

Minutes Faculty Assembly 9/17/2010

Present:

Welcome and Introductions (STE-000 0:0:0)

The first session of the Faculty Assembly 2010-2011 was called to order by Chair Gravett. Members of the Executive Committee and new delegates to the assembly were introduced.

Chair Gravett introduced a resolution in honor of President Erskine Bowles service. A motion to support this resolution was made by Chair Gravett and seconded by delegate M. Sprage (ECU). The motion was passed by acclamation.

Process and announcements:

This session of the Faculty Assembly will be conducted paperless. Delegates should refer to the faculty assembly website <http://www.uncfacultyassembly.org/> and specifically the active collaborate site found under the working groups, private links on that site for working documents, reference materials, and information regarding the meetings.

Standing Committees will not be meeting this year. Instead add hoc committees will address special topics. Add hoc committees focused on Furloughs, the Health Plan, the Budget and Workplace Innovation were scheduled for the afternoon meeting.

Future meetings are planned in as mini conferences with topics to include

- November 12: Academic Responsibility
- January 21: Legislative Advocacy
- March 25: Distance and On-line Education
- April 29: Academic Standards/Relationship with K-12 and Community Colleges

President Bowles Recognition (STE-000 0:21:20)

President Bowles was recognized for his service and was presented a framed copy of FA RES 7-2010. President Bowles then thanked the faculty and the Faculty Assembly for the effective work over the last five years.

Budget Update Report from Ernie Murphrey, Vice President for Finance (STE-000 0:30:20) (See 2011-13 budget outlook.pptx)

A flat revenue base is expected for the current fiscal year. However, with the expiration of temporary taxes, the expiration of federal stimulus dollars and the weakened economy, the State is estimating a \$3.2 billion gap. The Governor has asked the University to prepare 5 and 10% budget cutting scenarios.

Three statute prescribed categories will contain the budget requests.

1. Continuing operations (enrollment, utilities, vehicle replacement)--allocated directly to campuses.
2. Academic Salary Increases--lump sum to BOG then allocated to campuses

3. Expansion/Improvements (new and expanded programs, capital improvements)—lump sum to BOG then allocated to campuses.

Of these, again this year nothing is anticipated for category 2 from state budget sources. Chancellors are being asked to submit their top three priorities of category 3. Enrollment increase funding is likely to come under additional review this year. There is some consideration to add performance criteria, such as retention and graduation rates, to authorization of additional enrollment increases.

The schedule for the biennium budget includes the Governor's budget submission in January. The Senate budget in May, and the House budget in June.

Q/A (STE-000 0:53:40)

Raymond Burt (UNCW) Regarding suggestions that savings might be achieved by eliminating programs. Because salaries are the primary cost, there is no significant savings unless faculty positions are eliminated. Furthermore, the CODE allows for the release of faculty if a program is eliminated. Is the suggestion of program elimination then a means to terminate faculty? *E. Murphrey* There is no advocacy for removal of faculty. However, there is thinking about looking for creative options where there might be program mergers or faculty might move between departments.

David Domermuth (ASU) What are enrollment projections in light of the end of the "baby boom echo" bubble, and what impact will this have on budgets? *E. Murphrey* This will be factored into budgets through enrollment projections.

Ken Wilson (ECU) Will the plans for budget cutting that the Chancellor's are to have submitted by Sept. 15 accessible for review? Is this a process open for feedback? *E. Murphrey* Persons interested in the process should contact representatives on campus. And it is hoped that the process is open for feedback.

Lloyd Kramer (UNC-CH) Is the message to take back to campuses that there will be no increase in faculty compensation again this year? *E. Murphrey* Take back low expectations of any increase. However, E. Bowles and T. Ross are working to think about approaches alternative to state funding to address salary issues. *A. Watkins* Salaries are a sensitive issue. Last year got authority to use non-state funds for salary increases. There is no indication that we are looking at salary reductions.

Mark Sprague (ECU) Is there any way to preserve funds such that end of the year spend out of budgets can be rolled over to address potential budget crisis of next year? *E. Murphrey* The system does have authority to carry over 2.5%, and we were able to carry over significant funds this year to offset cuts. There is a risk however of losing carried over funds since reserves are an easy target for cuts. *A. Watkins* notes that the significant one-time funds that need to be spent this year are a result of contingency planning in the event that federal Medicare funds were not provided. *E. Murphrey* Much of the one-time carry over funding is being used to address the long backlog of deferred maintenance and capital improvement.

Jim Martin (NCSU) When programs are cut in anticipation of budget cuts, and those cuts are not realized, the funds are generally redistributed to other (including) new initiatives. Thus the over-cut/redistribute mechanism can significantly shift priorities with often little faculty input. *E. Murphrey* understands the problem; not sure how it can be addressed; but doesn't believe it is a major issue.

Roy Schwartzman (UNCG) Is it possible to increase F&A authorization to address budget cuts?
A. Watkins F&A are negotiated with funding agencies to address the overhead needs to carry out the sponsored work. F&A are not a mechanism to address general budgets.

Legislative Update. Anita Watkins, Vice President for Governmental Relations (STE-000 1:12:00)

Election year; regardless of election results, the elected body and the leadership will change. This requires effective education of legislators about the University and its priorities. In the current climate, we are playing a lot of defense.

- Budget—particular concern to ensure protection of the academic core.
- Recognize that education is more than 60% of the state budget with about \$3 billion to Universities, \$9 billion to K-12, and \$1 billion to Community Colleges.
- Tuition authority—working to retain tuition authority at university level so tuition \$ don't just go into the state's general fund.
- Financial Aid—historically paid out of the escheats fund. This fund is being depleted and a new source will need to be found.
- Enrollment trends are expected to flatten out some, but it is likely that enrollment growth authorization will be tied to retention and graduation rates.
- F&A while some legislators tend to look at F&A as a “plug for cuts” F&A are dedicated funds negotiated for specific purposes. Understanding F&A requires consistent legislature continuing education.
- Studies are in progress to evaluate the State Health Plan and Retirement and Longevity Pay.
- Implementation of changes in Personnel Records Law. There is some question as to the extent to which these changes are from the current time forward, or if there is need to create records retroactively.

Kimberly Cook (UNCW) Will department heads be given any training with respect to the changes in the personnel laws? *A. Watkins* The HR council is talking about that, and the Office of State Personnel is to give guidelines.

K. Cook Questioned the retroactivity. *A. Watkins* The law can be interpreted to be retroactive, however the committee drafting the law has suggested that its intent was not to be retroactive. This is subject to future legislation to clarify.

K. Cook Are these records issues for dismissals? Or any personnel action? *A. Watkins* Intent is to cover dismissals, salary and promotions.

A. Watkins

Legislative Policy Process. While the budget takes much consideration, GA also works with the legislature on the “non-budget agenda.” Such issues have included the effort to retain energy

savings at the campus level, as well as HR and retirement policy issues. If there are policy issues of concern, they should be submitted through campus processes. They will then submit to GA and the BOG.

Q&A (STE-000 1:28:23)

Linda Florence-Callahan (NCA&T) Is there any possibility of budget \$ to address salary equity issues? *A. Watkins* Campuses have authority to use non-state funds for salary issues. It is unlikely that the legislature will address this.

David Claxton (WCU) How are the Educational Lottery funds being used? *A. Watkins* Historically for financial aid and some K-12 school construction. More information could be provided if requested.

Gary Nallen (UNCA) The Governor had suggested a return of furloughed \$. Is there any chance of this return? *A. Watkins* SENAC pushed this. However, the cost to the state would be significantly greater than the “savings” achieved by the furlough. The Governor has suggested she will look for other ways to compensate employees.

Raymond Burt (UNCW) If enrollment expansion budgets are tied to retention and graduation rates, how will this impact quality of education. *A. Watkins* deferred to A. Mabe for later discussion.

Ken Wilson (ECU) With respect to the new personnel records law, will denial of tenure be included in this records disclosure? *A. Watkins* Did not know if that issue had been decided. *Volker Frank (UNCA)* noted that denial of tenure is an end of contract not a dismissal thus it should not be impacted by the changes in the personnel law.

Stella Anderson (ASU) Furlough authority extends only until June 30, 2011. What will happen next? And does GA favor retaining furlough authority? *A. Watkins* Furloughs are likely to come up as a policy discussion. As to GA’s response, this will be the decision of the new president. President Bowles was committed not to use furlough authority unless there was no other way to fill the budget gap.

Sandi Gravett (ASU) Requested discussion as to how the faculty can help educate the legislature. *A. Watkins*

- Use expertise to communicate to the legislature (e.g. evaluation of SBI labs)
- Tie faculty expertise to policy initiatives. This enhances the connection between the University and the State. (specifically connect to legislative committee chairs)
- Nov. to Jan. considering briefing sessions with legislators.

Vinston Goldman (NCCU) Asked for clarification on how education about tenure was being provided to legislators. *A. Watkins* indicated that she took Lori Tieras along to meet with legislators to describe the tenure process, and specifically differentiated university based tenure from that in the K-12 system.

Academic Updates Alan Mabe, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs (STE-000 1:44:40)

The biennial degree program productivity review is under way. This process is coordinated through the provost offices. The standards for the program productivity are set by the BOG. It was indicated there is understanding that some programs are necessary for a quality education, even if they do not generate specific degrees. It was noted that a regular review, with periodic elimination of programs is necessary to also authorize the creation of new programs. Over the last decade there has been a net gain of about 100 programs. In the last round of program cuts, discontinuations were “voluntary from the campuses.”

In consideration of tying enrollment and performance into a funding formula, there is need to develop criteria to mark what level of success should be required to warrant increased enrollment. Currently the growth controls are largely at the level of freshman enrollment. There are new opportunities with community college transfer. There is some anticipation of additional support if retention/graduation rate success is achieved.

The last decade has seen an increase of 61,000 students. All of this enrollment growth has received full funding through the enrollment funding formula. It is expected that there may be about a three-year reprieve in enrollment growth, but the current estimate is to expect another 50,000 students in the next decade. New campus enrollment targets are being established this year.

The system is addressing the national conversation, which has suggested the need to achieve a post secondary education certificate for 60% of the population. It is recognized that this is an arbitrary target. Current efforts are underway by the University and Community College systems to develop more realistic targets of how many degrees can be produced. It is suggested that it is more reasonable to focus on the total number of degrees being produced rather than just focus on graduation rate or arbitrary percentages.

Q&A (STE-000 2:07:50)

Ellen Jones (UNCG) How is the UNC Tomorrow expected to be manifest in the new administration? *A. Mabe* Tom Ross was on the UNCT commission. He will clearly set the agenda, but much of the substance of UNCT is expected to continue. Much of UNCT has been institutionalized into campuses such as realms of responsibility for tenure.

Steven Bachenheimer (UNC-CH) Should we advocate increasing foreign and out of state enrollment since these populations add tuition revenue? *A. Mabe* The only current limit is limiting the freshman class to 18% out-of-state. Only one campus reaches this limit. It is important to build external capacity without sending a message that NC students should be displaced to open out-of-state or foreign student seats.

Zagros Madjid-Sadjadi (WSSU) If programs are discontinued, what happens to faculty who are not otherwise attached to a department? *A. Mabe* there is a difference between discontinuation

of a major and discontinuation of a department. No faculty should be tied to a major but have no departmental home.

Lloyd Kramer (UNC-CH) With the change in administration, what will happen to the “Bowles Professorships?” (Referring to the president’s faculty recruitment and retention fund.) *A. Mabe* The recruitment and retention fund was made available by the General Assembly, and is to be a rotating fund and is expected to continue. Currently \$9.6 million have been invested in faculty and the fund balance is ~\$0.4 million.

Hunt McKinnon (ECU) Does the 60% post secondary certification require University or Community college degrees? Or could this include a welders certification, for example? *A. Mabe* There is a joint effort by the university and community college system to establish what this certification should be, and what are realistic targets.

Eddy Souffrant (UNCC) Why are faculty always having to justify their relevance? Why isn’t the fair value argument by which it has been stated that for every \$1 invested by the state in higher Ed there is a \$1.67 return, sufficient? *A. Mabe* Erskine Bowles regularly and successfully used this argument.

John Gamble (UNCG) What happened to iSchool, and why were restrictions added at the last minute this year? *A. Mabe* Legislative issues arose at the last minute that could not be resolved in time for the fall semester. Issues seem to revolve around STEM vs. Gen Ed course offerings. *A. Watkins* From the legislative perspective, there is a sense that there may be some double funding of students. The legislature fully funds K-12 students, so funding for iSchool should possibly be included in that funding rather than being an additional cost to the state budget.

Vinston Goldman (NCCU) Inquired about rumor that might require masters degrees to be completed in two years. *A. Mabe* doesn’t know of any such suggested requirements.

Minnie Sangster (NCCU) Are double majors counted in productivity study? *A. Mabe* programs are given credit for student with a single and double major.

Business Session (STE-000 2:32:25)

Chair Gravett requested a sense of the body with respect to possible modification of the by-laws to address term limits for Executive Committee membership. While there is a desire to have maximal participation from diverse delegates, there is also value and need for institutional memory for the Faculty Assembly to function effectively.

A sense of the body was also requested regarding the use of add-hoc committees instead of the standing committees for this session of the Faculty Assembly.

A few comments were voiced in support of the above matters. No objections to either of these points was raised.

Reports on 2009-2010 Resolutions

Res 1-10 Chair Compensation: ASU has not chosen to adopt guidelines in support of the Chair of the Faculty Assembly.

Res 2-10 Communication: no specific action to report.

Res 3-10 Honoring Judith W. Wegner: Judith was present to receive a framed copy of the resolution. She was also presented with the announcement of the Judith W. Wegner Shared Governance fund. It is anticipated that this fund will grow to the level to establish a Shared Governance Award.

New business (STE-001 0:00:00)

Resolution FA Res 6-2010 Academic Freedom

This resolution on academic freedom was drafted by the Executive Committee and was brought to the full assembly for consideration. Chair Gravett brought the resolution to the floor and opened the meeting to discussion.

Raymond Burt (UNCW) raised several issues with respect to the wording of the resolution regarding concerns that the resolution could imply limits to reasonable intuitional review and evaluation. Specific concerns addressed the extent to which academic freedom is a collective responsibility of an institution and its faculty vs. an individual right. There was further concern that it be clear that peer review is the appropriate mechanism for evaluation of scholarship, and that academic freedom protections should in no way be interpreted to exempt one from professional peer review.

There ensued significant discussion focused on developing an understanding of the individual vs. collective institutional nature of academic freedom. Even as an institutional structure, academic freedom is normally applied to individuals. Several delegates raised concern that removing language of individual protection could also be misconstrued to restrict ones scholarship that might not be in the main stream of a discipline. *Zagros Madjd-Sadjadi (WSSU)* suggested language to capture the reasonable need for institutional evaluation while also providing protection of an individual's scholarship. "Protection of academic freedom should not be used as a means to subvert normal professional evaluation." This language was incorporated into the resolution.

Eddy Souffrant (UNCC) noted that both scholarly interests as well as scholarly profession must be protected by Academic Freedom.

Vincent Goldman (NCCU) raised the question as to whether peer review language was intended to suggest that work must be a certain quality to be protected by academic freedom? It was agreed that quality of work is required for promotion and tenure, but academic freedom should not be subject to the same outcomes of peer review as is promotion and tenure.

Sandie Gravett (ASU) noted that the resolution had been given to Erskine Bowles, Alan Mabe and Laura Luger, and noted E. Bowles had asked “Is this a problem?”

Catherine Rigsby (ECU) indicated that at ECU they were undergoing a re-write of the faculty manual. In the re-write of the section on academic freedom, the faculty were told by the university attorney that the academic freedom portion of the faculty manual wouldn't be approved until the university system makes a statement about Academic Freedom. Thus, this is an issue of immediate concern at ECU.

The resolution was put to a vote and passed unanimously.

Reports from add-hoc committees (STE-001 0:44:08)

Furloughs:

Eleven members of the Faculty Assembly met from 1:00 PM to 2 PM to discuss furloughs. This is a summary of some points discussed.

We think that the legislature should be cautious and careful about furloughs. Furloughs have consequences. They mean a reduction in work.

We noted though, that the 2009 10-hour faculty furlough involved the loss of nothing, the loss of no work.

We discussed whether furloughs should be system-wide, or a campus decision. The current year possible furloughs will be campus decisions. We discussed the pros and cons.

We discussed how we might highlight the impact of a faculty furlough. Do we cancel academic activities? Do we cancel classes? We discussed the pros and cons. Someone suggested that we do not attend graduation.

We discussed an alternative to forced furloughs, that is, voluntary furloughs offered to all state employees. There are potentially a lot of people who would want to take time off. If the voluntary furlough does not meet the monetary goal, then the state could then turn to mandatory furloughs. We think that there should be a trigger to initiate a voluntary furlough. This trigger should be put into place ASAP.

Budget:

Legislative Priorities

- **Tuition Waivers for University Dependents**

The UNC system is unusual among public university systems in that there is no tuition benefit for its employees. This is one of multiple components that makes the benefits package as part of total compensation non-competitive. It is anticipated that this would be a low cost means to provide significant value to employee compensation.

- **Instate Tuition for all graduate student employees**

Both teaching assistants and research assistants are university employees that provide significant benefit to the State. Teaching assistants, in particular serve the large undergraduate student population and are critical employees if institutions are to keep the cost of education as low as practicable. The out-of-state tuition cost for teaching and research assistants is a cost currently born out of the GSSP, departmental budgets and grant funds. Currently out of state domestic students may apply for in-state status in their first year of residence, and international students can never achieve in-state status. The

requirement to pay out-of-state tuition rates limits a department and/or institution to recruit students. Providing in-state tuition rates to all graduate student employees will positively impact the quality of education, enhance enrollment possibilities, and positively impact graduate student employee salary in a cost effective manner.

- **Incorporate start-up and infrastructure costs into any modified funding formula**

The current funding formula has been heavily based on student enrollment. This funding formula has effectively provided resources to the University. A critical deficiency of this funding formula that should be addressed in any new funding scheme is the actual cost of start-up for a faculty member as well as the infrastructure cost for required facilities renovation.

- **Develop effective planning for Bond II**

The 2000 Higher Education Bond provided critical infrastructure to all of the UNC campuses. However, that bond only provided funding for one-third of the determined need to bring infrastructure to “par” in 2000. A decade later with a system growth of more than 60,000 students and a large projected growth into the next decade, infrastructure needs are at least as great as they were in 2000. While it is recognized that major capital investments are unlikely in the current budget, it is critical to initiate laying the foundation for a future bond issue to address critical infrastructure.

Issues for consideration by the General Administration

- **Faculty involvement in decision making and planning**

The involvement of faculty in decision making and planning with regard to budget and enrollment matters, for example, is critical, yet inconsistently practiced on various campuses. The Faculty Assembly recommends that General Administration communicate to all respective campuses the expectation to establish an effective budget advisory committee that includes representation from the Faculty Senate, Faculty Assembly, Department Heads, Deans, as well as the CAO and CFO. Similarly an enrollment and university planning advisory committee that includes representatives from the respective faculty governance bodies that as well as the registrar and head of university planning and analysis, should be established.

The budget task force is considering drafting a resolution to this effect.

- **Protection of the Academic Core**

In the 2009/2010 session the Faculty Assembly drafted a white paper providing definition of the Academic Core. This effort also developed a recommended set of metrics by which the protection of the Academic Core can be evaluated. The Budget Committee recommends that

- The white paper be distributed to campus leadership, likely the CAO’s
- Data articulated in the academic core metrics be assembled and regularly tracked. This likely would require a joint effort between a FA subcommittee and GA’s planning and analysis division.

The understanding of the academic core, and supporting data are necessary as critical funding decisions are made. Furthermore, as emphasized in this white paper, it is critical that correct and reliable data is available, which has been reliably tracked over 5-10

years. Understanding trends in academic core metrics will provide for the most effective planning and budgeting decisions.

- **Faculty involvement in Faculty Workload Policy**

We recognize the continued interest by governing bodies in the workload of faculty. At the same time we also recognize that there is often a lack of understanding of the work actually performed by faculty. Therefore, we request that faculty representatives from campus Senates and the Faculty Assembly be included in any body involved in making or revising policy or conducting studies of faculty workloads.

Workplace Innovation:

The Discussion group on Workplace Innovations recommends that the Faculty Assembly examine the potential for innovative explorations of university practices. Three reasons are compelling at this time:

- 1) This would be a means for the assembly and the faculty at large to contribute positively in the face of difficult times
- 2) This would allow faculty to have a measure of control over their own destiny
- 3) With the installation of the new president in January, this is an opportune time for the faculty assembly to be engaged in innovative solutions and developing a cooperative interaction with the new administration.

The committee discussed three possible approaches:

1) Explore innovations – we would identify the various areas in which innovation would focus: During the meeting we listed these topics:

- Sustainability
- Employment options - (4 day work week, shared positions, flexible workloads)
- Technology - telecommunications – (cost-effective applications)
- Faculty support (office usage, departmental budgets, etc)
- Academic policies (enhancing retention and graduation)
- Course and curriculum (trimesters, etc)
- Identifying Administrative flexibilities (classroom scheduling, etc)
- Interdisciplinary work (NC Reach, etc)

2) Use faculty as expert consultants by administration and GA.

3) Proving ground for innovation – have individual campuses pilot some of the innovative ideas

It would be advisable for the Faculty Assembly web presence to be a conduit of information and innovation. The discussion group came up with a wide range of topics and potential strategies during the hour allotted. We recommend that the faculty assembly facilitate a wider exploration of innovative strategies.

State Health Plan:

Recommendations:

- Assemble a blue ribbon panel using university faculty and outside experts to study the State Health Plan. This must include an effort to make more efficient use of state resources.
- Have forums on overall compensation including health care on each campus. Develop a list of talking points for campus discussions.

- Consider not paying insurance administrator on a cost + fee basis.

In discussion following the report, several members of the body recommended that the blue ribbon panel include one or two members of the Faculty Assembly, even if they are not healthcare/insurance experts in order to insure effective communication with the Assembly.

These recommendations were endorsed by the full body of the faculty assembly by a unanimous vote.

Recognition of Kelley Eaves-Boykin-Chair of the Staff Assembly (STE-001 1:05:55)

The four primary areas of activity for this years staff assembly include •staff development •collaboration •communication •community service. The faculty will be invited to participate along with staff and students in food drive campaign sponsored by the Staff Assembly.

Other Business

Zagros Madjd-Sadjadi (WSSU), Chair of the HMI committee noted that the HMI committee has requested to return their meeting time to 8:00 am on days of the Faculty Assembly meetings so as not to conflict with other delegate meetings during the lunch hour.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 pm