1. Approval of Minutes
   - Minutes of the January 16, 2019 Faculty Council Meeting were approved as written.

2. Chair Report
   - Mike Wakeford presented Wade Wilson’s Chair Report as Wade was unable to attend due to illness.
   - As we understand it, Governor Byers will be at UNCSA for Board of Trustees meetings tomorrow and another meeting with the Faculty Salary Adjustment Workgroup. Waiting to hear back from Jim DeCristo for time and place. Again, Governor Byers intentions are to get this voted on during the current legislative session.
   - To re-iterate, the survey of the faculty revealed and/or re-enforced several Faculty Council agenda items.
     o Faculty salaries:
       Moving forward to the best of our abilities.
     o Faculty workload:
       Wade discussed this issue with Provost English before the Winter break. He pointed out that some faculty roll into administrative positions and that this impacts faculty workload. He also respectfully requested that Provost English look at pre-2008 adjunct lines and that he please make an attempt at resurrecting these numbers to assist with this issue. He also requested that he run the numbers on student to faculty ratios over the past ten years.
     o Diversity.
     o Shared facilities usage.
     o Student support and collaboration, both with other departments/schools and other local opportunities.
   - The Administration continues to operate in the spirit of shared governance. The search committee for the new HR Director is set and it includes colleagues from across our campus, including the Staff and Faculty Council Chairs. Thank you for this Chancellor Bierman and Provost English.
   - At the UNC System Office during the Faculty Senate Chairs meetings this academic year, the main directive we are all pushing for is deeper and more widespread shared governance at all UNC campuses. This year, under the leadership of David Green, Faculty Assembly has not been writing many resolutions to the System Office or the Board of Governors. They do not have much of an impact. David continues to press the
message to the System Office and Board of Governors that they have an expert pool of faculty before them, so please bring us in earlier for input and consultation during decision making that impacts the system. He is confident that Dr. Roper (Interim UNC System President) will work well with the faculty.

- Board of Trustees Meeting: February 7
  - Audit Committee (Feb. 5): Martha Golden
  - Finance Committee: Josh Selander
  - Advancement Committee: Martha Golden

3. Vice Provost and Dean of Academic Affairs Karen Beres
   - Reviewed details for the proposed minor scaffold and Arts Entrepreneurship Minor.
   - Provided a summary of the Arts Entrepreneurship Minor Program.
   - Confirmed that Degree Works is able to track minors.
   - Proposal is slated to go to Educational Policies Committee on April 10.
   - Council discussion followed.
     - Karen emphasized that minors are a privilege, not a right. In the minors framework there are benchmarks that the student needs to meet.
       - A student must be in good standing in their primary arts discipline/school, and approval must be obtained by the Dean/Associate Dean/Assistant Dean of the Arts school and the Dean/Assistant Dean of the Division of Liberal Arts, in order to declare intention for the Minor program. The Arts Advisor will be consulted by the Dean/Associate Dean/Assistant Dean of the Arts school in making a determination about student eligibility.
     - The only minor that is being proposed for approval at this time is the Arts Entrepreneurship Minor.
     - Discussion ensued regarding the possibilities of course sharing with other UNC institutions and other institutions in Winston-Salem.
     - Karen is open to further conversation as needed regarding the minor proposal before April 10.

4. Proposed Amendments to Sections 603, 604, and 609 of The Code
   - Proposed Amendments sent to Faculty Council on January 28 to solicit feedback from the Faculty. Jim DeCristo requested that we send comments to him by February 6.
   - Chair Wade Wilson provided the following comment to Council: The main change I understand is that the final appeal for faculty goes to the Board of Trustees at the local level, and not to the Board of Governors committee in Chapel Hill. There were cases in which faculty members would wait many months before being able to schedule the appeal session with the Board of Governors. It also logically follows that there are likely some timing differences in the scheduling of appeals under the new code, as having everything take place at the local level will be more efficient.
Council discussion ensued.
  - General Counsel David Harrison was present to help provide clarification as needed.

Summary of comments:
  - One faculty member who reviewed the proposed changes has asked why, under the proposed new policy, a faculty member whose appeal to the Chancellor results in an unfavorable decision needs to wait for the Chancellor's office to forward the appeal to the Board of Trustees. Why, this faculty member asks, can't the faculty member send the appeal personally to the Board of Trustees? The Faculty Council thinks this a reasonable question worth consideration as any changes are discussed.
  - The UNCSA Faculty Council is always concerned when a policy change appears to foreclose any degree of access to an appeal or grievance process. While we understand that reasonable minds can disagree on whether these proposed changes are, in fact, substantially detrimental to faculty members' ability to challenge campus-level decisions, we do conclude that the policy represents a "narrowing of the window" for formal appeals of decisions to terminate employment or deny promotion. For that reason, we respectfully advise the Board of Governors to consider the merits of the proposed changes very carefully before making a final decision on adoption.
  - Regardless of whether these changes are approved or not, the UNCSA Faculty Council is very concerned about the process by which these changes were brought to its attention. We question why the System Office and/or Board of Governors didn't engage the UNC Faculty Assembly on these changes first, and instead sent them straight to Faculty Senate chairs on each campus with a request to review and offer feedback in a compressed time frame? The shared governance process works best when the Faculty Assembly is utilized as a central point of contact. When that governance body's role is circumvented, the perception—if not reality—is that the proposed changes are being fast-tracked and that the spirit of shared governance isn't being fully honored.

Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
Leslie E. Kamtman