

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA ASHEVILLE
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

February 8, 2024; 3:15 pm, Laurel Forum, Karpen 139

Members Present: D. Eggers, A. Laughlin, K. Boyle, M. Mahoney, J. Beck, R. Berls, J. Brown, B. Felix, S. Kaplan, S. Kapur, T. Meigs, B. Sanft, R. Tatum, E. Tomberlin, R. Vandaie, C. Whitlock, S. Williams.

Members Excused: L. Ward.

Visitors: A. Boakye-Boaten, S. Bryson, M. Cameron, E. Couzo, R. Criser, J. Dougherty, L. Han, M. Harte Weyant, M. Harvey, L. Horgan, S. Kaplan, T. King, J. Konz, L. Mathews, M. Moreno, G. Reynolds, T. Rizzo, T. Ruffin, A. Shope, A. Strickland, M. Strynick, S. Wasileki, A. Wolfe.

I. Call to Order and Welcome by Faculty Senate First Vice Chair Andrew Laughlin
Andrew Laughlin, Academic Policies Committee Chair and First Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate, explained that Senate Chair Dee Eggers is joining the meeting by Zoom since she is not feeling well and thought it best to stay away from being in person today. As second in command along with other perks being APC Chair, he welcomed all to the February senate meeting and thanked them for coming.

II. Chancellor Kim van Noort Remarks

Chancellor Kim van Noort had remarks to present to Faculty Senate saying this is going to be a very important group in the coming months. She said that we are going to have a lot of discussions. They are the elected representatives of the faculty, and she expects that they will act as such as the faculty leaders on this campus.

She is pretty disappointed by some unnecessary panic that she feels has spread around campus. She thinks there are some statements that have been made that are premature. The statement, for example, that we are about to fire all adjuncts that has never crossed her lips. In senior staff meetings, they have been talking about this that they do not think this university can function without adjuncts, but we are going to have to look at how we use adjuncts just as we did in 2010. Those of you who were here in 2010 she has read the reports and thanked Kirk Boyle for digging up the archives. Looking at how we are depending upon all faculty is something that we have to do all the time whether they are adjuncts or full-time tenured track. We look at what they are teaching, how that is impacting our budgets, and how it is impacting the student's experience. We have to do that, but we are not at a point yet where we can say we are going to fire all adjuncts, or all student employees, or stop spending entirely. We are not at that point yet.

This is a deliberative process that we have got to enter into that has been ongoing. It started in late November, and she walked through the process. In late November 2023, she was made aware of the fact that contrary to what she thought that our deficit was much larger than just our appropriation reduction. We have been carrying a structural deficit with us for about six or seven years where no budgets have been reduced. Things have been fixed over time, but we are running out of the capacity as she believes she said on Tuesday, to fix it. We owe it to ourselves in planning for the future to make sure we get things taken care of now.

That deliberative process began in November with a lot of conversations between herself and our budget and finance folks. She brought in one of our partners, a firm called First

Tryon. They are based in Charlotte. She has worked with one of their principals for a long time. He was CFO of Elizabeth City when we all went down to Elizabeth City to work on their turnaround. He now works at First Tryon. They work with us for a variety of financial consulting. They are fitted finances firm and she asked them to come in and take a look because she thinks we need some kind of certitude. She wants certification of what the numbers are, what has happened, and how we got into this position.

They are about done with what they are working on that is not easy for our budget is incredibly complicated. She has wondered how our budget can be so complicated for such a small school, but that is part of it because we are small there are ways that we have to think about our budget that she was unaware. Although some schools do it the way we have been doing it, she does not think there are many other schools that have been doing it the way we do.

The senior team began discussions about what is going to be the plan, how are we going to think about this, what are the numbers, and what is the best way forward. First Tryon provided us with a lot of strategic ideas. They did not tell us what to do. They are not going to ever tell us what to do. They said, "Okay, first, you need to think about this, then think about this." They have established a sort of order of inquiry. The first thing we are doing is the budget directors from each are looking at ways to reduce spending. They met again today and are going through line by line and seeing what expenses can be eliminated and we do not have to spend this spring to the point that we may have to break a contract if we do not have to buy something. They did that in Elizabeth City. They broke some big contracts, but they broke some big contracts because they could not afford it. They are going line by line.

The major deficit is in the operating budget, what we call the "2" funds or general funds, this is where First Tryon's time was invaluable. We need to look at those and see if they can be put into other funds. We have lots of kinds of money. We have money that is extremely restricted that can only be spent on specific things. We probably are not going to be able to move many of our general fund expenses into those buckets, but there are others that we can. We make sure that we have everything in the right place because it is state law that we must balance our general fund budget. Then we look at unrestricted and less restricted money. Finally, we have auxiliary reserves - unrestricted reserves. We look at them last for they are funds we use in case of a catastrophic event that we need to immediately solve. We have to have money in the bank for emergencies like if a residence hall catches on fire or a classroom building that is inoperable. We also have to have reserves to maintain our credit ratings and 60 days operating cash. We are not close to that, but we are not far from that. We need to be very careful about that as well.

We have to look at reducing all those expenses first, then we eliminate vacant positions. They are doing that right now. Every unit is looking at the vacant positions that are out there deciding which ones we absolutely have to hold on to even if we do not fill them right away thinking that we do not need to hire that position right now and thinking about who and what priorities are there, we are not going to be able to 100% stop hiring. We saw what that did to us during the pandemic that was horrible. There are going to be times when a hire is going to have to be made.

Only after we have looked at all the expenses and every other way to make this better will we begin position review. When they do, they are going to begin reviewing the numbers of probationary employees and part time temporary employees that we may have to consider letting go. They will review the at-will and time-limited EHRA positions where many of those are in administrative staffing positions.

Then finally, and only after consultation and deep discussions with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the Deans., and the Academic Administration, they will consider the possibility of program curtailment. Program Curtailment means many things and is the word they are using for what they are in Greensboro right now that has created a lot of angst and

panic. We are not there, but if and when we get there, we have got to know how we are going to go about making those hard decision and what data we need to make those decisions. First Tryon has agreed to provide us with an algorithm, and they are probably going to do the actual work. It will be our data to take a look at what programs cost and the cost per degree. We will have a conversation about what kinds of data points do we want for we are going to have to agree on the data. We can have 9 million different studies done and we have to pick which one we are going to use that has certified data. First Tryon is going to do some work for us, and we will have more information about that when the time comes.

She wanted to tell this group first before it is out there, and they have not done a press release on this. Every two years, we have a review by the Moody's Rating Group. Two years ago, January 2022, they downgraded us from an A1 institution to an A2 institution with a positive with a stable outlook. Back in November, we started the process with them for a review again. They called us yesterday and told us they are maintaining our rating at A2. That is super good news. They are revising our outlook to negative. She had a conversation with them and our partners from First Tryon, who are our interface with Moody's, about why. They said that the positive things are that you are in a strong system, the UNC system has a triple A rating. They are gold that will always help us a lot. We also have some state stability evidenced in last fall's enrollment. You have strong leadership. The things that were not in our favor was the previous enrollment declines and trend lines and the overall stability of the industry. She thought it was very interesting that higher ed right now is considered to be a highly competitive place. They suggested that we seriously need to look at our brand, our offerings and our reputation moving forward as well as improve our liquidity. We got some good recommendations from them. We are going to be sharing this more publicly tomorrow.

You can google the report to see it is out there at moodys.com. Register and sign in and read the report as you can from any other university or entity in the world. The good thing is they didn't downgrade us for that would have been a serious problem. The other good thing is we are not planning on borrowing any money anytime soon though we have to be cognizant of the fact that we at some point need a good rating from them. It is very important. We have good confirmation that good things are happening, but our outlook is going to be negative for the next two years. Since we have less than two years to work on this, we are going to need First Tryon to give us some good advice on what to focus on first.

She just wanted to reassure everybody that despite what may have been said and some worry that is out there, we are following a very deliberative process. No hard and fast decisions have been made yet. They are still working on determining exactly what and how we are going to figure this out. We know we can do it. It is just what needs to be done and do it in the right order. We have got to look at the spending, look at vacant positions, look at temporary employment and student employment. It is great that we can employ a lot of students though not nearly enough of them are on federal work study. We need to take a look at that because we need to get as much as we can. 70% of our budget is personnel so we have to work through that as well and this is going to be really hard. She does not want to have to do this, we do not want to have to go through this, but we are going to have to. Let's roll up our sleeves.

She thinks the budget directors made a lot of progress today. First Tryon is coming back to look at some things. They are digging into our books now. We need an outside person to come in and say this is what it looks like to them. This is what we think, and this is what we would advise you to do. Then we can say, we cannot do that or yes, we can. She will continue to share this kind of information.

She just wants everybody take a deep breath because she does think there was a little bit of dissonance between what some things were said to chairs and others without care and being humane. We are going to work harder on communication.

Questions.

Andrew Laughlin relayed that her email mentioned a new committee, the Position Review Committee. He was wondering if she could give us a bit more details about that committee and how that committee interacts with the Position Allocation Committee, where their data is coming from, and what data are they going to be looking at.

Kim van Noort replied that the Position Review Committee is going to be a pretty high-level group: Provost; Chancellor; CFO; Deb Shivers, the Chief Human Resources Officer; and probably Mary Hall over in the Controller's Office. This is like a last line, so everything goes through its regular processes and considerations whether it is the path, leadership, or Student Affairs coming together and deciding they want to ask for a position with the rationale and most importantly, where the money is going to come from. This is a really good exercise because we are going to have to really think about where to find funds for positions. Now, the faculty positions are going to be a little bit different because they have the PAC process that has data to be used. The same data will be used, different data may be used, and she may even talk to what data might be used, but it all has to be within, "Can we afford it? And can the unit afford it?" She is sure the Program Review Committee will ask for a lot of questions and what priorities are coming forward from the people who are proposing a position like, "Why is it critical? Why now and not in six months?"

Meghan Harte Weyant offered from a Student Affairs perspective that one of the things that they have found as they have unraveled, as the scope of this issue has emerged is that position, particularly on the staff side, what would happen is conversations would happen to say, "Okay, I have this position line, and I have this funding for it, but they were not having regular communication between HR and Finance to ensure that funding line was solid and had not been swept to cover some other shortage. They have identified a number of issues in Student Affairs where HR and our Budget Manager believe that funding was there, but because of that lack of communication or operationalization of what that should look like, the funding was swept to the holes so then when you hire someone on, you now hit yourself a double because you have removed the gaps you were going to use to fill the hole, and you have to start paying that person. We are in a position right now where we cannot have that level of miscommunication. The Position Review Committee is not looking to make a determination do you need a position or not, but do we have all the boxes checked including whether we have the funding source - kind of like a quality control measure to ensure that decisions are not being made where Human Resources thinks one thing and Business and Finance thinks another and the Provost or the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs is thinking something else.

Kim van Noort answered that is exactly right. That is exactly what has happened, and it is double whammy if the funding does not really exist, and it is needed elsewhere but still going to start doing that. It is \$50,000 here that we are taking away, and it is \$50,000 we are committing over there. It is not a one-to-one swap, and that has been a major problem that just getting those people in the room together to verify the money is there. That is true of faculty positions; that has happened with faculty positions where we did not have the money where the money was not there. We hope this helps so the money will be.

Becky Sanft said we have a number of committees that award money. For example, the University Research Council have Faculty Scholarship and Service Awards. She is requesting that these groups receive guidance as we move forward with awarding because those calls will go out soon.

Suzanne Bryson said they can certainly if people email her the specific activities that would not seasonally happen. She does not have the benefit of having been in Academic Affairs for a full year cycle. Any information you could warn her right away of the types of cycles.

Kim van Noort spoke to not get her wrong that there are some things that we know we have to do. For example, undergraduate research monies have been allocated for students for the summer. We need to think long and hard before we pull those because there is a hallmark

of what we do that is critical student support for some of our students. That is going to be important and much of that is the allocation fund appropriation funding, which we have to be careful about from a perspective of future funding.

Rob Berls said he is seeking guidance interfacing with students. A lot of them have indicated fear or trepidation, possibly transferring. He has no idea what to tell them. Could we formulate some guidance for that in the future?

Kim van Noort asked what they are afraid.

Rob Berls replied they are afraid that their programs will not continue. That is a typical concern that students have. He has tried to tell them if they have started their program, they will finish their program. We are absolutely doing that. There is still a lot of miscommunication and not understanding what exactly it is called.

Kim van Noort replied that will likely continue and it will likely happen. She thinks it is a really difficult needle to thread because you want to reassure them without knowing that we can reassure them that we will let them know and keep them informed of their options that will support them throughout whatever it is. She has had a lot of questions from students about, "This was my favorite adjunct professor, and if he gets fired, I am going to leave." If that is your main reason for being here, and your only reason, that is one thing. She is always careful to say, "I'm so glad you had that experience with that particular instructor. That's wonderful. We're very happy." But we also have to be able to keep the university running. She thinks students are going to have a particularly difficult time working through this. She has spoken extensively with the SGA leadership. They are going to really stay close to them because they have a lot of questions, and they are very smart and so they get it. They want to be able to help the students understand what is happening.

Meghan Harte Weyant added that she is not sure it would be helpful, but she has responded to a couple of different parents and outreached to the parents.

Kim van Noort confirmed the same in her office.

Meghan Harte Weyant relayed that parents of an education major were terrified of the programs that would close. They want to know should they transfer to Charlotte next semester. You are probably hearing things just like this. Meghan Harte Weyant would be happy to share [her response](#) to students and parents if that is helpful. She and Michael have talked about what that can be, and she has checked with John about what she can legally say because she does not want to make a promise that she cannot keep. She also wants to be reassuring so if it is [helpful also for her to share tips with Faculty Senate she is happy to do it](#). You can make those talking points your own.

Senate's response was please do and Rob Berls thanked them.

Andrew Laughlin asked a quick, follow up question about the Position Review Committee. Will there be faculty or Faculty Senate representation on that committee?

Kim van Noort replied there is not because faculty have the process of the Position Allocation Committee for making recommendations. The Position Review Committee is not so much to pass judgment on the merit of a position, but whether or not we have the funds. We can certainly discuss that. It is less of a decision-making body, but there will be decisions made.

Melissa Mahoney suggested that since the ultimate decision resides with that committee whether or not a position is going to be funded would suggest it is important to have a faculty member there in the room to hear and be part of those deliberations.

Kim van Noort replied that was a good point.

Marietta Cameron spoke that she thinks part of the concern for adjuncts came from the Deans being directed and it is a directive that is still enforced that we are to have schedules without adjuncts. Please know the language. The adjuncts are not being fired is true. They are not being fired. All adjuncts that are currently employed will finish out their classes. Adjuncts are hired to be temporary, so I think we kind of conflate some of the understanding here. She wants to be clear least you walk out of here thinking that the deans have overstepped, and she is

worried about that. They have asked and are still asking for departments to create schedules without adjuncts. They did not say that adjuncts will be fired. We are in a deficit situation and that is something that we should take seriously, and Academic Affairs have been looking at ways to manage the budget. She wants to make that clear because of the type of pushback and questions they are getting in terms of what they have said about the schedule.

The other point she wanted to make about knowing the personnel language for this language has to be given the way it is because the Chancellor and leadership is bound legally to announce Reduction in Force (RIF) will happen in the Spring. Hearing this strikes fear in some of our staff colleagues' hearts. Some of our staff colleagues are afraid of that, and when they see us going about our business, not understanding what RIF means and is going to happen this spring - that officially starts in March and is only one month away - when they see that we as faculty are playing into the narrative - there is a narrative out there about faculty being tone deaf, entitled, and not hearing the pain of others. We have tenure not because it is a privilege; we have tenure because there is a responsibility to care for those who do not have the privilege that we have. When we do not look, hear, and understand what our colleagues are feeling, what they are hearing, and take in the seriousness, how can we expect anybody to have understanding for us. Make no mistake, the staff colleagues whose jobs may be gone because of the situation that we are in, their work still has to be done and has to go somewhere and go to those of us. If you cannot hear what is being said, see \$6 million deficit and understand what that means, our chancellor point blank told us that people will be affected. If we keep on navigating around and skirting around like we do not understand, then it is to our and our community's detriment.

When the Deans are telling you do not spend, it is not because we are being paranoid. If you want to be informed, listen to what has been presented. There are some public audits out there so you can see the problem for yourself. Go inform yourself, and you can see the seriousness of the situation that we are in. You are the elected body, you represent us. Study, be informed for yourself, and then make some decisions. Thank you.

Jonathan Brown also had a question about contingent faculty. He is very concerned about our visiting professors, lecturers, and our adjuncts. He is concerned about staff, too; this is a faculty meeting. The Chancellor is saying that adjuncts are not being fired, and to Marietta Cameron's point, while not being fired, the Chairs and Program Directors have been told to build a schedule without adjuncts in the Fall. His question is, "How are you distinguishing between firing and simply not renewing a contract?"

Kim van Noort replied there really is no difference. We are not firing them tomorrow, as some people have suggested. There is some fear that when we say fire, we mean now for there is an instance of an instructor resigning. No, we cannot do that. Of course, our good instructors are staying with us this semester. There is a possibility some of them may not be renewed. She thinks that they build a schedule without adjuncts is an exercise that will have to be reviewed at each department level to determine if it is even feasible. If it is not feasible, what is feasible is where the department chairs and the Deans have got their professional judgment moment: "How can we afford to offer the number of classes we need for students if we do not use adjuncts?" Will we be able to run enough classes that means have to look at the class sizes and number of classes you really need to offer for your majors. We should do that all the time; that is not anything new, but especially as numbers of students have shrunk. We have to take a hard look. Maybe we only need three electives in a given semester and that would then reduce our lines. There are a lot of ways of thinking about it, but she understands what Jonathan means.

Jonathan Brown followed up that the question in his mind that while it is most easy to not renew adjuncts contracts, he wonders where the line is where you consider a worker to be temporary. Is a lecturer on a one-year contract a temporary worker? Is a Senior Lecturer on a three-year contract a temporary worker as well?

Kim van Noort yielded the floor to General Counsel John Daugherty.

John Dougherty started by saying in his case, he does not have a definite term to his appointment. Appointments with a stated term means at the end of that term, it is over. There is no requirement for notice and no requirement for a reappointment. Three years means a three-year term. That means any separation within a three-year term would be a breach of the agreement, and that would require some remuneration or notice. Everyone is temporary in the sense that everyone's appointment ends at some point. Tenure, for instance, is the least temporary in that it is permanent by nature, but eventually at some point, it ends, but term limited is term limited.

If you want to say term limit and temporary is the same thing, they can be indistinguishable, but it is just what is the duration of the term. He disagrees with the Chancellor slightly saying there is difference with firing and not reappointing. There is a difference in the employment context between agreeing and paying an employee for a term as long as you are doing the work versus, we will again have you as a lecturer or adjunct for another term. Those are different decisions. He would eagerly urge anyone to avoid the term fire unless we are meeting to end an appointment to which there was already an agreement.

Jonathan Brown followed up again for he understands the concept of contracts and we are all temporary workers. He is asking when you say we are going to be reviewing temporary work whose work is that.

John Dougherty asked for the floor again. He replied that it is a problem with a concept that is most important outside of the faculty realm and why do we need to be using the language temporary worker. You all know all faculty and some staff are EHRA employees because they are exempt from Human Resources Act. We also have a large contingent of employees that are SHRA meaning they are subject to the Human Resources Act. SHRA employees are state employees just like say employees that work for the Department of Corrections. SHRA employees work for government agencies, but they are all under the State Human Resources Act, and as a matter of public policy, we have certain procedural protections for the Employment Rights of SHRA state employees. Now, SHRA employees do need to have some attributes in order to gain those protections. Primarily, they need to be employed for 12 months for a non-time limited position. Once they achieve that their career status state employment has greater procedural protection than someone who is on a temporary appointment or on a probationary appointment. One of the procedural protections is before a state agency will make any Reductions in Force (RIF) affecting career status employees, they have to show that they have taken all other reasonable measures to address whatever deficit there is with reducing expenses, with alleviating probationary employees, eliminating time-limited temporary employees. That is where the temporary nomenclature is very important, because it distinguishes someone with greater procedural rights against someone with lesser procedural rights as an attribute of either their position or the duration of employment. He understands that there are temporary SHRA employees and temporary EHRA faculty lecturers and adjuncts that have time-limited appointments because it is always proved to be able to evaluate where we have the most discretion and flexibility when making personnel changes. When we say we must review temporary first, it is partially because of the SHRA processes that would be required before we take any other employment actions.

Kim van Noort added that is why we have got to be very deliberative and make sure we go through the proper steps, not only for the legal sake, but also for the sake of the people that were involved to make sure that we know we have had a good process.

Ted Meigs said part of the biggest reason we are in this, of course, is because of the enrollment has dropped. There is a formula that the state uses that is a very rigid formula saying what we get the next year. Did they take into account factors that would lower enrollment like NC Promise given to other fellow UNC system universities. That was bound to have some effect on our enrollment. Could there an appeal to the system to tweak the formula to help us due to NC Promise given to neighboring institutions.

Kim van Noort has heard this many times and the answer in order to ask the question is it is hard to get the data about students who never apply here. If they apply here and end up in the pipe of Western and they end up going to Western, then we know that. We know the number of students who applied to us and applied to Western but actually eventually went to Western. We do not know the students who never applied here who may have just applied to Western because of NC promise. The issue there with NC promise it is available to all students. We are working on getting equal. Right now, we have an \$80,000 cutoff for Access to Asheville that will be a better deal for students than NC Promise, but only for that group of students because NC promise only covers tuition, they also have to pay fees. NC Promise students pay more than \$500. They pay fees (an additional \$4,000). Access to Asheville is good, but only for that population of students whose families adjusted income is below \$80,000. She is anxious to see if this moves the needle a little bit on that population, to see if maybe they would choose coming here rather than going to Western if we can give them an even slightly better deal than they are able to get at Western. Funding models shift.

Will they ever shift the funding model? Kim van Noort answered they just did, and it was horrendously painful and took seven years. The new funding model places a greater emphasis on undergraduate education. In the long run, when we start growing, we will grow fast. The change in undergraduate student credit hours generated (SCHS) has a bigger impact. If we get more undergraduate SCHS, we are going to get more money than we did before, if we have less, we will get even less, and the hits are going to be bigger. That is what was the kind of a boomerang for us is that we have those two years where, after the funding model change, we got to hit harder than we would have been hit before the fundamental change. Once we start growing, we are going to be in a good space. There is also the conversation to be had about the funding model now is based on SCHS, so we have got to be super strategic here. Enrollment is important because without numbers of students we are not going to have higher SCHS. We need to find ways to get more SCHS. Can we really double down on asking students or incenting students to take 30 hours a year because that is more SCHS or is that worse? What are we offering in the summertime? Can we use summer? Summer is now in the funding model. Summer is now in the funding model so that is a really good thing because used to be the only distance education classes were in the funding model in the summertime. What can we do in summer to increase the number of SCHS that we are getting? Have you ever thought about a January term? There are creative ways that we can work within the funding model to increase our funding. She appreciates that the funding model is not just number of bodies but how many classes are being taken.

Jeff Konz spoke on the impact of NC Promise. Provost Campbell asked him to look at some of the consequences of that. Chancellor said there is no way to really know how the students are applying, but they did take a look at the proportion of high school graduates in Western North Carolina who applied here, and the portion of community college students who finished their Associates who apply here. There was no impact on high school applications. There was a small discernible impact on transfer. He thinks it had the appearance of significant impact transfers students.

Kirk Boyle had a question related to Ted Meigs' interest in what the system offices does because it does seem like there is a vicious cycle and a virtuous cycle that can be so fulfilling and propelling once they get started, especially with the lag time of two years for enrollment numbers. He asked whether the system office if they see that we are responsive to this crisis, which of course they know about, and see us making big strides between now and June 30, is there any way they can help with any kind of funding so we do not get penalized with an extra 2 million the following year.

Kim van Noort said we are going to have to act fast. Here is her best strategy because you are absolutely right that it has its own momentum. Do not forget that we got \$10 million two years ago where \$5 million was recurring directly for student success initiatives. We have to

get pretty close to balancing the budget this year for us to ask for relief for next year because next year we are going to have a bigger deficit than we have got to solve going into next fiscal year for we got a \$500,000 reprieve this past year. That was already a help. She has not explored how far we would have to be before they would say that they would bridge us. As she said on Tuesday, we have got to take responsibility for doing this. She does not think we are going to be balanced by next year. It would be very difficult for her to think that we are going to achieve this. Her goal is fiscal year 2026 that we be perfectly where we need to be that will hopefully then also coincide with improvements in where the appropriation comes. We have got to work towards that. In the meantime, we are going to have tuition increases because we are going to have more students.

She concluded her answer to say it is possible that if we need help next year, if we got a great, solid plan and began to execute on that we would be able to have some conversations about that. What she is anticipating is that once we show that we are trying to get this in order, we are going to be able to get a push on some other things, but it is very rare that you see a university get a slug of money to balance or tide them over. Elizabeth City got a little bit in year three she thinks, but not much. They did get NC Promise that was a real lifesaver for them.

Kirk Boyle asked what she knew before she became fulltime Chancellor.

Kim van Noort answered that she had heard that it was more serious. We had not dug down to figure out what we were going to have to deal with, but she took the job anyway because she loves a good challenge, but also, we cannot fail here. We are not going to fail. She is like we have got to fix this so let us figure out how to do it and put it into place. Let's have some urgency about it. Let's be empathetic, let's be caring about everybody that is going to be impacted, but something has got to give. She would rather we do it than someone else. We are - you all are really smart, and we should be able to figure this out.

Chancellor Kim van Noort is available anytime for questions. Stop her. She is sometimes in Brown for lunch. She is happy to talk to anybody that wants to talk to her. They are going to start the listening sessions pretty soon and they are also going to do them with students for she thinks it is important that the students have chance to tell us their concerns. The website will be up on Monday, and they are working through the many FAQs that they are receiving, making sure that they are answering them accurately and transparently. They look forward to further conversations.

III. Approval of Minutes: December 7, 2023, and January 18, 2024, Special Meeting Minutes
The minutes from December 7, 2023 and January 18, 2024 were passed without dissent.

IV. Introductions and Reports to Senate

Faculty Assembly Representative:

Vice Chair Toby King, Evelyn Chiang

[Faculty Assembly Report](#)

[Civic SLOs slide](#)

Questions.

Sam Kaplan asked what the currently tabled draft require in terms of content and was there anything explicitly excluded.

Toby King replied that there was nothing explicitly excluded in the reject. The thing about the some of the readings that are suggested in these SLOs are taken from the Reach Act to assuage the political hunger for this kind of overreach and legislative intervention. The thing about the reject that he found so distasteful is the establishment of grading criteria and the percentage of grades that must be controlled by exams, treating this information. In these SLOs, we took three documents from each of these from the reject and build whatever course you like. This is a very, very low floor. You are not required to do anything more than just include these three documents in somehow whether you talk about the foundations of the United States in SLO one or the implementation in SLO two.

Sam Kaplan followed up with asking this means that the course could be a DIR course that could address these SLOs.

Toby King replied that he imagines an African American History course would.

Jonathan Brown asked if this is self-imposed to meet the spirit of the intent.

Toby King answered yes.

Sam Kaplan added the difference sounds like is the state would dictate how the course is assessed and for a certain portion would have been an exam certain portion.

Jonathan Brown said he was not trying to poke holes and appreciates all the work. He is looking at the list that is a very short. What courses about James Baldwin or Tallahassee Coates?

Toby King replied the list is short, deliberately so. He was completely surprised to get some feedback from another institution that said, "Why can't we have more SLOs like giving us more options?" He was just shocked because the idea was that we give you as little as possible and let you design all the rest of it yourself. The goal would be to allow as much interpretive flexibility as possible, and not over determine any particular idea. That is the hope. He does also want to acknowledge that there is no way to frame this that is not an explicit response to the reject, so yes, this is self-imposed, and these are self-imposed parameters. The rhetorical framework is important to say that we already do this and could easily find it in our curriculum. All we are saying is here are a couple of checkboxes that indicate that we did.

Jonathan Brown asked if he has any indication that the majority of senators or anyone among them, if they see enough of these will be rejected?

Toby King replied yes.

Marietta Cameron asked what would have been the response of the faculty if the legislature instead of focusing on civics had a focus on saying we move to require that everyone has to take statistics course because that will be helpful for our citizens to understand how to decipher their fraud and also point out that we are in terms of the global rankings in mathematics, we are 478 out of 592, as far as the countries are concerned. What would have been our response to that because that was something that is needed on that.

Toby King replied that his first thought is that the legislature did try to not match any funds for non-STEM disciplines across the state. The progress that he just described that he feels that we are making in these kinds of conversations with Faculty Assembly, System Office, Board of Governors, and the legislature have been making enough progress to make him believe that this is not a slippery slope moment. We talked about it in that group. All of us talk about it, aware that it could be that and let's keep watching the horizon to see what that moment could be. He thinks that you get one chance to really make your stand and blow it all up. If you do, you lose all of the momentum, all the progress that he feels that they have been making. If that moment of taking your stand and blowing it all up is to come at some point in the future, he would like to be there at that moment. He does not want to push this off so that is someone else's problem. He honestly feels that this is not the moment to make that judgment. He returned the floor back to Marietta Cameron.

Marietta Cameron asked to conclude by asking this rhetorical question: "What do we value so much that we are willing to stand for it no matter what the pushback is, because if we do not have that, we will fall for anything. That is not originally from Marietta Cameron, but it is something that she really believes in. She is worried very much that we have lost any assemblance of moral authority and because we have lost that, we will lose tenure because the responsibility of tenure is to stand in the moment that we use it. When we don't use it, it is gone. Thank you.

Toby King thanked Marietta Cameron.

In a chat comment from Tiece Ruffin said, "We must be careful, and we must teach the truth! Texas is not the blueprint." Chancellor van Noort replied that we should not denigrate our colleagues in Texas who have been teaching and working for years under legislative mandates about courses they are required to teach. All students in Texas are required to take two history

classes, US history to Civil War, US history after the civil war, and two political science courses regarding local, state and federal government. They manage to do it because of the very reasons that Toby King is citing. They were able to get it to be flexible enough so that the texts were not dictated and the majority of the SLOs were not dictated. Just teach it. We need to be careful and think about who owns moral authority. She does not think we necessarily get that just because of our position.

Toby King reiterated that opinions on this will certainly vary. They are happy to take all letters of support or critique and to take them seriously to respond to them and to take those messages up and down, back and forth, everywhere. We were not thinking we would not get any critique.

Strategic Enrollment Management:

Vice Chancellor Meghan Harte Weyant

Meghan Harte Weyant, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, wanted to offer a place to give regular updates about enrollment management and all that entails from a strategic perspective. Since she arrived, they spend quite a bit of time thinking about admissions and retention but bringing them together so that we begin to think of them strategically as a pipeline is really important. Sometimes it feels like an impossible task like in a video game, but we are in this together and are going to figure it out. She meets regularly with the Provost, and they talk about strategic enrollment management. They have a group of Strategic Enrollment Managers that includes her and the Provost, Jeff Konz, Lynne Horgan, Regine Criser, and Marcio Moreno. They look at what is happening connecting the parts of the pipeline from admissions and financial aid to Academic Affairs and Provost to the deans with scheduling and get students ready. That all happens behind the scenes as it should, and no one knows what is happening in strategic enrollment management until there are major things going wrong. Marcio Moreno is also here to give update about numbers.

She wanted to talk about budget and enrollment management since both admissions and retention is going to be critically important. For every five students we prevent from dropping out or transferring or going somewhere else, that helps our retention rate by 1%. It is 6:1; six students 1%. She never likes thinking about students as percentages, but the number is important because it helps us realize that this is attainable. Six students at a time, 12 students at a time, 20 students at a time to move that needle. We need to be thinking about how many students do we graduate, how many students are coming in, and how many credit hours are they enrolled because all those things are important and linked to the enrollment management for two reasons. One, it is us delivering on our mission and offering students that pathway to graduation that they are so excited about when we see them on tours coming with their families and all the family sacrifice that comes with going to college. Delivering on the mission. The second is there is budget implications. Every time we are not managing enrollment, there are budget implications.

She wanted to kick off this first meeting by saying she is going to do her best to be here every time so that she can answer any question so that faculty may have or provide information faculty would like her to bring.

Questions.

Sam Kaplan said that when she talked about pathway to graduation that felt really exciting. You also used the term pipeline that did not have the same emotional hit for it felt more like students as a commodity. He is curious why sometimes it is pipeline and sometimes a pathway.

Meghan Harte Weyant said that is good feedback because it is not it for me. We built a pipeline to help students from high school get here and that means a clear path. One of the things that frames her work is student success and retention. She had a conversation with a student who said to her, "You never would have recruited me to play soccer, and then put me on the field without a coach. Right? You would have thought that was silly. You would not

expect me to just know what to do and how to play. I have never been to college before, and I do not know what that pathway looks like.” She thinks it is important for us to remember this because many of us have been doing college for a really long time and is our lived experience. We know what the pathway is. We have been through it in a lot of ways, and we have been the most successful at it because that is what brings you back to a university environment. The word she should have used was pathway.

Marcio Moreno reported some numbers after the February 1 deadline for regular decision. Last year they finished regular session with 5,400 applications. This year they brought in 7,500 applications so they are working with 2,000 more applications than last year. Although that does not mean we are going to admit them all, now we have more applications to take a careful look to make sure we admit every single student that have requirements met and meet the goals they want to bring. Regarding admittance numbers, the same point last year, we admitted 2,800 applicants. As of today, we have admitted 5,300 applications. The most important and exciting numbers for him is the commit numbers. The commit is when the student actually raises their hand and say they want to go here. Last year, we had 122 freshmen students at this time, and as of this morning, we have 191. We have already committed 56% more students than last year.

The how and why is we are reading faster and going out more to make sure we are reading by daily and weekly goals. We are printing letters every Tuesday. They have worked very hard.

Transfer numbers look good also. We have received 38 more applications than last year. Last year, we had 12 transfer students. Right now, we have 35. And the last one is postbacks. Applications are up by 40%, admits by 176% more than last year from 38 to 105, and commits from 12 last year to 40 right now. Everything looks good here.

However, it does not mean anything if we cannot get them to where they need to be on the first day of class and here is where we need faculty’s help. We have to keep working. There are two things that keep him awake at night. The first one is financial aid (FAFSA). He is pretty sure everyone has heard the national mess where FAFSA simplification is a no for this year. They were just told they will receive the financial information by March, and they need at least two weeks to get ready, so they are packaging aid for students by April. That leaves less than four weeks for students to actually compare universities and make a decision. The only good point here is that everybody else is at the same boat. We are at the same place, and no one can go faster. Actually, they are really scared for he knows some universities that cannot package that fast so they might actually be admitting students without a financial factor. That is really, really scary. Depending on what other universities do by extending and students go on a waitlist could have a ripple effect where we might have 500 and suddenly, we only have 300 because Chapel Hill or NC State goes to a waitlist of these students. We will work with families be as fast as we can and report and respond accordingly.

Where faculty can help is this. They are sending out emails and invitations for upcoming open houses and events in different cities (Wilmington, Raleigh, Greensboro, and Charlotte), and they are inviting some faculty to attend. If you can, please do it. My first question after the news about the budget cuts was what has to be cut and his area is going to try to help as much as they can, but enrollment is what is going to get us out of the trouble. The chancellor mentioned Elizabeth City where he comes from and worked hard and has a lot of experience from there. Enrollment needs to continue because it is how we’re going to get out of this, so they are going to be asking for a lot of help.

Tiece Ruffin had a question to ask Meghan Harte Weyant about student success work. She asked if there is data regarding enrollment, student success and retention for informed decisions. She is conflicted about the notion of coaching around enrollment and retention when we definitely need faculty or adjuncts to deliver the curriculum. Coaching alone cannot solve it.

Has data been that presented on the success of coaching and the metrics that shows results based on the reassigned time and course releases we are getting.

Meghan Harte Weyant said she was making a comparison that we should staff just student success coaches and not staff faculty. She was suggesting that an integrated coordinated approach, particularly given a budget constraint, should continue to move us to do everything we can with the resources we have, and her idea was not to refer only to student success. We have a really strong student affairs staff who can be really helpful and none of that detracts from what you are saying, which is we need really strong faculty in the classroom. She does not see this as we must pay for one and not do the other and apologize if it came across that way.

Tiece Ruffin was wondering in terms of hearing how we are leveraging resources to meet the needs of our students with the tradeoffs or the cuts of some areas because she has not seen data besides our numbers are good, but we cannot say that the numbers are good with retention this year solely based on student success coaching or solely based on student affairs. The chancellor said it in her address it was the collectiveness contributing to student success.

Regine Criser, who oversees the faculty student success coaching program, reported that as far as student success there are faculty involved each semester for the past 3 years. There are coaches on the Senate if you have questions about their work. For information, faculty or economic success coaching is used for students on academic warning. It provides those students with individual one-on-one support provided by some of the professional staff in the Office of Academic Advising and also by faculty who are trained on providing this level of coaching and individual one-on-one support. This is a program that started under Kai Campbell because we realize that our attrition of students on academic warning is significant. This helps those students regain good academic standing and turning them in continuing students is a really good plan to address some of our enrollment issues since enrollment is made up of recruited students and retained students. That was one of the major student success initiatives to stabilize our enrollment specifically of continuing students. She has data to share that shows they have been able to increase the students who moved from academic warning to good standing at the end of the term. As we navigate a lot of different project pressures, delivery of the curriculum is of utmost importance for that is what our students expect and where our students experience uncertainty and want to see guaranteed. If we cannot continue with academic success coaching the way it is set up right now for students on warning, then we will just have to come up with a different strategy, which we are ready to do with no guarantee that it has the same kind of outcomes for stabilizing the enrollment as we have seen so far.

Meghan Harte Weyant said she was not the provost, but how she would answer that is that without partiality to student success, everything should be on the table for us to look at make sure that we are delivering on the curriculum has to be on the table. As she understands it, we have to be open to any and all of those things and use any and all data we have in order to inform those decisions.

Tiece Ruffin appreciated the elaboration. She wondered what the data includes for she knows she has written appeal letters for students and provide IT support to students without student success reassigned time. There are other minoritized faculty that have done the same thing who do not have the title of student coach because we see it as ethically a moral responsibility. Students come to us in Africana studies, and we have study halls twice a week for minoritized students to attend. She is not sure any of that is captured in the data that is presented to this picture.

Regine Criser said the data she captures is specifically for the faculty success coaches for a very specific assignment for a very specific group of students. That does not capture all the students nor excess work that is happening across campus by everybody for her access is very limited to this specific program.

- V. Academic Policies Committee: First Vice Chair Andrew Laughlin
[Decision Summaries](#)

First Reading

- [APC 22](#) Transfer Credit Policy revision (Elimination of the 10-year old credit rule)
(Lynne Horgan, Registrar's Office)
- [APC 23](#) Add new course MATH 295: Math for Machine Learning
- [APC 24](#) Delete CSCI 312 and 412, replacing with new topical course,
CSCI 339: Topics in AI and Machine Learning;
Change prerequisite and offering pattern for CSCI 346, Computer Graphics
- [APC 25](#) Add a minor in Data Science to be administered by the
Department of Mathematics and Statistics
- [APC 26](#) Revise the requirements for the Computer Science major
(Becky Sanft, Kevin Sanft, MATH/CSCI)
- [APC 27](#) Revise the requirements for the minor in Professional Writing and Rhetoric
(Brian Graves, PWR)

Second Reading

- [APC 12](#) Petition for CHEM prefix and major credit hour exemption for
BS Chemistry Major, required for major changes
- [APC 13](#) Delete CHEM 312, replacing it with CHEM 317, 318, 319, and 320
- [APC 14](#) Delete CHEM 380, replacing it with CHEM 395
- [APC 15](#) Change the major requirements for the BA and BS degrees in Chemistry
[Appendix A](#) [Appendix B](#)
(Amanda Wolfe, Sally Wasileski, CHEM)
- [APC 16](#) Add new course, ECON 265 Race and Economic Opportunity;
Add new course, ECON 359: Climate Finance
- [APC 17](#) Add new minor in the Economics department: Minor in Finance
(Leah Mathews, ECON)
- [APC 19](#) Add new course, PSYC 341, Positive Psychology
(Caitlin Brez, Mark Harvey, PSYC)

Andrew Laughlin presented the first reading documents and asked if there are questions or concerns, to please contact him so they may be addressed. He then presented the second reading documents noting that they were all approved by APC without dissent. He asked if any senator wanted to pull a document from the bundle to discuss and no one did so they could be voted on as a bundle without discussion. APC 12 through APC 19 passed without dissent and 1 abstention.

- VI. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee: Third Vice Chair Melissa Mahoney
[Decision Summaries](#)

FWDC Seeking Input from Faculty Senate:

- [FWDC 5](#) Add Service While on Full Leave
Faculty Handbook Section 4.2.3 within [Section 4.2](#)
[Amended FWDC 5](#)

[FWDC 6](#)

Revise Faculty Handbook Procedure for Annual Evaluation of Faculty
Faculty Handbook [Section 3.4.2](#)
[Amended FWDC 6](#)

Melissa Mahoney asked for input on the above documents. FWDC 6 proposes a standard that faculty on school leave are not required to submit an AFR for the period of their leave. FWDC 5 attempts to accomplish two things. The first, it proposes a standard that faculty excused fully from their duties from UNCA and are not expected to and cannot be compelled to engage in service work while on leave. Second, it attempts to establish our process and conditions for approval for faculty seeking to engage in service work while on full leave. She thanked faculty and staff who submitted feedback for their time and energy in doing so. Up to this point, she has not heard concerns about FWDC 6 or the first item on FWDC 5. There was some discussion on the process and conditions for approval for faculty seeking to engage in service on leave so FWDC wanted to invite further comments on both documents.

Jonathan Brown asked whose problem is FWDC 5 solving.

Melissa Mahoney answered this solves the problem for all faculty making sure understood that faculty do not have to engage in service when on leave while giving a process to get permission for those who wish to engage in service while on leave.

Jake Butera relayed his concern is less about that person being compelled to do service. He believes there already is a FWDC document that said faculty on FMLA not being compelled to service. His major concern is that the way FWDC 5 is written does not give faculty much agency should they choose to continue service that they are working on. It creates the burden of going through potentially three or four different levels of Administrative Approval. The lack of a sort of appeal process makes it feel as though there likely will not be an opportunity for faculty to practice that agency, removes agency. He currently is on leave, having to do an AFR this year and been allowed to continue some service while being told that I could not continue other service without many guidelines and clarity as to why those decisions would be made.

Sonia Kapur had concerns about how evaluations are conducted when faculty do not have AFRs for promotion tenure decisions. It is not clear how not requiring AFR works.

Jonathan Brown has concerns about obtaining permissions. He would like it to say they are required to notify of intent for it is obvious it needs to be very clear what they are intending.

Melissa Mahoney said that she flagged that for she understands how some wording may remove agency from the faculty members instead of being within the faculty members right or freedom to engage in service the wording puts the ability in the hands of administration.

Jonathan Brown does believe they should serve notice to their Chair. He does believe that there might be situations where a person absence and not employed by the university still engaging in service might not be in the best interest of the university.

Brian Felix thinks that expectations for service needs to be defined in the front end would avoid some situations that have occurred.

Marietta Cameron said some things she is concerned in multiple dimensions is the matter of equity. Some service is more valued than other service. Service that is not valued so highly that there is only certain people who do it of a particular demographic that does all the housekeeping service with very little acknowledgement or understanding about it and very little reward There are other service activities that holds quite a bit of influence in terms of the university and those positions are set up so that only certain people who have certain positioning and influence can do it. We should always be careful about our policies that favor certain manipulations of the system to only allow certain people of certain demographics to serve. For example, she has 70 colleagues and students right now doing Science Olympiad. Not many people are jumping up and down for that and that is not seen as high impact (she said she is being tongue in cheek. Technically, everyone on this faculty is supposed to do service. That is expectation outcomes. Why is it that certain people of certain demographics get to choose at all costs what is going on while the work still has not been done.

Jonathan Brown asked if it is being suggested that faculty members on leave should be compelled to step down from their service positions.

Marietta Cameron responded that anyone on leave is on leave. She is asking for equity and consistency. We need policies where everyone can equally have access as to not privilege some and not others. The end of the day someone has to teach courses and she is aware of those in this room who consistently do overloads on a regular basis and do not get anything for doing that. Meanwhile, others get course releases and all kinds of rewards for that while there is somebody steps up to do the overload that receives no recognition.

Tiece Ruffin relayed she was asked to do an AFR upon return from her PDL in Ghana where she had to do teaching, service and scholarship. She did not do any service for UNC Asheville. She did AFR based on the work she did at the University. She thinks is if you are not connected here and you are on leave then you should not be doing service. She was DI Coordinator and Anne Jansen stepped in because she saw the importance about being here and being connected versus her trying to be DI Coordinator while on leave.

Melissa Mahoney replied that is the case they are trying to protect to allow faculty to say no to service while on leave. She believes that represents the vast majority of cases that people do not want to engage in service when they are on PDL or FMLA or other leave.

Jonathan Brown relayed that the more this is formalized, the more we are inviting a power dynamic that puts a faculty member, especially junior member, in a vulnerable position.

Melissa Mahoney relayed that formalizing also protects faculty members by putting a standard that faculty are not compelled to do service on leave. Without the standard, the handbook does not protect faculty from saying no should their chair try to compel them to engage in service while on leave. Formalizing is protective of most cases more than it is harmful or have a potential to harm.

Rob Tatum agreed that this document changes the default position and where the decision is made. This is an important bill. He hopes the amendments get changed.

Melissa Mahoney relayed if you do not have to submit an AFR then the assumption is you are not being judged in your annual evaluation of that time period.

Jonathan Brown relayed it is the same assumption because your chair is the one asking you and they are the ones writing the evaluation letter thus is the major driver. There are issues if a chair has personal bias.

Melissa Mahoney relayed if faculty take a spring leave deeming no service nor AFR then they should only judge you on your fall AFR. Establishing a standard that faculty are not to be compelled to engage in service work while on leave protects more faculty and is effective.

Jake Butera the document as currently written cuts both ways where if you would like to continue your service, your chair can determine that you cannot based on a number of considerations. Hearing Tiece Ruffin talk about her Fulbright having too much to do to continue service, he thinks the language protects from those scenarios. He agreed that it would be a nice way of dealing with this would be to make it clear which types of service has to be done in person and which can be provided virtually. His worry is without those guidelines, the lack of an appeal process, and sheer number of administrative levels that can determine that you cannot do service without a clear justification is what makes this document a bit problematic.

Melissa Mahoney relayed that some of the inspiration behind pulling this document from second reading for this conversation was her understanding of FMLA is that you cannot while on FMLA be required by your employer to engage in any type of work for your employer. However, if you choose as an employee to engage in work, you can do so. It is not like she always thought if you are on FMLA, you cannot do any work. It is more nuanced than that and depends on where the agency resides, the employee or employer. It is really about not being compelled by your employer while you are on leave that prevent bias in the decision-making process where either nobody or everybody can. She wished that John Daugherty was still present for she is not sure if this governing body of faculty can have recommendations in the handbook or is this Human Resources matter.

Sam Kaplan asked if there is anything at the system level that addresses this and provide faculty guidelines. Melissa Mahoney says it depend on the leave and there are so many different types of leave here.

Marietta Cameron said her understanding is with FMLA that is granted when a family member of hers is in dire need. She loves this place, but her family loves her back and that is where she will center.

Lisa Sellers asked to make one clarifying point. As one of the persons who has to assist in completing the process when we need to fill a vacancy that the first question asked is whether the service assignment will have service to be done while the person is gone. Many committees serve a limited time during the academic year. If there is not any work to be completed, then the person is not removed from membership of the standing committee. In such situations, the position is refilled only if the chair of the Standing Committee makes a request to the FWDC Chair for that position to be filled. Faculty Senate has specific expectations outlined as well as their own rules for handling vacancies.

First Reading

[FWDC 8](#) Revisions to Annual Evaluation of Chair and Program Directors
Faculty Handbook [Section 3.4.4](#)

Second Reading

[FWDC 7](#) Revise Faculty Handbook Guidelines for Election Schedule
Faculty Handbook [Section 10.2.1.3](#)

Melissa Mahoney introduced FWDC 8 and asked if there are any questions to reach out to her before the March meeting.

She asked for a motion to approve FWDC 7, which was seconded. No discussion. FWDC 7 passed without dissent.

VII. Institutional Development Committee / UPC: Second Vice Chair Kirk Boyle

[Decision Summaries](#)

Second Reading

[IDC 1](#) B.A. in Elementary and Inclusive Education
[Education Budget](#)

Kirk Boyle IDC's second reading document that passed IDC without dissent. He explained in passing this Preliminary Authorization for a new academic degree program that it is taken down to the system office for approval, then it would come back to do the request to plan and APC documents, so this is a fairly early stage. A motion was made and seconded to accept IDC 1. No discussion. IDC 1 passed without dissent.

Kirk Boyle talked briefly about IDC's work on academic program review in regards to the Liberal Arts Curriculum Task Force that has met once and is meeting this Friday. The task force is trying to hear the faculty voice about these issues. The task force is only making recommendations. Faculty well-being will be considered.

VIII. Announcements/Adjournment First Vice Chair and APC Chair Andrew Laughlin

Marietta Cameron made a request for she thinks it is important for this body to acknowledge the things that are affecting our institution and document its history through attaching to the minutes campus announcements.

She also announced needing volunteers for the Science Olympiad this weekend where 340 students and their coaches are coming to campus on Saturday. She needs 120 volunteers and has only 70. She thanks all the staff, students, and faculty who have volunteered.

Andrew Laughlin adjourned the meeting at 5:42 p.m.