

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA ASHEVILLE
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
November 2, 2023; 3:15 pm, Laurel Forum, Karpen 139

Members: D. Eggers, A. Laughlin, K. Boyle, M. Mahoney, R. Berls, J. Brown, B. Butler, S. Dittenber, B. Felix, S. Kapur, T. Meigs, B. Sanft, R. Tatum, E. Tomberlin, R. Vandaie, L. Ward, C. Whitlock, S. Williams; H. Holt.

Visitors: K. van Noort, L. Barefoot, A. Boakye-Boaten, C. Boone,, M. Cameron, R. Criser, J. Dougherty, L. Horgan, T. King, J. Konz, J. Paksoy, G. Reynolds, T. Rizzo, A. Shope, A. Strickland, D. Traywick, C. Yau.

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

II. Interim Chancellor Kim van Noort Remarks

Interim Chancellor Kim van Noort reported on the following:

- She recognized and praised faculty's work especially the Academic Policies Committee for their careful consideration of students' proposals.
- She reminded everyone to check their October paycheck to make sure their check correctly reflects the 4% raise that should be retroactive to July 1. She praised Budget and Finance and Human Resources' hard work to get those out to employees before the holidays. There should be another 3% increase next year.
- She explained about the shortfall this year due to decline in tuition and appropriation receipts. The General Assembly provided us and a couple other UNC System schools a reprieve so we would not have to one big hit to our budget. This is not a "crisis" situation though there will be some budget cuts that will have to be made in the Spring for the following fiscal year and the year after that one. They are working with less salary though they are utilizing reallocated funding to cover this year. They are also trying to stockpile our maximum carry forward for next year as well as other strategic, creative ways to bridge gaps over the next couple of years.
- They have received the final regulation and instructions concerning the Faculty Realignment Incentive Program (FRIP) [formerly the Faculty Retirement Incentive Program]. There are criteria that faculty must meet to be eligible. Human Resources are working on the list that determines the faculty who are eligible, and they have a template letter from the system office to send out to those eligible. They are working feverishly and hope to provide more information starting next week. You cannot do both the incentive plan that is one-year salary bonus or phased retirement.
- She has never seen the System Office churn out policy as quickly as it has been happening this past year. There is a lot coming to the HR realm. They are going through the entire UNC Policy Manual and cleaning up and change things around. Most of the major substantive changes we have seen and able to comment and a lot of it is cosmetic.
- She received a memo about new Distinguished Professors Endowment Trust Fund changes. Those state funds for that matching program are going to be

limited to STEM disciplines. They have a whole list of those disciplines. This is coming from the legislature. We will see how this eventually shakes out. This does not affect us immediately for all our distinguished professorships are fully funded. We are working on one or two new ones, and one of them could be impacted by this.

- There are conversations going on about how to use the Faculty Recruitment and Retention Fund so it is not a purely retention fund. She does not like that you have to have an offer or be interviewing in order to be able to draw on those funds. Perhaps, those funds could address equity issues. [Senate Chair note: Faculty Assembly was informed that the standard has been changed from offer-in-hand to “evidence of recruitment” because the system found that the previous standard might have resulted in too many people actually leaving.]
- Regarding Faculty Workload, Jeff Konz is sitting on the system-wide task force charged with developing the guidelines and regulations around the faculty workload policy. We expect to have those by early December. Our Board of Trustees must approve them by its June meeting so we will have about a semester to work through the parameters, perfect civil code, and have conversations with other schools gathering other examples. Jeff Konz has been running a ton of numbers on this. There will be a cross-functional body that works on the proposal and we will probably have a skeletal proposal to tweak that they will bring to several different groups for consideration and discussion before it is finally approved. This will be a stopgap approach for this will not be perfect the first or the fifth time we do this. She knows for she helped implement the one in Texas. The hardest part is not the actual policy. The hardest part will fall to the department chairs for how the process works is there are conversations to determine annual workload assignment that is tied into the evaluation and permanent record. The implementation is the hardest part where the chair will have to juggle the needs of the department with teaching schedules. She asked if Jeff Konz would like to say anything. He added that the other component will be the annual reporting. One of the really good things coming out of this process is each campus will be able to design their own annual workload report that reflects the institutional vision given this opportunity to think about what we want to report and how to quantify service and other items we can quantify that have not shown up before.

III. Approval of Minutes: October 12, 2023

The minutes from October 12 were approved without dissent.

IV. Introductions and Reports to Senate

Student Government:

President Alondra Barrera-Hernandez

[SGA Vice President Liv Barefoot Statement to Faculty Senate](#)

After the SGA Vice President Liv Barefoot read her statement, Dee Eggers thanked her and explained that the academic calendar is on the Academic Policies Committee’s First Reading list of proposals. Proposals are introduced at first reading. The discussion and vote do not happen until Second Reading in December. She assured SGA that there have been many emails going back and forth about the calendar and the issue is still very much alive. She

apologized if there has not been communication back regarding that. She thanked SGA for their advocacy.

Vice Present Barefoot asked that student voices be included in these discussions as well. Dee Eggers replied absolutely and thanked her for her report.

The Academic Policies Committee (APC) Chair, Andrew Laughlin, also thanked the SGA students for coming and this will be brought up again at APC's first reading documents portion of the agenda. He apologized if it appeared that they were doing this behind their back. That was certainly not their intention. The Academic Policies Committee review is the first round before the document is brought before Faculty Senate for First Reading. Second Reading is when the actual vote happens.

Faculty Assembly Representative: Vice Chair Toby King, Evelyn Chiang
[Faculty Assembly Report by Faculty Assembly Vice Chair Toby King](#)

V. Executive Committee: Faculty Senate Chair Dee Eggers
[Chancellor Search Advisory Committee Update](#)

Marietta Cameron made a request that the statement come to the faculty before the Senate minutes are approved.

Dee Eggers said she would be happy to do that.

Toby King asked if the three names are the complete list that will be considered for Chancellor and the President will not add nominations after the process.

Dee Eggers answered not to her knowledge.

John Dougherty confirmed that the Chancellor search and election policy was revised this past spring. The provision that Toby King was referring does not exist in current version. As the process stands now, the Board of Trustees submit an unranked slate of at least three candidates to the President for the president's consideration. From that list of at least three candidates, the President may propose one as a recommendation to the Board of Governors for election.

Toby King asked for confirmation that this is to say we feel confident that of these three people, one of them will be Chancellor.

John Dougherty confirmed that there is not a mechanism in the process for a candidate not among those three to be elected.

Marietta Cameron made the following statement:

"The UNC Board of Governors has approved a process for conducting a Chancellor Search within the UNC System. So, as a matter of record, I stand and express my concern. Even hearing Senate Chair Dee Egger's appreciation of our implementation, I am concerned about how this process came to be. While I believe this process will result in a good candidate for our institution, I represent the concern of various faculty about how the UNC Chancellor search process has been modified. This concern is not unique to this campus as faculty across the UNC System opposed this modification of the Chancellor process that severely limits faculty & staff representation on the search committee. And there's great concern about the president who's receiving the recommendation is a member of the search committee. I call to your attention to our tenure process. We do not have people making the final decision on the recommending committees. This is for a reason: we value the integrity of the process. Once again, I am not

belaboring the point. I simply wish for this to be a matter of record so that it can never be said that no objections were made.”

Dee Eggers thanked Marietta Cameron for her statement and she will send this out to all faculty. Dee Eggers’ intention in her statement was to speak to the integrity of the process and be very clear that she was doing the work of the charge. Dee Eggers shares Dean Cameron’s concern and both statements will be in the record.

Toby King added that he also fully endorses what Marietta Cameron said, and he feels the same way. He was very disappointed how the changes to the Chancellor search process went down over the past year. He was told by top men that these changes would certainly not affect the UNC Asheville Chancellor search process. These changes definitely did, and we became the test case. He anticipates that this goes very well for us because the test case will want to look good. In terms of a larger scope, he would be really interested in the chancellor searches that happened on other campuses over the next six months to a year and see what happens there. Based on what Dee Eggers says about the test case framework, he is not at all concerned right at this point about the results of this particular search.

Dee Eggers said that given where we are in the process, she thinks it would be appropriate for Faculty Senate to be requesting the initiation of the provost search soon. She asked if anyone would have any reason not to request the initiation. The next chancellor will select the provost though she does not see a reason why we cannot start advertising.

Kim van Noort relayed that they are preparing things for the permanent Chancellor, and the MOU with the system office search function be in place and the permanent Chancellor or the next chancellor is going to want to decide about how that committee is constituted. Everything will be ready to go, at least from the administrative side. She promised that she would make sure that that was in place in the transition.

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

[SGA Proposal: Democracy Day](#)

First Reading

[APC 5](#) Adding new course, POLS 313, US Census: The Politics of Counting
(Ashley Moraguez, POLS)

[APC 6](#) Add new course, ART 480: B.A. Exhibition Preparation
(Tamie Beldue, ART)

[APC 7](#) Revise the ECON elective requirement in the
Concentration in Pure Mathematics (MATH)
(Becky Sanft, Greg Boudreaux, MATH)

[APC 8](#) Change the demonstration of competency in Mathematics
(Becky Sanft, Greg Boudreaux, MATH)

[APC 9](#) Addition of new course, ANTH 346, Medical Anthropology
(Marcia Ghidina, ANTH)

[APC 10](#) Addition of new course, SSCI 360, Poverty Law Practicum
(Marcia Ghidina, SSCI)

[APC 11](#) Proposed Academic Calendars:
Appendix 1: 2024-2025: Final draft
Appendix 2: 2025-2026: Preliminary draft
(Lynne Horgan, Registrar's Office)

Second Reading

[APC 1](#) Change credit hours and revise description for IST 325
(Lisa Mann, IST)

[APC 2](#) Require the First-Year Seminar to be taken during the first semester,
and revise the FYS 178 description to reflect the change
(Regine Criser, FYS)

[APC 3](#) Revise the Academic Standing Policy
[Proposed Amendment to be made from the floor](#)
(Lynne Horgan, Regine Criser)

[APC 4](#) Change the title of PSYC 208
(Keith Cox, PSYC)

Andrew Laughlin introduced the first reading documents and directed everyone's attention to those pointing out the decision summaries for information. Please contact Andrew Laughlin if there are concerns or questions well before the next Senate meeting so APC may have time to address those.

He asked the senators to pay special attention to APC 11. These are the proposed academic calendars up for first reading today. This document includes an appendix for each of the 2024-25 and 2025-26 calendars. Last year, Senate already approved the 2024-25 academic calendars. As is the normal process, we have the chance to review and approve the calendar again this year. APC did so at their last meeting as well as consider the SGA proposal for Democracy Day (SGA proposal linked above). He understands this proposal was originally sent to the Chancellor's Office and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

APC decided not to include the Democracy Day in the calendar and keep the calendar as it was originally determined and approved last year. This is the decision summaries relay their reasoning for this decision:

"The Academic Policies Committee has unanimously approved the proposal from the Registrar's Office to establish the Academic Calendars for 2024-25 and 2025-26. The 2024-25 calendar was previously approved last year, and the 2025-26 calendar is being proposed here for the first time. Both are substantively similar to the 2023-24 academic calendar, for example having a slightly later start date in August, a 3-week Maymester (as in pre-COVID calendars), and an

Undergraduate Research Symposium the Tuesday prior to the week of Thanksgiving Break.

APC also considered the recent request from the Student Government Association to create a Democracy Day during the two weeks of early voting during the 2024 Presidential Election to provide more voting access to students. We did not include a Democracy Day in this version of the calendar. While APC acknowledges the importance of voting opportunities for students, we feel that the removal and rescheduling of a full instructional day was not the best way to increase such opportunities. APC feels that Early Voting is a long period of time, and increasing access to the polls during this time might be where students could focus their advocacy efforts:

- More frequent shuttles to the polls during early voting, including more weekend shuttle options hours. (Early Voting includes three weekends, so adding more shuttles especially during weekends would be beneficial.);
- Looking into whether UNCA could be an early voting site like it was in 2020. (I have heard from Ashley Moraguez that the ball is already rolling on this front, and the university is optimistic that UNCA will be an EV site in 2024).

To create a Democracy Day would necessitate removing an instructional day to keep in line with UNC System Policy on the number of instructional hours. To do so would require one of the following:

- Shorten Fall Break by 1 day;
- Start the semester 1 day earlier (on Friday instead of a Monday, which could interfere with Housing and move-in day);
- Extend the semester by 1 day (which would complicate after-semester activities including Exam times and Commencement).

To explain the APC/Faculty Senate process, once APC approves an item it is offered for First Reading before the Faculty Senate. Second Reading is when the proposal is discussed and then Faculty Senate votes. He wanted to emphasize that APC is not the body that decides. Faculty Senate is the body that votes and approves. Since First Reading is not when we normally discuss proposals, he wanted to give the student representatives another chance to meet to discuss. First Reading is not necessarily where we do discussion, but we are fine with more context. If there was anything else you wanted to add regarding your proposal, or any other concerns you had, that meeting could be arranged. If SGA thinks that APC has bungled this

order of operations, that is on him. He took responsibility for that. However, he felt this is the beginning of the conversation and is willing to hear their thoughts, questions, and concerns.

Liv Barefoot, SGA Vice President, responded that when considering this going into the vote on December 7, they do urge everyone in this room today to consider that this is a student led proposal, and since this is an university, the part of this learning is how to make changes and become leaders in our community as we go beyond this campus' boundaries. They believe that change starts here, and they want to make sure that students have the opportunity to the fullest extent to exercise these rights, especially as a part of this larger international community. They want to make sure that this is fully considered going into the vote, and they hope that decision be reconsidered to include Democracy Day because they do think this is the best way.

Scott Williams asked for clarification about the SGA proposal on Democracy Day. With all classes on campus canceled, what specific events would be required.

Ashley Moraguez replied that students would not be required to go to events though they would be highly encouraged. They will have candidates on campus as well as supply students with research on candidates.

Liv Barefoot said they would have shuttles running throughout the day to off campus early voting sites in the event we are not an early voting site. The day without going to class would give students the chance to engage educational resources and have time to sit down and make informed decisions about who to vote for because we think that becoming informed is integral to civic engagement, not just going out and voting. Providing this day gives students, faculty, and all on campus time to be informed of the candidates' stances as well as North Carolina voting laws and means of voting so all are able to exercise their voting rights to the fullest extent.

Ashley Moraguez added that they are also encouraging Democracy Day to be held during early voting so they can help students get registered to vote as well since Election Day is not the time be registered to vote.

Scott Williams asked a follow up question. He sees where there are schools in the proposal that have canceled classes for voting. He asked whether there were examples of other schools that have asked for a full day off.

Ashley Moraguez replied to her knowledge the other schools advocate for Election Day off and so they only track that. She does not know any campus that cancel during the early voting days.

Toby King supplied that from the Faculty Assembly, the perspective statewide is there is a real panic among many of our legislatures and legislators that legislate us. Due to that panic, UNC System campuses are not encouraging the culture of civic life that is politically fraught with complications. From his view, we need to tend to our own house or the legislation will come from above. We need to determine and enact our civic culture on campus and in our curriculum. He does not know whether Democracy Day whereby we take a day off is the way. He has worked on APC [Secretary note: Toby King has chaired APC also] and he has worked on the calendar that is super complicated. Considering we have snow days, you would think this would be easy, right? However, actually there has to be a certain number of class days each day of the week for the semester to legally count. There is a real mathematical problem to solve. While he does not know about Democracy Day in general, he applauds the willingness to develop a culture of civic life and build it up. He encourages faculty to take a lead from the students and Dr. Moraguez who have been doing this work, whether this day works out or not,

to build upon those ideas, that energy, that enthusiasm, and work towards the spirit of what they are proposing as far as we can take it.

Liv Barefoot said that she understands the legal amount of days for she was raised by a teacher, her mother. They could poll students again but they believe that they would find overwhelming students support to have Democracy Day even if it means removing a break day somewhere in the calendar.

Toby King offered congratulations and relayed that his comments were mostly directed towards faculty. He admires them for their work.

Dee Eggers asked if this was a movement across the UNC System?

Liv Barefoot says this movement is across within the ASG system like her role right now. There are other forms of civic engagement initiatives, including having candidates come to campus and things like that, but there is not this specific proposal across all systems.

Kirk Boyle asked Dr. Moraguez if there are any updates on UNC Asheville campus being reinstated/reinstituting being an early voting site.

Dr. Moraguez responded that over the summer, the deputy director of the Buncombe County Board of Elections reached out asking who to contact about becoming an early voting location. Dr. Moraguez put her in contact with Jessica Inman and Robert Straub, who have been working to see the feasibility from our side of things to see if we could host it for 2024. There is support on campus; logistically, we have to figure it out. The other moving piece though the current chair of elections is supportive, SB 749 that was passed over Gov. Cooper's veto is enacted January 1, 2024 will change the makeup of all the county board of elections and so new, different early voting locations may be chosen.

Andrew Laughlin moved to the Second Reading documents. There were four documents up for Second Reading. They were all approved without dissent by APC. He is pulling one from the bundle motion. Documents are bundled in order to make one motion to approve all documents. Documents that are not approved unanimously, have amendments, or a Senator would like to pull for questions are not bundled but considered separately. APC 3 will be pulled since it has an amendment to be considered.

A motion was made to accept APC 1, APC 2, and APC 4, which was seconded. APC 1, APC 2, and APC 4 passed without dissent.

A motion was made to accept APC 3 as amended that was seconded.

Discussion. Regine Criser instructed the senators to look at the amended document for that is the document that will be voted on. They are asking not to use the term probation to describe an academic status for that is not really aligned with best practices. They have researched this for some time.

Scott Williams asked though changing the label does the offense that the label refers says the same.

Andrew Laughlin replied that that is correct.

Kirk Boyle voiced his support for the amended document. He thinks the term probation sounds very criminal whereas the terms in the amended document sound neutral. In the intermediate period, there might be a student who is on the current academic warning system who will then go to the next academic warning and they will need to be told that it is a new level of warning. In a couple years that will not be a problem.

Regine Criser echoed that they can easily address this in their messaging to students.

Dee Eggers asked whether a student who is currently on warning, would they be able to petition to be grandfathered because the process they started in changed in the middle of their process.

Regine Criser would not think they would want to do that for this process is more student friendly. She does not foresee a lot of students advocating for their ability to be suspended from university.

Regine Criser said that one of the things that came up in their conversation with APC was around removing the option for dismissal. However, there are impacts of academic standing around regarding financial aid that need to be taken into account. Some students in this situation would not have to be dismissed from the university and could continue on warning for multiple semesters. Others due to federal regulations around financial aid might not be permitted to continue because financial aid will not be disbursed under certain economic circumstances. We have a long conversation about how some students based on their economic circumstances are going to be less impacted or more positively impacted by this policy change than others. They are committed to bring this up in Faculty Senate because it is an invitation to the institution to really think about how we attend to equity issues.

Jonathan Brown relayed another equity issue that he brought up in the APC meeting regarding dismissals for we think about a dismissal as a punishment for not maintaining good academic standing. He does think we have a responsibility at some point to stop taking tuition money from someone who is clearly not progressing toward a degree. That was a concern he had about removing our ability to dismiss a student.

Regine Criser thanked Dr. Brown for his concern. Her belief is she would rather address the concrete issues through practices in the office rather than design a stricter exclusionary academic warning policy that impacts more students.

Ted Meigs added to Dr. Brown's point that even on the old mechanism, there was not ever a way to just slam the door on someone and tell them they could never come back. On the old system three years and they could reapply.

Scott Williams asked for the motivations for changing this policy. If we currently have 4000 enrolled students, would we want to pass this?

Regine Criser replied yes because it is our campus policy that has been reviewed as part of what the Equity and Retention Task Force started in 2021. We realized our policy is stricter than the UNC system requirement for academic warning policy. It does not make sense for us to have a stricter academic warning policy than any other campuses.

Lynne Horgan said that it takes students some time to recover. Students might need to change their major or to repeat courses. This policy allows one additional semester to do over and recover.

An abstention was registered so APC 3 passed 15-0-1.

VII. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee: Third Vice Chair Melissa Mahoney

[Decision Summaries](#)

First Reading

[FWDC 4](#)

Advising Responsibilities for Faculty
Faculty Handbook [Section 3.1.4.5](#)

Second Reading

[FWDC 2](#) Revise Guidelines for First Year Experience Advisory Committee
Faculty Handbook [Section 10.4.37](#)

[FWDC 3](#) Revise the Honors Program Description
Faculty Handbook [Section 11.2](#)

Melissa Mahoney presented three orders of business from FWDC. She introduced FWDC 4 for first reading that revised Faculty Handbook 3.1.4.5. If anyone has concerns please contact her prior to the next Senate meeting

FWDC 2 revises Faculty Handbook Section 10.4.37. The motion was made to accept FWDC 2, which was seconded. No discussion. FWDC 2 passed without dissent.

FWDC 3 revises the Honors Program description in the Faculty Handbook. The motion was made to accept FWDC 3, which was seconded.

Graham Reynolds spoke for the document. In this document there is no change in curriculum. He is considering some curricular changes that will come through APC. He thanked FWDC and Crystal Yau for helping with the document. He said this was an opportunity to update and revise some much-needed language in the handbook. No further discussion.

FWDC 3 passed without dissent.

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

IDC Chair Kirk Boyle reported for IDC with two brief updates. IDC met to tackle academic program review process. At this time, they have collated, reviewed and discussed pertinent documents. Apparently, this issue goes back a few years. His goal for the IDC 2023-24 year is to produce the document that has been discussed but has not yet come to fruition. They would like to come up with a document that would be presented to Faculty Senate that would be more of a set of guidelines instead of best practices. Instead of like standardizing the process for every program, they believe the process needs to be pretty pragmatic depending on the different programs. At their last meeting, they hosted Brad Faircloth who is the Compliance Program Assessment Coordinator and Deaver Traywick, the Director of Institutional Planning and Accreditation Support. They provided IDC with a useful model from a previous institution that Brad Faircloth worked for. They are in the process of commenting on that document.

The second update is on the LAC task force that has met on October 20. He was delegated to be the Co-Chair of that committee with Interim Provost Herman Holt.

Dee Eggers explained that the language of the IDC document from last year said only one of the other nine faculty members could be elected. When no one came forward from among the nine this then defaults to the Faculty Senate Chair. She delegated that to Kirk Boyle because he was willing and enthusiastic, and she is so appreciative.

Kirk Boyle reported that they had a productive first meeting. They reviewed the charge and the game plan. They had a vigorous discussion of student learning outcomes. They found the student learning outcomes for the liberal arts core. The Provost will call the next meeting that they plan will occur sometime in November.

Dee Eggers gave Faculty Senate a heads up that there will be substantial changes to the system code and policy manual around grievances, hearings, and dismissals. They came through last year and we need to update our faculty handbook. The Executive Committee has been reviewing those documents and they believe these will take a lot of eyes and considerations so

we probably will have these divided up among the three committees so this is not all on FWDC for it is substantial work that would not work to place on one subcommittee.

Toby King added that if anyone wants to see an example of a Faculty Handbook that crashed and burned, check out Appalachian State's this past year that is the worst thing you could possibly imagine. He encourages Faculty Senate to do a good job and make ours robust and principled so no one can just go around and ignore.

Dee Eggers informed that the Faculty Senate did approve changes to their Faculty Handbook at Appalachian State. Their General Counsel then completely revised those and that was what went to their board of trustees.

Marietta Cameron supported Toby King's statements, and she added. "We as faculty prioritized the defense of shared governance, and we ignored faculty governance. In order to have faculty governance respected we must show that we are capable of holding ourselves accountable. We must rethink our Faculty Handbook. Instead of giving ourselves the most extreme benefit of the doubt, we must implement policies and state direct consequences for policy violations. In answer to our critics, we faculty must advocate for the privilege of faculty governance **and** shoulder the responsibility of faculty governance. If we cannot responsibly govern ourselves, certain power-wielders will gladly govern us as they see fit. "

Toby King confirmed that is exactly what happened at Appalachian State.

IX. Announcements/Adjournment

Faculty Senate Chair Dee Eggers

Dee Eggers adjourned the meeting at 5:01 p.m.