would be having a number of listening sessions with students.

Reid Chapman said one of his concerns, from that initial meeting with Deaver Traywick that has been referenced now a few times, that from SACS perspective, that reviewing and revising the LAC in the absence of assessment would be deeply problematic. As we they begin to shape what they will do in terms of assessment next year, Allie Ellenbogen has researched and got some working definitions for the SLOs that are currently in place.

Jeff Konz wanted to clarify the distinction between assessment and review. And I think the Deaver's comments in your meeting are likely the same ones he made and meetings that I've been in with him, which is that from a SACS perspective, we are in better shape on program assessment than we were on General Education assessment. SACS does not use the language of review at all so Reid Chapman's point is correct. There would be concerns when we are doing a review without assessment data. He is really pleased to see the progress we are making on all of that. He also wanted to say in terms of data from the IR shop, they have often struggled with trying to figure out exactly how many hours students need to take to complete LAC and majors, how many hours they have leftover. They are making really good progress on taking the ODS tables that feed Grad Plan and translating those into analyzable databases that we can use to answer at least the first question of how many hours do students have to take to fill LAC requirements. They are not yet able to figure out the double dip with majors that will come down the road, but certainly this summer, we can give you data on that piece of it alone.

Jake Butera agreed with Rob Tatum about the SLOs. If not to change anything, then at least to address the things that were missing. Do we need to have a better system in place to oversee the LAC? The LACAC charge is rather limited. It mentions much submitting reports to Senate but does not state how to propose structural changes. Any information that we bring in will be helpful. and useful. A review would open up to hear many different voices for example transfer students, athletics and sustainability.

Eric Tomberlin asked if there are SACS accreditation considerations with whether do or do not review.

Jeff Konz explained that SACS expects us to carry out continuous regular assessment of our general education program. There is nothing to his knowledge that mandates a periodic review. It might be a best practice to have a review every decade or so. The standard is clearly about general

education assessment happening continuously and regularly. We have not for all the reasons we have heard. We are making good progress on getting there again. The standard is only about general education assessment.

Jake Butera pointed out on the Senate agenda that we have IDC as presented for first reading and the amended version that includes amendments that sent through IDC. Jake Butera presented the amendments as outlined in IDC 2 amended.

Judy Beck asked about one year versus two years. She thought Jake Butera's statement about not waiting was powerful. However, on the other hand, the idea that the LACAC is collecting data this year, maybe two years is reasonable

Reid Chapman said they are looking at putting an assessment plan in place for next year, not for this year. We would have some data in December and more data at the end of the academic year.

Jake Butera said his understanding is when the proposal was two-year review that LACAC suggested that might not be necessary anymore.

Reid Chapman replied that there is not uniform thought within the LACAC on that.

Jake Butera added that the language in the handbook is a taskforce has two years before it must become a standing committee. There were comments that this time seemed long for recommendations would not be ready until 2025 and then changes would have to come through Senate.

Scott Williams asked how important is the LACAC assessment data to the work of the task force. Rob Tatum said the important piece is the SLOs and waiting on assessment data that may no longer be determined by the task force as a learning outcome seems counterproductive.

Brian Butler stated that the LACAC is a program we have developed over multiple years, and we are going to ignore on the ground all the things that they have developed in a brand new group and decide maybe those SLOs are to be rejected because the committee decides a different one. Again, he commends the committee on their work on IDC 2. He thinks they took it very seriously and put together something that could probably greatly strengthen the program, given the right information, given the proper respect of what is on the ground. He is not arguing against IDC 2. He is not arguing that there is never the right time. His argument is if we saw this as something we really want to take seriously, we would have to take seriously the information that we need, we would have to take seriously how it is going to be structured in terms of an inquiry, and we are going to be taking seriously who is going to be leading it.

Jake Butera wanted to clarify that the task force can review the SLOs, suggest other SLOs, but the task force cannot throw out the current SLOs. It does not have that authority in any shape or form. It is, again, a task force to review, to answer some of these questions, and to make recommendations by either one or two years.

Brian Butler acknowledged the correction saying the task force could suggest that we should change the SLOs without full information. He thinks proper respect would be to get the information first.

Ashe Cosette replied that everything about this is not to diminish respect. It is an acknowledgment that our mission has changed and a need for an assessment that our current SLOs align with that mission. It is not a disrespect to all the groundwork that has come for that groundwork led to the change of the mission.

Jake Butera added that it is not the case that there is no information out there. It is incomplete and more information may still come in. It is not the case that there is no information and that it will be completely uninformed.

Dee Eggers believes there is a possibility that assessment could happen next year and the task force could happen next year. The assessment that happens next year could inform the final recommendations.

David Clarke called the question and there were no objections.

A motion was made to pass IDC 2 as amended, which was seconded. IDC 2 passed 10-7-1.

[IDC End of Year Report](#)

XII. Old Business / New Business / Adjourn Faculty Senate Chair Dee Eggers
Dee Eggers adjourned the first meeting at 7:21 pm.