

Indigenous Cultures & Communities Requirement Proposal

Indigenous Cultures & Communities Requirement Proposal

April 15, 2020 11:34 AM EDT

Here's what people are saying

Please enter your comments here:

I support the proposal as a way to emphasize our heritage. I don't think it will be onerous. Seventeen AIS courses are cross-listed, five of which are Gen Ed Core Skills courses, six of which are writing-intensive courses. Thus, courses meeting 40 hours of the requirement can also meet various other requirements, including Major and Minor requirements in the cross-listed departments. We have a significant amount of volunteering already happening, so much of that will count towards the ICC requirement. Finally, many of the extra-curricular educational and cultural opportunities available at UNCP are poorly attended. The proposal will result in more students taking advantage of these opportunities.

The philosophical issues of whether this should be required and the actual benefits to students put aside, I am very concerned by the logistical feasibility of this proposal. If courses are to be cross-listed between departments, are the departments required to continue offering them in the future? If a class is cross-listed between Biology and AIS, but the professor who has the expertise to teach a cross-listed BIO/AIS class leaves UNCP (retires, moves to a different university, takes long-term sick leave, dies, etc.), will the Biology department be required to hire a new faculty member to teach a cross-listed course? Teaching an indigenous cultures focused class is not the same as teaching a WE class; all subject areas have a required writing focus for their graduates. But most professors on the job market will not have the expertise to teach a cross-listed AIS course. I have similar concerns about the offerings for events. Many of the events listed in the documents occur in November, Native American History month, which is a very busy time for all students as they lead up to finals. This will limit their ability to attend appropriate events. Also, will students be able to attend recurring events and receive credit repeatedly? If a student attends the Pow Wow every year, do they get two credits or eight credits? Should they get eight credits for attending the same event over and over? What are the standard requirements that will make an event meet the ICC requirements? What will be the time frame for getting ICC approval for events? Will it have to be planned before the beginning of each semester or would spontaneously planned events be allowed to meet the ICC requirement? Additionally, this proposal does not adequately address how these requirements are going to be met for distance education/online students. By the nature of distance/online education, students are not required to be near UNCP to complete their degrees. So how are they going to meet the requirements for service learning and ICC events? Yes, they could take two cross-listed courses. But that could be very difficult for certain degree programs that have a very specific timeline to complete requirements for graduation on time. Also, as all students will be vying for positions in cross-listed electives to complete this graduation requirement, online only students could be put at a further disadvantage for getting into the required classes. If we cannot offer means to complete the ICC requirement equally to our online students, the requirement should not go into the catalog. Finally, I agree with my colleagues that the time frame for this decision and approval of the ICC requirement to go into effect for the Fall 2020 catalog feels very rushed. Especially in light of the limitations due to Covid-19. I suggest the discussion continue for the faculty at-large into the next academic year before a decision is reached.

Please enter your comments here:

The ICC proposal puts into practice UNCP's mission statement—values and outcomes that are informed by UNCP as an Historically Minority Serving Institution. It provides an opportunity for the campus to create diverse coursework and programming that increases student engagement and retention. One example that best illustrates an ICC focus in my teaching is the oral history service-learning project I designed with the Lumbee Tribe, which later evolved into a documentary film. The over 100 students who participated in these two multi-semester projects, sixty of whom were enrolled in my first-year writing classes, would have easily fulfilled at least half of the required contact hours listed in the ICC proposal in one semester given their completion of 30+ service community hours and attendance at university-sponsored events (some of which they organized and served as presenters). The opportunity to work directly with the local indigenous community impacted Lumbee and non-Lumbee students alike, building greater cultural awareness as well as a sense of belonging among first-generation college students. Students shared in their course evaluations and reflection essays that they appreciated how service-learning helped them to gain confidence while learning new skill sets—archival research, public speaking, and recording and transcribing interviews, which in turn helped them land jobs after graduation. I realize not everyone takes this approach in their teaching, but some do. We, as a university, have been talking about a diversity requirement for many years, but it has yet to pass. While I agree with the concerns over logistics, I support the proposal and think we should discuss a compromise with the number of hours required, especially since many of our students work full-time. The proposal clearly seeks to build connections among students and between the campus and community, supporting the goals outlined in UNCP's core values and institutional distinctiveness statements. [REDACTED]

Since the implementation of NC Promise, some have argued that UNCP is facing an “identity crisis.” The institution has students graduating that despite having spent multiple years at UNCP, do not understand the rich history of the institution and its relationship with the American Indian community. Many students from non-Native backgrounds share the sentiment that UNCP is indeed a HBCU, an example of how needed a requirement like the ICC proposal is. While the logistics of implementing the proposal need refining, the purpose of the proposal is clear and long overdue. Being North Carolina’s historically American Indian University is what sets UNCP apart from other institutions in the UNC System. Shame on UNCP faculty, staff, and leadership if students earn a degree without gaining an understanding and appreciation for the American Indian community and culture that was so instrumental to the creation of their beloved university. The ICC proposal is a chance for UNCP to brand itself as an institution with a unique history, rich heritage, and deep appreciation for Indigenous people. Let’s not miss our chance to make it happen.

Please enter your comments here:

I have no objection to requiring a course on Indigenous Cultures as part of graduation requirements, but the proposal for extracurricular experiences is unworkable, will have negative impacts on 3+2 engineering collaborations, and the governing organization violates principles of shared governance. The requirement for activity beyond a course reminds me unfavorably of compulsory chapel attendance. Many universities decades ago, even public ones, had policies of compulsory chapel attendance. These policies failed to inculcate the expected religious values in students unless they were already interested in the religious ideas expressed. The indigenous cultures information conveyed in the proposal's call for at least 40 hours of presentations or service will have the same outcome. There can be even less impact for presentations given today's student's opportunities for distraction. This will be ineffective at giving students appreciation of indigenous cultures. The lack of comparable institutions with such narrowly focused extracurricular requirements is not, in my opinion, a recommendation for innovation.* It is instead an indication that other institutions consider it unworkable. It won't make us a leader; instead it will damage our position. In many majors, faculty have determined that an internship is a valuable learning experience and opportunity to build skills useful in future graduate school or job pathways. In my major, we have worked hard to ensure these internships (150 hours) are not financial burdens and often are paid. Now you wish to add a considerable number of hours of unpaid service obligation to the undergraduate curriculum (at NC Central, such hours in the major count toward the community service requirement). This is untenable. On a more specific note, our department has just established a 3+2 program with NC State Civil Engineering under which students attend UNCP for three years, State for two years and then get a bachelor's degree from both institutions. As NC State will not have the ICC extracurricular opportunities, students in the 3+2 will have to cram the UNCP requirement into our three years. In this three years, they need to accumulate 101 credits (~17 per semester) in order to complete UNCP and NCSU general education requirements, most of Geo-Environmental Studies degree requirements, and all the math and physics required for engineering, all at a GPA to reach NC State's minimum. This is a challenging curriculum. Students will need to devote their full academic effort specifically to it. Using one gen ed course for an ICC requirement is manageable, the extracurricular requirements are not. (Chemistry & Physics has a similar 3+2 as well.) Finally, a new bureaucracy to govern this is a violation of shared governance principles. This is a curricular matter in the broad sense. We don't allow an element of general education to have unilateral control of its element (e.g., mathematics to be in sole control of what constitutes math for general education). Therefore, a committee made up solely of AIS faculty cannot be the governing body for this requirement; the Faculty Senate and its committees must be in charge and there must be faculty from across the university for governance. [REDACTED] It shows the committee's straining for effect that they have to include Lee University and University of the Cumberlands, two private religious universities not at all comparable to UNCP, in their list of schools even with general service requirements. As to UT-Dallas, I could not find any indication that their community service is university-wide, it only applies to the Jindal School of Management.

This is a carefully thought-through and valuable proposal. Students will benefit from this while at UNCP (because programming and curriculum will be more focused on indigenous content) and after, because they will have cultural competencies that will make them more competitive as applicants to graduate school and on the job market. I would add undergraduate research to the pathways to completion. Many students do research outside of the curriculum or as independent study and it should count towards this requirement. [REDACTED]

Please enter your comments here:

This proposal is deeply troubling, both in terms of its timing, and in terms of the details being proposed. In terms of timing, this is far too serious a reorganization of student life and student credit hours to be deliberated in haste in the face of a global pandemic. It needs multiple open forums with face-to-face participation, and should have at least a vote of the general student body. We deliberated more about getting football, and that has much less impact. As far as the proposal goes, it is lacking in several categories. It has no clear definition of "indigenous," simply expecting the rest of the university to trust that one small council will effectively judge activities and service hours. AIS courses are not problematic, and already have a substantial cross-section in General Education, but the student activity and service hour requirements here are undefined at best, and largely at the discretion of a small, self-appointed group. The volume of hours is also problematic — it represents a massive increase in one area of programming, which cannot help but cut into programming for other areas; it is difficult to imagine how this would avoid a negative impact on diversity programming on campus that is not AIS-oriented. It is also difficult to imagine how our students who commute, who participate in one or more sports, or who work to support themselves will be able to carve out 80 hours for programming without slowing their progress to graduation. It is also unclear how the hour-tracking will work — students without the available credit hours to squeeze in some extra courses would be going to dozens of activities; even with electronic check-in, the consequences (not graduating) are unreasonably high if or when there is an error. Administrative problems are also quite clear — the council deciding what activities are sufficiently "indigenous" is unelected, and it is not clear to whom (if anyone) it would be accountable. Some positions on the council make sense in terms of the content of the proposal, but others seem based primarily on the interests of the current holders of those positions. While we are overdue for a more robust diversity requirement (rather than an AIS requirement), this proposal is not it, and it is not ready for a vote even aside from the ongoing pandemic. There are good ideas here that can be adapted to the robust diversity requirement we need with further deliberation and negotiation.

--As many other commentators have said, we should not pass a major graduation requirement during a time of pandemic, when it is impossible for students and faculty to participate adequately, and we have no idea whether Fall 2020 will be a normal semester. --We should also not pass a requirement this major that received so little publicity before it was sprung on the faculty at large. Its reception at Enrollment Management Subcommittee was decidedly negative, and then suddenly it was taken off their agenda and sent straight to the Senate, until senators objected to that and it went back to Academic Affairs. It looked like a pretty clear attempt to rush the proposal through and bypass meaningful commentary. Senate leadership needs to rebuild trust among faculty by pulling this proposal for this year and starting a real program of campus feedback whenever we resume face to face operations. --The actual proposal is entirely antithetical to the values of diversity and inclusion, because it celebrates one culture and heritage above all others. Most universities have multicultural or diversity requirements. Even most HBCUs have such requirements these days. The African-American/Black Studies requirements that survive at some HBCUS are a holdover of past days, when racial identity was understood very differently. It is astonishing to me that UNCP is proposing to go backward by 50 to 75 years in our understanding of race and culture. Other people have quoted our mission statement to show how this proposal violates what we say we stand for, so I won't repeat that, but I entirely agree with their analysis. We need a diversity requirement, not an AIS requirement. --At the beginning of this process, we (and the Board of Trustees) were told that "most HBCUS have black studies requirements." In reality, only one of the five HBCUs in the UNC system has such a requirement (NC A&T), and their requirement is for 3 credit hours, not 6. Advocates of this proposal started it under false pretenses, and that taints anything else they say now about how it will work and how little harm it will do to students' ability to graduate on time. --The amount of time commitment required from students is totally unsustainable. Many students cannot add 6 hours (5% of the 120 they need for graduation) to their current programs. None of the ad hoc committee members are people who have routinely worked with at-risk students in advising, probation counseling, or attempts to figure out how to find that one last credit hour to graduate, and I am charitably assuming that means they don't know the kind of challenges our students face in getting out of here without running into extreme debt. We just finished reducing the credit hours for many programs down to 120 in order to meet a mandate from the system office, and now there's a desire to ADD 6

Please enter your comments here:

hours? --Some members were apparently aware that 6 hours will be impossible for some majors, so they created the extracurricular path. But 80 hours of programming is just as infeasible. The "responses to faculty questions" document breezily assures us that this works out to "ten hours per semester (the equivalent of attending 1 UNCP programming event every three weeks)." One event EVERY THREE WEEKS? That's onerous beyond belief! What is the average number of events currently attended by UNCP undergraduates? I mean ALL undergrads, not just SGA members. I guarantee that we have many students who have never attended any such events, and to imagine that they will somehow be able to now quit their jobs, find someone else to take care of their kids, or find rides to campus is ridiculous. And that doesn't even take into account the online-only students. --These requirements will cannibalize enrollment from non-AIS classes, and attendance from all student organizations and service opportunities that are not AIS-related. Students will not be able to add to the time they already spend, so they will have to take the time away from other things. If we pass this proposal as is, we are essentially saying that we ONLY care about student organizations and service that relate to American Indians. That's exactly the opposite of "inclusive." Some people have been promising at meetings or in emails that actually anything that relates to "indigenous" people in any way will be approved to count. That's not what the actual proposal says at all, and even if it is extended slightly, there are plenty of things that will never qualify, and which will now die on the vine. --The calculations of hours is irrational. Why are we only counting the contact hours of classes? According to SACS requirements, all courses are supposed to include at least 2 hours outside of class for every hour in class. Why would the hours outside of class not count toward this requirement? If we did that, and also remember to include the 150 minutes for the exam period, a 3 credit-hour class represents 130 real-time hours, and one class alone would meet the 80 hour goal. --Meanwhile, the "responses" document contends that many institutions require more than 80 hours of service of all students. Maybe, but at those places students can choose from all service opportunities and programming. More to the point, why is every event being counted at 2 hours? Some require much more, and students should also be getting credit for overhead time like travel to and from the event (which for a commuter student living in Fayetteville is 2 hours). --It is very clear that this proposal is based on a lot of impractical assumptions about our students and our curriculum, and that probably results from the composition of the ad hoc committee, which lacked experience in a lot of areas, and also appears not to have requested any real data about our students' extracurricular and service participation until they were challenged on it. The creation of the council that will oversee the designations of fulfilling ICC credit also shows the same tunnel vision. Only AIS faculty can serve and vote, and only Student Affairs offices that will benefit from increased resources are represented. There are no student support offices represented, no one from enrollment management, and no faculty from departments that don't have AIS classes. There will be no one on the council who can bring data to show any negative effects that might be occurring in advising, retention, and graduation, on enrollment in other areas, or on student organizations from other areas.. This is a clear recipe for decision-making that is based on turf issues, and NOT on overall student welfare. TL;dr: This proposal has many flaws, will impact our students very negatively as currently written, and SHOULD NOT be voted on this academic year.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Let's be honest. The real purpose behind the recently-renamed AIS proposal is to promote AIS programming: to offer more AIS courses and to increase student turnout at AIS-sponsored events. Everything else is smoke and mirrors. This proposal is not good for students, it is not good for other programs and departments, and it is not good for the university. The fact that the proposal has not been made public until recently and is now being rushed through toward approval without due process speaks to its proponents' insecurity about its contents. Were the campus given proper time to scrutinize the document in a regular academic year, the proposal would not stand a chance of passing. 1) That UNCP is considering implementing an AIS graduation policy akin to (yet significantly more expansive than) one of North Carolina's HBCUs is problematic. North Carolina A&T is the largest HBCU in the country. In Fall 2018, their student population was 77.91% black (not African American). Their website clearly targets a black audience. Perhaps it makes sense that this institution would require a 3-credit course on AA culture and history. They "graduate more African American engineers and accountants than any of the HBCUs in America," and "The A&T Four launched the Civil Rights Movement." NCA&T's brand is clear. What is ours? Brand is something that faculty do not like to consider—but what effects would such a graduation requirement bring? UNCP is not NCA&T. Our website reports our most recent minority student enrollment by race as follows: Black/AA

Please enter your comments here:

31%; American Indian 13.2%; Hispanic/Latino 7.4%; Asian/Pacific Islander 1.5%. Although the university was founded by American Indians, the current student population is overwhelmingly other (86.8%). The AIS requirement does not reflect the diversity of UNCP in 2020. If we were to complete a study of UNC institutions to see where we differ in terms of graduation or general education requirements, it is possible that we might realize we need a global or diversity requirement for students. Even a quick look at North Carolina's HBCUs, since we for some reason like to look at HBCUs, reveals these requirements: North Carolina Central (Global Awareness); Fayetteville State (Global Literacy); in addition, NCC, FSU, and WSS either require a foreign language or accept a foreign language as part of the global requirement. This is not necessarily an argument for a global requirement—but perhaps we should at UNCP be instead pushing for a requirement in foreign languages or global engagement. Passing the AIS requirement will mean that the creation of a multicultural requirement at UNCP (if we should ever want to create that requirement) would be an impossibility. Students will be regardless of interest funneled into one avenue for exploration—American Indian Studies. What about the African American Studies minor? the Asian Studies minor? Hispanic Studies? Women's Studies? There is a privileging of the indigenous at the expense of all else. And this is not good for American Indian students, either. We know that so many of our students, particularly local students, seldom travel beyond local geographical lines; our students, more perhaps than students at some other UNC institutions, need exposure to other languages, cultures, and worldviews. "You can get there from here," the Chancellor likes to say: Well, where are they going? Presumably, we are preparing students to go somewhere that is not Pembroke. In that case, we should stop this navel-gazing and focus on preparing students for the outside world. 2) Have students outside of NASO and SGA been made aware of this proposal and its impact? Do incoming freshmen know? Have other minority groups on campus been provided the opportunity to draft letters? The SGA's resolution was drafted in a time of crisis when students were away from campus. 3) These lines appear on UNCP's web home page: "Founded in 1887 as a school for the education of American Indians, The University of North Carolina at Pembroke now serves a distinctly diverse student body and encourages inclusion and appreciation for the values of all people." If the AIS proposal passed, UNCP's Office of Student Inclusion and Diversity (OSID) would in the future need to work overtime to advocate and promote activities for diverse groups in effect "othered" by the AIS requirement. Perhaps we all need to be reminded of the mission, vision, and diversity statement of UNCP's Office of Student Inclusion and Diversity: <https://www.uncp.edu/campus-life/student-inclusion-and-diversity> . Here is an excerpt from the mission statement: "OSID provides leadership and advocacy to support cultural diversity and prepare students to engage in a diverse world. The office serves as a resource to foster and promote student success by providing programs and services that prepare socially and culturally aware students." Here is an excerpt from its diversity statement: "The Office of Student Inclusion and Diversity at The University of North Carolina at Pembroke promotes an educational and supportive climate that allows all the diverse members of its community to thrive and succeed. . . . We value and honor different cultures, racial/ethnic backgrounds, religions, economic status, age, sexual orientation, abilities and uniqueness of all UNC Pembroke communities. By celebrating our similarities and differences we strive to prepare students, to be current and future leaders, thinkers, and representatives of The University of North Carolina at Pembroke in order to be transformative and spread the university's historical tradition." 4) The AIS requirement will undoubtedly have a negative effect on enrollment in foreign language classes in the general education curriculum, and it will likely direct student choice in terms of courses they will take for history and literature. In addition, this requirement will begin to control and influence course offerings in humanities departments. It will also impact and influence faculty lines and hiring. Student participation in extra-curricular activities and events will diminish in some areas because they would be required at AIS-sponsored events. How will this affect African American, Asian, Hispanic, literature, theater, music, art, history, and other sponsored events on campus? Event attendance for these programs will likely decline as they are considered less significant because they are not graduation requirements. 4) The proposal itself reads like academic satire. Others have thankfully already pointed out the majority of its conceptual flaws.

- The proposed graduation requirement penalizes students who begin their postsecondary education at UNCP. These students will be required to complete more hours for the Indigenous Cultures and Communities requirement compared to their peers who transfer to UNCP from somewhere else. Right now UNCP has the same graduation requirements for all students. Having different graduation requirements for different groups of students is problematic.

Please enter your comments here:

- The proposed requirement disadvantages tremendously distance education students who do not have the option to attend events on campus or participate in community service project. I am not talking about students who take classes online; I am referring to distance education students who are enrolled only in online courses and who often reside far from Pembroke, NC. These students will be essentially forced into completing 2 additional courses to satisfy this requirement. These courses will have an impact on their GPA. The same is true for students who commute to campus. We need to acknowledge the student body we work with. A significant number of our students have in the past missed classes because they cannot find childcare, or they don't have transportation to campus, or they are having to take care of a sick family member, or they have to work two jobs to survive. They do not have the luxury of attending multiple events a semester for graduation purposes. What about our student athletes? They have busy schedules in addition to travel during the season.
- The three options to complete the Indigenous Cultures and Communities requirement are not equitable and balanced. Students who take an AIS or AIS cross-listed course will undoubtedly spend a lot more time and effort than students who are attending various events. More importantly, the stakes for students enrolled in an AIS course are much higher both in terms of their academic progress and their GPA.
- The logic that students will benefit equally from taking an AIS class and attending cultural events or participating in community service is faulty. There is no research or evidence that options 2 and 3 will achieve the proposed student learning outcomes. The same applies for the suggestion to record the events and allow students to watch them at a later time. How much would students truly be learning while staying on their phones during events they have been forced to attend? The same applies for community service project. Do we really want to have a significant number of possibly disgruntled students forced into participating in community service at the last minute in order to meet a graduation requirement? This can cause quite a lot of damage to UNCP's reputation and image if students are less than thrilled about having to do community service.
- Forcing undergraduate students to attend certain events as part of their graduation requirements will have an adverse effect on attendance at other events on campus (e.g. SOB speaker events, Music department recitals, Biology department speaker events; events organized by student organizations/programs in celebration of Hispanic Heritage Month, Black History Month; Distinguished Speaker series, etc.). There are only so many events students can reasonably attend throughout the semester. Poor attendance at AIS events in the past IS NOT a good reason to force this graduation requirement on all students.
- If students have to complete an AIS course to meet this proposed requirement, it will have an adverse effect on enrollment in other general education elective courses including foreign language courses. UNCP's mission statement claims that "we cultivate an international perspective, rooted in our service to and appreciation of our multi-ethnic regional society, which prepares citizens for engagement in global society." How is forcing students to complete an AIS requirement helping them cultivate an international perspective or preparing them to be citizens in global society? If we are going to propose a new graduation requirement then it should be a diversity requirement that truly aligns with the mission statement of this school. A diversity requirement is what students said they wanted in the open forums for the Strategic Planning. We keep hearing that students wanted this and requested this but what evidence do we have that this is the case? Does the larger student body want this? SGA is certainly not representative of our student body. Furthermore, the proposed graduation requirement references North Carolina A&T State University which requires all students to complete a class in African American history. What the proposal doesn't acknowledge is that North Carolina A&T State University is an HBSU and its student body is more than 80% African-American according to their 2018-2019 enrollment profile. The rest of the HBSUs in the system have a multicultural/diversity or foreign languages requirement.
- Cross-listing classes does not increase the number of seats available in these classes; some AIS cross-listed classes are major specific or have prerequisites. Is there funding for additional faculty lines to satisfy the need for more AIS or AIS-classes? If departments will be asked to offer more AIS cross-listed sections, then they will need the resources to do so yet there is no plan for additional faculty lines. Right now most departments are maxed out in terms of resources. Faculty are teaching excessive number of overloads and class sizes have increased in an effort to meet student needs. How much more can faculty be asked to do without additional resources?
- The organizational structure is unsustainable and unrealistic. A graduation requirement of this magnitude will require more than oversight by a council. In addition, it appears that the council will be granted unlimited power in determining what courses, programming, or service satisfy this proposed requirement. This organizational structure eliminates faculty input once this graduation requirement has been approved. The council will "regularly inform the Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate of its actions and

Please enter your comments here:

recommendations,” but will essentially operate as an independent body. • In addition, events satisfying this requirement should be publicized well in advance—at least one full semester in advance so that students and advisors can plan accordingly. The degree pathways ignore students who are transferring into UNCP or who are changing their catalog year and who do not have 4 years to satisfy the requirement. What happens when events are cancelled for a variety of reasons and we have students who absolutely need them to graduate? The expectation that students will complete at least 5-6 indigenous events every semester is unrealistic. We very well run the risk of having students trying to cram all of these events in their last couple of semesters on campus and failing to do so. Are we really going to stop a student from graduating because they are missing say 5 hours to satisfy this requirement? Or 10 hours? Where do we draw the line? The bottom line is—the feasibility of this requirement is questionable. Furthermore, while the ad-hoc committee has been working on this requirement for 2 years, the rest of the campus community was just made aware barely a month ago, in the middle of a pandemic, of the details of this proposal. What is the impetus for pushing this proposal through right now and fighting to implement it in a couple of months? To suggest that we will “grow” into this requirement is naive. What is the timeline for “growing”? What resources would there be in the future? What happens when these resources do not materialize after we have adopted this new graduation requirement? The ad-hoc committee and the Executive Committee should have made this proposal available for discussion way in advance, should have collected feedback from students and faculty, should have made amendments to this proposal as needed, and only then should have presented it for a vote. To amend this proposal while it’s being voted on by the Academic Affairs committee or the Faculty Senate is irresponsible. This new graduation requirement will have significant impact on our retention rates and possibly recruitment so we owe it to our students to slow down and work out the concerns and questions that have been raised about this proposal before we rush to sign off on it. If we really want students to learn about UNCP’s history and the local community, then make it part of freshman seminar. Better yet, consider having a true multicultural/diversity requirement which embodies UNCP’s claim as one of the most diverse institutions in the Regional Universities South category.

While I appreciate and agree with the sentiment and proposed goals of this proposal, I have concerns about both the feasibility and overall added value to the university that this proposal would bring that lead me to overall not favor it in its current state. My biggest concern is that the implementation of this requirement would decrease retention rates, delay time to degree completion, and decrease enrollment compared to our competitor schools. In sum, I feel that far less hours, or one course, could fulfil the goals of this proposal while keeping in mind other goals of the university. A lot of stake in this proposal seems to be falling on the assumption that programming/courses for students would be high impact(HIP). Have any evaluations of the programming/courses students would be required to attend/enroll in been conducted to ensure that it is indeed high impact? Before implementing such a requirement, I feel that more/some data should be collected regarding the success/satisfaction/attendance of current programing and courses. I echo concerns from Question #1: It does not appear feasible for many of our students to commit to 80 hours. Even if students attended every event between August of 2018 and March of 2020, they would still only have 68 hours. The number of hours should be reduced in my opinion to accomodate for student's high stress levels and possibility that they are working and/or raising children, commuter students, etc. Are we positive we have enough faculty to handle the course load to accommodate all students taking two courses to fulfil this requirement? If not, will the faculty in this department have increased courseloads, or do we intend to hire more faculty? What is the current size of the department that will be handling this, and how will we ensure they will be able to meet their other university related goals (such as research) with this increased teaching load? I'm concerned with the hiring of an additional CCE staff position dedicated to only monitoring student's completion of these requirements-I feel an online system might be beneficial here. How would students know if an event counts towards this requirement or not? Will it be explicitly stated on programming? What happens if/when students attend events and do not have their brave ID or banner ID number? How else will proof of attendance be monitored? I like the idea to incorporate events and programming into welcome week (Also should consider homecoming, etc.), as many events overlap with student's class schedules which does not allow them to attend.

Please enter your comments here:

The preamble of the UNC Faculty Constitution states: We, the members of the Faculty of The University of North Carolina at Pembroke, desiring to: • Provide a democratic form of government for the coordination of faculty activities; • Provide a forum for the expression of faculty views and interests; • Maintain academic freedom, academic responsibility, and faculty rights; • Improve intellectual, cultural, social, and physical welfare; • Develop better educational standards, facilities, and teaching methods; • Foster the recognition of the rights and responsibilities of the faculty to the school, the community and humanity; do hereby establish this Constitution. There are several issues with the proposal (e.g., clarity, process, enhanced priority, etc.), and one issue concerns its incompatibility with the UNCP Faculty Constitution. The proposed organization of the ICC Requirement Council states, "composed of five voting members selected from among the faculty and affiliate faculty of the Department of American Indian Studies."

- Why the distinction? "The chair of the American Indian Studies Graduation Requirement Ad-Hoc Committee of the Faculty Senate, at the approval of the Provost and Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and in consultation with the Chair of the Department of American Indian Studies, shall appoint members of the first Council to three-year terms with the possibility of renewal."
- Where did this committee come from; we have an ICC Council and an AIS Graduation Requirement Ad-hoc committee.
- The language also suggests it's an ad-hoc committee of the Faculty Senate; but is it really. It appears it is a mandated committee without Faculty input, consultation or oversight? So, how can this be a "Faculty Senate committee?"
- And if this is an ad-hoc committee of the Faculty Senate, is it this conceived as permanent ad-hoc committee; or not? Also, the proposal states, "... the Council shall regularly inform the Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate of its actions and recommendations."
- Once established, it appears the Council is independent of the general faculty, Faculty Senate and the UNCP Faculty Constitution and only accountable to the Provost.
- Council informs the Senate of its actions and recommendations; to what end? Additionally, the chair of AISGRAC with approval of Provost and consultation with the chair of AIS select members of the council. And subsequent council coordinators and council members shall be elected from among the Council members with consultation with chair of AIS and approval of Provost.
- Perhaps the language of the proposal should clear up this process; currently, taken at face value the role of the General Faculty and Faculty Senate is apparently unnecessary. Typically, the principle of shared governance is used in the context of faculty and administration; this proposal appears to go beyond this principle by establishing an important independent body with a broad range of power to develop or suggest policy, without faculty advice or consent (e.g., curriculum, graduation requirements, participation in self-governance, etc.). Suggestion: The proposal needs to be vetted through the established Faculty Senate process, beginning with the appropriate subcommittee(s) and then work its way to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate.

I am in favor of this proposal because I think it helps us meet two major goals--it engages students with questions of diversity in society in a meaningful, sustained way; and it promotes engagement and a sense of institutional uniqueness and community that should help improve retention. I also appreciate the thought and work that went into the proposal itself, as befits such a significant change to our graduation requirements. I have spent 8 years on curriculum and/or academic affairs committees and have seen very few proposals that reflect this level of thought on the implementation side. That said, I do agree with those who are concerned that implementing the "activities and events" method of meeting the requirement could pose significant logistical challenges, and that I would like to see a working model of how this is going to show up in a student's degree audit. Also that our current circumstances make it difficult to plan for this as a requirement for all students entering in Fall 2020 when we don't even know what Fall 2020 will look like. Ultimately I would like to see the Senate approve this proposal but push back the requirement to students entering in Fall 2021 to provide more time to come up with a solid and replicable plan for implementation.

It is wrong to require all students to complete such a topically limited course that will not prepare them for professional careers and/or graduate schools. The university should keep the students in mind with regard to what they need to succeed.

Please enter your comments here:

I appreciate the efforts of this committee and do believe the intent of this proposal is worthwhile and guided by a desire to advance the indigenous population (and rightfully so). However, I remain concerned about the evaluative aspects of this program. First, I am not aware of baselines/exit surveys. In other words, what awareness and appreciation do freshmen have upon entering UNCP as compared to past graduate/current seniors of UNCP for indigenous populations. Has this been measured? Perhaps there is already adequate appreciation and awareness developed over the course of 4 year in more informal ways (as opposed to a more formalized process). Minimal differences across the 4 year period would perhaps lead to an initiative of this sort, perhaps. Or it could lead to an intentional integration of indigenous study throughout all gen ed courses. Has literature been explored related to the former and the latter to determine which venture may be more worthwhile for our campus community? Also, I am not sure that tying the exit survey to graduation is the best way to get accurate data. What if the experiences were completed during freshman or sophomore year, yet the survey is completed in the senior year? It is more likely data/responses will be skewed/inaccurate. Also, the sample survey (questionnaire) items provided are a bit leading and suggestive. Furthermore, they yield qualitative responses which leads me to ask, "who will analyze the data to determine impact?" Perhaps a survey with a items that include a Likert-type scale will yield data that can more easily be analyzed (if the intent is to measure outcome). Also, are there activities that align with each goal? And are there assessments/data collected immediately following the completion of a non-course activity? In short, I do believe the aim of this initiative is worthwhile, but in an age where accountability is of the utmost importance and funding is scarce, more consideration should be given to the program evaluation aspects as well as implementation components of this work. Doing so will position us all to not only feel good about this work, but to demonstrate the impact it is having on our graduates. Thank you for the opportunity to offer comments.

Indigenous Cultures and Communities Requirement: *Should not be required for students entering UNCP, however students interested in Indigenous cultures should be encouraged to take courses and be an active member of all activities, and presentations of the Indigenous community. *Will not be effective since at the beginning of each semester, the Council will meet to make any necessary changes to the requirements. Therefore, the requirements will not be consistent and probably, what was part of the requirements one semester will not be part anymore in another semester of the same academic year. This will create confusion among the student population, especially for the ones about to graduate that will suddenly find out that these requirements were not met due to the changes made two/three years ago. *UNCP Mission Statement says that we serve a distinctively diverse student body; students from many different cultural background and other communities represented. Then, this mandate will not serve our diverse student body. In addition, this requirement will affect other programs that requires their participation at different co-curricular events as part of their grades. This requirement will be unfair for our diverse population and programs at UNCP.

This proposal should be set aside until the university is running as normal. UNCP individuals are concerned with their health and well-being right now; both students and instructors are putting much of their effort into their new online classes. Does the UNCP community have the mental energy right now to seriously debate a large change to graduation requirements?

I appreciate the work the committee has put in this exciting proposal. I would like the committee to think about the composition of the Council. To this point, consider including a local Indigenous representative(s). I see this as a way to strengthen and, in some cases, build ties to the local Indigenous communities. If this proposal is seeking to think outside of the box, I think we should think beyond western traditional understandings of community engagement and connection. Including an Indigenous voice outside of the academia can address this point.

Please enter your comments here:

Below are my random thoughts and concerns. How will this be funded? Will the coordinator be given additional salary or release time? Will true online students be forced to take 2 AIS classes in order to fulfill requirements? Is there criteria in place to define what courses can be cross listed beyond what is currently in the Faculty Handbook? A lot of the programming listed happens during Native American History Month, November, how will that affect students academically? How many professors give credit or require attendance at these events? Are the venues large enough to handle increased attendance? I remember when UNCP had a Freshman Common Read, a program that had a diverse committee that selected the book. The program worked and then the committee was basically dissolved because the University administration took it over to be Native American Read. Since then there has been no common/freshman read (2016). If this is adopted it would be nice to have, in writing, assurances from the UNCP administration, that the programs would be funded so that continuity could be established.

I don't think that this is the best time to carry out a vote on a proposal that will affect every student and all degrees. We are in this situation where students cannot have an open forum to talk and understand the proposal or consult with their Students Organizations, peers, advisers or professors. This should be postponed until a normal academic year where a fair discussion can happen, and where everyone may have the opportunity to review it and discuss it. We must not make rash decisions that will seriously affect the graduation requirements for our future students during the current situation that we are living. This proposal will also affect many of our programs, where their requirements are already too many and that they hardly have time for anything else in their schedule. My Spanish program will be very impacted by this proposal. Many of our students don't even have the time to complete some of the simple co-curricular activities that are important for their careers, not just in regard to Hispanic American Indians but also the Spanish culture that is as important as well in developing the necessary skills to master many of the learning objectives of our program. I am very proud of being part of UNC Pembroke, and the history that our University represents. However, we have grown and being known to be one of most representatives of diversity across the State. Therefore, we cannot allow ourselves to be defined by a single culture, but rather, we have to accept this diversity and let our students feel proud of their roots from which they have inherit and not what this proposal wants to enforce or impose on them. In my opinion it would be a disservice to the students. Moreover, it does not seem fair to me that in this proposal our own students who come to study the four-years of their career here at UNC Pembroke are punished with more hours than those who already have credits from other Universities/Community College. That can make our enrollment drop as we are giving priority or more consideration to transfer students. Or is it that the two years that our own students have been in our own environment do not count for anything? There are many aspects of this proposal that is not ready to go forward or should not happen at this moment. I feel that this proposal is being pushed to pass at the inappropriate times because it is a proposal for all our Undergraduate Students and not just only for the students enrolled in American Indian Studies. Therefore, all the students should have the opportunity to express their voices, as well as all the professors representing the different departments in which this proposal may affect their programs. We have many other aspects in which we are working due to the situation in which we are living, therefore we should not have to be making these kinds of decisions right now.

Please enter your comments here:

The committee or advisory council that is being proposed to approve courses and programming seems unwieldy for a variety of reasons. Who & where (and how far back in time) counts as indigenous people is still not clear, since sometimes the term "indigenous people" is paired in the document with "tribal cultures" and sometimes not; this could easily turn political. We already have transfer students, re-admits, and early college students who have no idea about the 3-course sequence in writing-intensives that they will have to complete to graduate; I dread having to spring this requirement on them. That may be their own fault in not scrutinizing the university catalog, but maybe it's also bad information practices on our end, so this requirement needs to be up front everywhere, not buried as bullet point #17. The student who comes back to complete a single course in the major actually ends up with two additional courses in AIS to complete. What will the administrators do if we're closed for a month after a hurricane and a graduating senior claims he couldn't finish his hours to graduate in December? Is this the time to be adding a graduation requirement? We don't even know what enrollment and finances are going to look like next year. This proposal will surely require at least one new faculty position in AIS, while the rest of us can't even ask for faculty positions. The notion that "our students asked for this" seems naive, considering how dismal the voter turnout is for SGA elections. The vast majority of the student body pays no attention to what SGA does. I say all of this as a person who took indigenous subject matter in college by choice. It will be sad to see students attending required guest speakers, up in the nosebleed seats, or in the back of the room, looking down at their phones the whole time because they only showed up for a card swipe. (Also, who's going to work the card machines? If we host an event, do we have to pay some office on campus in order to get the swipe service? Will we have to attend required training and staff the card swipes ourselves? If there is a malfunction that day, the students will be livid.)

I do so hope this passes, I worked at an HBCU in another state and African American Heritage courses were gen. ed. requirements for all students.

While the document provided attempts to respond to a lot of common concerns, I feel that the answers are NOT satisfactory. In fact, I was almost offended by the tone of some of this document. It is one of the more defensive proposals I have ever seen. It reads as if "we have heard your complaints and we don't care" 1.5 events per semester may not sound like a lot to YOU but will to our students. It should simply be 2 classes. Require 2 AIS linked courses. The rest of it WILL be a nightmare of logistics. DoIT has a habit of promising something will be super easy and then the implementation is a nightmare, so please forgive me for not trusting their word that this will be some easy process. "i forgot my brave card at home" "i was there the scanner must have been broken!" Students swiping in and then just leaving. There are going to be 10000 problems not accounted for that we are going to be having to deal with on an almost individual basis. Anything that requires the micromanaging of individual students to this level will be an all around nightmare for everyone involved. Service learning is a noble goal and we should strive towards finding ways for students to get more involved in their communities. This is simply a mess of a proposal however. Until you have it SET IN STONE, how it will be tracked, and you can verify the ease of tracking, then this is all VASTLY premature. Get the systems in place first, THEN propose something.

End of Report