

## Minutes of the UNC Faculty Assembly: May 2, 2008

### Attendance:

### Morning Plenary Session.

I. *Chair's Report.* Chair Brenda Killingsworth called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

*Annual Report.* Killingsworth called on Assembly Secretary Judith Wegner to present the draft Faculty Assembly Annual Report for the 2007-08 academic year. The report was approved.

*Size of Campus Delegations.* Killingsworth then commented on changes in the size of campus delegations that would be triggered under the newly-approved charter and bylaws. Killingsworth said that she has been contacted about the system for shifting sizes of campus delegations. She said that there may be small changes that could result in shifts up and down due to modest fractional changes in size of campus faculty. She will refer this matter to the governance committee and executive committee for a report early in fall 2008.

*Chief Academic Officers Meeting.* Killingsworth reported on the recent meeting of the Chief Academic Officers (CAOs), convened periodically by General Administration (GA). She noted that one of the major issues discussed at the meeting was the Faculty Assembly's request to create a joint task force on non-tenure track faculty issues. Harold Martin reviewed the 2002 Non-Tenure-Track Faculty GA Task Force Report (many new provosts are part of this group and were unfamiliar with that prior work). Martin asked for further information from the campuses to be submitted in the next few weeks.

*Budget.* Projections are not yet in on available state revenues (but should be in soon). It's likely that the Governor will be recommending 2% increases for all state employees. There are issues about raises for UNC faculty v. community college faculty v. K-12 teachers (and GA is advocating for UNC faculty to continue to move toward the 80%-ile in salaries). It's likely this will be a shorter session (the Legislature comes in on May 13 and may well conclude its work by late June or early July). Since financial aid is now in the budget, the focus this year is on other issues (including campus safety).

*Branch campuses.* Killingsworth said that the FAEC had presented ideas submitted by the faculty in connection with branch campuses. More details will follow. Harold Martin is appreciative of the faculty's views on these issues. There will also be detailed regulations developed.

*Program planning policy.* This topic will be addressed by Alan Mabe in the afternoon session.

*Other GA priorities.* Killingsworth noted that she has requested access to the work plan/time line tracking information to help the Assembly be aware of what is being worked on. She said that input is welcome.

*Research: competitive funds.* Killingsworth said that priority is given to collaborative projects involving multiple campuses, and to projects related to UNC-Tomorrow goals. There will also be a Faculty Assembly research committee next year.

*School of Science and Math and possible transfer credit.* There will be a task group that addresses the possibility for their students to gain credit when they enroll in system campuses. There will be faculty representation on this task group. Trish Casey (NCSA) raised a similar question for the School of the Arts. Trish Casey volunteered to be on this task group (or to have another NCSA representative appointed).

*COACHE Study on Faculty.* This study will be done as to all campuses, and there will be an opportunity to add questions that address faculty-related issues. Killingsworth said that she plans to appoint a task force on this matter. Jim Martin (NCSU) said that NCSU had done that survey fairly recently, and inquired whether all campuses would be included. Killingsworth said that topic was discussed and she thinks that there is likely to be a system-wide area. She invited volunteers to assist and had several volunteers: Linda Wilson-Jones (FSU), Gloria Elliot (FSU), Brenda Killingsworth (ECU), Ken Wilson (ECU), Eileen Kohlenberg (UNCG), Jim Martin (NCSU).

*Tuition by the credit hour.* Killingsworth said that GA is still working on this matter, with the goal to implement such a system by 2010-2011 (a revenue-neutral system is the goal). Jim Martin (NCSU) raised the question whether there was consensus in support of this approach. Judith Wegner (UNCCH) said that there had been strong disagreement about this in the past. Jim Martin said that there's really reason for concern that movement toward tuition by credit unit, and aggregation of atomistic courses is not the same as a meaningful college education. Jim Martin volunteered to be on such a task force.

*Multi-Campus Institutional Agreement.* Ken Wilson (ECU) asked whether that agreement had been settled. Killingsworth said that she thought so, but that she thinks the question can be put to Alan Mabe who will be here for the afternoon session.

*Resolution Honoring Jim Phillips.* Judith Wegner presented the draft resolution honoring Jim Phillips for his outstanding work as Board of Governors Chair. Several members of the Assembly spoke about his accessibility and commitment in responding to faculty members. The resolution will be presented at the BOG meeting. Mark Taggart suggested some editorial revisions that will be incorporated. The resolution was passed unanimously.

*Dates for 2008-09 Faculty Assembly meetings.* Killingsworth noted that the FA Executive Committee had developed proposed dates for 2008-09 meetings, taking into account BOG meetings and other factors. The proposed dates are September 19, October 24, November 21, January 16, and March 27. There will also likely be monthly Executive Committee meetings in months when there are not Faculty Assembly meetings. Linda Callahan (NCAT) asked whether it would be better to have a May meeting, but said that as long as the FAEC met monthly. Chip Arnold (ASU) asked whether if the BOG met in April then there should not be a later Assembly meeting to respond. There was some discussion about whether it would be better to have a May meeting. Killingsworth stressed that GA is more willing to share information in advance than in the past. She said that she thinks there is less concern on this front than in the past. If the FAEC and other committees stay on top of things, we should be in good shape.

*Approval of Minutes of April 4, 2008.* There were several corrections that will be incorporated. Judith Wegner asked whether it is better to have more detailed minutes or simplified action-oriented minutes. Mark Taggart and Meg Morgan said that they prefer shorter, more action-oriented. Jim Martin said that we could video or audio-record discussions that could be used for archival purposes. SD Stith (ECSU) asked whether such technology would pick up all voices. The Assembly approved the minutes as amended.

*Special Recognition.* Killingsworth recognized George Wilson (NCCU) who recently received the first NCCU faculty service award.

## II. Report of the Nominating Committee

The Chair of Nominating Committee (Mark Taggart, ECU) presented the committee's report.

*Nominations for Chair.* The Committee nominated Gary Jones (WCU) and Judith Wegner (UNCCH). The delegates were invited to add nominations from the floor but none were offered and the nominations were

closed. Each of the candidates spoke. Written ballots were used. After ballots were counted, Mark Taggart reported that Judith Wegner had been elected as chair by a majority of votes.

*Nominations for Vice Chair.* The Committee reported that Catherine Rigsby (ECU) had been nominated. Candidates were invited from the floor. Martha Marking nominated Gary Jones who declined. Trish Casey nominated Subash Shah (WSU) and Nancy Goldsmith seconded. The nominations were closed. Subash Shah was elected.

*Vice Chair for Communications.* The committee had nominated Linda Wilson-Jones (FSU). Trish Casey (NCSA) nominated Ken Wilson (ECU) who agreed to serve. The nominations were closed. Each candidate gave comments. Linda Wilson-Jones was elected.

*Secretary.* SD Stith was nominated by the nominating committee. There were no nominations from the floor. Stith was elected by acclamation.

### III. *Discussion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty Issues*

Killingsworth said that the CAOs are to submit information by the third week of May. Jim Martin asked whether this information would be shared with the members of the Assembly, and Killingsworth said that she would request that that be done. Delegates had been asked to come prepared to speak to the experiences and issues on their campuses.

*ECU.* Ken Wilson (ECU) reported on the ECU process. It took some time to secure and analyze data. A report done by ECU was included in the meeting materials.

*UNC-CH.* Judith Wegner (UNCCH) reported on some of the complexities of non-tenure-track faculty situations at UNC-CH. There are real differences between different roles, disciplines, and situations department/unit by unit/department. Bonnie Yankaskas (UNCCH) spoke more about medical school situations which are even more complicated by funding. Ken Esendshade (NCSU) asked what data is out there regarding race and gender. Judith Wegner said that at UNC-CH the Office of Institutional Research has some of this information posted, and said that there have been other studies related to gender salary equity and faculty retention that include related information. This information is on the UNC-CH Faculty Governance website.

*NCSU.* Jim Martin (NCSU) said that he has been working on these issues and that there are data through the Institutional Assessment site at NCSU and through the AAUP (these data show for NCSU that there are approximately 36% women on the faculty, and only about 17% are tenure-track). Jim Martin reported on NCSU's experience, and NCSU materials are available on the FA website. He said that there are many people who are unfamiliar with prior studies. Jim expressed concerns about policies that have so much flexibility that it's not clear what protections are actually afforded. He said he continues to be concerned about protections for non-tenure-track faculty under the University Code. Definitions are important, differentiating roles (career track or not), etc. One size won't fit all, but we need to build off this information to define rights, procedural protections, etc.

*WCU.* Sharon Jacques (WCU) is in nursing and they have many of the same issues as is the case for medical schools. They have departmental guidelines. There can be clinical teaching faculty versus tenure-track (Ph.D) faculty working on research. There is no one size at the campus or system level, and much has to be dealt with at the unit level.

*NC School of the Arts.* Trish Casey (NCSA) said that their faculty is by definition non-tenure-track, so they are at stake unless there adequate protections. Nancy Goldsmith (NCSA) also spoke about the situation at NCSA. They were created by legislation in the 1960's. The original idea was that faculty would have one foot

in the classroom and one foot in the performing arts. It was recognized that those who would be the best instructors would not necessarily have Ph.Ds. They are therefore all “instructors.” It was envisioned initially that the faculty would turn over frequently. What has happened instead is that although there has been a good deal of administrative turn-over, the faculty has stayed in place because they love their work. The faculty are aging a bit. They’re seeing a greater number of adjunct and visiting faculty members. Their philosophy has always been to have a strong full-time faculty, because that approach serves the students best. That way they can attend to the educational progression and emotional situation of their students. What is happening currently, with a new administration, they are seeing very rapid change.. There is a proposal for the BOG on May 9 to change their name to “The University of North Carolina School of the Arts,” and there has been some controversy. They have been on a trimester calendar since their founding. With pushing from their administration, the faculty just voted to move to semester calendar. For many years, in policies and reports for the University System, the NCSA often is marked with an asterisk (and they’re happy to have the NC School of Math and Science join them in the system). They’re concerned that with this asterisk, they have not been able to share fully in the system unless they move to have tenure. Their faculty has voted twice not to have tenure, but there is additional pressure to move that way.

*UNC Charlotte.* Meg Morgan (UNCC) said that the original UNC System report on non-tenure-track faculty came out in 2002. She has not noted any focused attention to this document. Anything that has changed has been at the college or departmental level. She’s in English and has run the writing program, with many part-time faculty members who teach just one course, and are hired at semester at a time. They have part-time faculty who get \$2,000 per section (responsible for teaching 30 students), and those instructors have to review multiple papers that are rewritten. Those faculty members may teach four sections per semester. Morgan has urged that those in this situation could be appointed at least for a year’s term, teach three sections per semester, and get benefits. She thinks we should focus on departments who rely heavily on many part-time faculty members to see how we treat our part-time faculty. Jim Martin (NCSU) commented that he had heard observations about the need for departmental flexibility. He stressed that there are things that should not be allowed to departments (for example, you should not be able to fire someone based on malice).

*Appalachian State University.* Martha Marking (ASU) said that increasingly non-tenure-track faculty are on personnel committees. They’ve been dealing with this situation at ASU and trying to change the situation in order to address related concerns. There may be some controversy. Their faculty senate has recently completed a report that they will share. Their committee had a very wide-ranging committee representation.

*UNC Wilmington.* Raymond Burt (UNCW) said that there are many instructors whose yearly appointments just keep rolling over with resulting questions about long-term status. There are tensions with tenure-track faculty. Shortly after the 2002 GA report, they began trying to clean up titles and setting up a system for promotion that would lead to a “senior lecturer” title. Now, there is a one-term contract that can be renewed, then a move to three-year contract, and after that a department can recommend promotion to senior lecturer with a recurring number of three-year contracts and raises. One of the new issues has arisen with regard to growth in nursing, green sciences, etc. where there have been more titles and differing roles. The UNCW HR department started to define “faculty” in terms of number of hours in the classroom, and has been suggesting that they be classified as “EPA non-faculty” (if out supervising students in the schools). There’s really a need to be clear on who defines such things.

*UNC Asheville.* Peg Downes (UNCA) said that they have had non-tenure track faculty on key committees (e.g. Faculty Senate). There have been moves to five-year contracts. They have a position-allocation committee that now has more faculty involvement. Gwen Ashburn said that non-tenure-track faculty and lecturers are covered by this committee.

*NCCU.* George Wilson (NCCU) said that they are facing situations in which faculty are hired with a great deal of money. They won’t come without tenure. Departments have to give up positions to take people in this situation. This came up with regard to pharmaceutical science. He wondered whether others have had

that situation. Gary Jones (WCU) asked how those appointments were being made. Wilson said that they're trying to be sure that they go through such appointments processes (but that has not always been the case).

*NC A&T.* Cynthia Gillespie-Thompson (NCAT) said that they are facing some challenges because some faculty members do only research, or only teaching, rather than all the traditional roles.

*FSU.* Chet Dilday (FSU) said that they have recently received funding to create an Masters in Social Work (MSW) program within the Army. They now have faculty based at Fort Sam Houston in Texas who are FSU faculty. These faculty members are military officers. It's not clear how the situation will be handled. They tried to interview some of these people as potential faculty members (by video) but the army is already moving people in/hiring them without faculty consideration at FSU. If he reads the UNC-Tomorrow recommendations correctly, there may be more pressure for non-tenure-track people to be appointed (e.g. working with community colleges). He recently was on a committee to select someone for the CIO position. They considered a candidate from the University of Central Florida, who said that at his school they have a permanent staff for support, and they use mostly adjuncts. Many of these folks inquire about what their role is in various respects (role on campus, committees, and so forth).

*Discussion of Next Steps.* Judith Wegner (UNCCH) asked for thoughts about composition of the task force. Kathy Crowe (UNCG) said that their librarians are tenure-track, but others said that their librarians are not tenure-track. Trish Casey said that she hoped that someone from NCSA would be on the task group. SD Stith said that he thought it would be a really extensive undertaking. Killingsworth said that this effort would be a joint one with GA. Stith said at ECSU he had raised the question why someone with a high salary who was an administrator was treated as a lecturer. All of these categories may raise questions. How do people get put into these various categories? Stith said that the Faculty Assembly wouldn't have requisite resources to deal with this study. He stressed again that he can't get information about why the positions are as such. He wants GA to request that information. Killingsworth said that this will be a joint task force to address such matters. Jim Martin (NCSU) said that it is difficult here to get into details at this juncture. We need maybe a dozen people on the task force, but there's also need for broader hearings and so forth. Judith Wegner said that there may be need to put in resources, but also to focus on faculty insights (similar to the Scholars Council). Jim Martin said that it would be wise to include good deans/department chairs that have insights to really make things work. Mark Taggart said that there are fixed-term faculty members who have moved into tenure track positions. The Assembly will return to these questions in the fall.

#### *IV. Recognition of Chair Brenda Killingsworth*

Bonnie Yankaskas (UNCCH) and Gary Jones (WCU) who had served as vice chairs with Killingsworth came to the front to recognize and thank her for her service. Judith Wegner (UNCCH) presented a resolution in Killingsworth's honor which the delegates unanimously adopted. President Erskine Bowles spoke about Killingsworth's contributions to helping him with the transition into his role as University President, her stalwart service in attending all UNC Tomorrow sessions and listening forums, and the respect she had earned from members of the Board of Governors. He said that she would be recognized again at the June 2008 Board of Governors, when she completes her term as Faculty Assembly Chair.

**Lunch Session: Elections of Executive Committee Representatives by Campus Clusters.** Delegates were asked to sit at lunch with colleagues from campuses of similar size so that each "caucus" could elect a member of the Executive Committee as required under the new bylaws. Campus clusters are as follows: 2-delegate campuses (ECSU, NCSA, NCSSM, UNCA); 3-delegate campuses (FSU, NCCU, UNCP, WCU, WSSU); 4-delegate campuses (ASU, NCAT, UNCW); 5-delegate campuses (ECU, NCSU, UNCC, UNCCH, UNCG).

#### **Afternoon Session**

*I. Presentation by Associate Vice President Alan Mabe.*

Chair Killingsworth reconvened the meeting. She said that Vice President Mabe would report on several topics on behalf of himself and others who were not able to be in attendance at the meeting.

*UNC Tomorrow.* Mabe said that phase I reports came in from the campuses on May 1. Tony Caravan and Norma Houston will distill key information and hope to summarize by May 29 for internal review, and then present the information to the BOG in time for its June meeting. On June 16, there will be feedback provided to the campuses. Mark Taggart (ECU) asked whether the responses of the campuses would be posted on line? Mabe said that faculty senate presidents and individual campuses might be able to have access, but they don't want to have full open distribution yet. Lora Holland said that she had tried to log on individually and thought that there would be password-based access. Judith Wegner (UNCCH) asked whether the BOG would take action on anything related to UNC-Tomorrow in May, June or over the summer? Mabe said that Norma Houston hoped to identify material that was information-only, and things that were for action.

*Tuition by the Credit Hour.*

Mabe said that the Finance Division at General Administration (GA) is now taking the lead on this matter. For background, there are two models: one for on-campus (live) courses, and another (based on credit hour) for those taking on-line courses. There is block tuition for residents (12 hours base, but as many more as may be desired). On some campuses, if you hit the 12 hour base, and then take an on-line course, enrollment may be allowed without more cost, but on others there may be an additional cost for distance-based courses (and that may be the case for those from other campuses). Some campuses are considering having certain majors available on-line (students would take general education at one site, but then their students might take a major at another campus on-line). This approach may be useful for particularly expensive majors. Almost everyone thinks there should be a move either in the block approach or tuition by the credit hour. There is a sense that GA is really going to pursue this matter now. The earliest implementation will be a few years away. They've discovered through their inter-institutional work that there's a lot of involvement that is required with advisers, registrars, and so forth. If they hit a road block, they might back up, but they're now moving ahead. Someone from NCSU has done a white paper that outlines all the things that need to be done in order to work this out.

Jim Martin (NCSU) asked whether there's now been a decision to proceed with per credit hour system? He thinks there is a need to resolve on-line costs. But a per credit hour system isn't the only solution. Mabe said that CAOs had voted two years ago with consent of all but one to support the change. Mabe said that they are going to move ahead. Those in GA think they don't know enough yet about how feasible this approach ultimately be. He thinks that once such systems are implemented they return to some sort of balance. Judith Wegner (UNCCH) said that there was considerable concern on this front two years ago and that there were significant faculty concerns about how such a system might disadvantage poorer students or skew choices of courses and majors. She said that the methodology used by GA in purportedly identifying national norms on tuition systems at that time was flawed. She said that there had not been adequate input from faculty members. Mabe acknowledged possible disagreements. He said that there might be better financial breaks for students in the new approach.

Sharon Jacques (WCU) said that the "per credit hour" proposal seems to be a way to raise the tuition without making such hikes visible. Mabe said the goal would be to be revenue neutral. Jacques asked how fees would be addressed. Mabe said it may depend. Different campuses do this in different ways.

Jim Martin (NCSU) asked whether there was any assurance that pedagogy and quality would trump business decisions. Mabe said that the availability of on-line offerings and the system "quality control

council” would provide assurances in this regard. The question is what is in the best interest of the student. The goal is to incentivize so that students can take advantage of opportunities.

Gary Jones (WCU) said that if there is information on quality oversight of on-line offerings could that information be made available to faculty members. Mabe said that President Bowles had directed Mabe to assure quality. Mabe told provosts to assure quality. Each provost identified someone from their campus to be part of the on-line quality council. Jimmy Reeves (UNCW) is the Faculty Assembly’s representative to this group. The quality council thinks that they will be able to address this matter by fall. There’s a need to assure the world out there that we’re paying attention to quality. In the UNC Online website, there are references to SACS and so forth. If the quality control council comes up with something it will be circulated for comment. Jones stressed that we must not lose the “quality of the brand” for UNC programs. Mabe said that it’s a moving target, the council is learning from each other, and so forth. Ken Wilson (ECU) said that the logical place to assure quality is in the department where the course is being offered. At ECU in his department, they’ve implemented a peer review process. Mabe said that he agreed with that view. Mabe’s field is philosophy and knows he cannot judge other fields. He thinks, however, that peers can review things and provide a basis for judging quality.

Jim Martin (NCSU) said that his concern about quality isn’t just about on-line matters. He doesn’t assume that on-line means low quality. One of his concerns is that payment by the credit hour disadvantages their best students. Mabe said that there’s no indication that practices using one approach is better than the other. Martin said he’d like to see the data.

Linda Callahan (NCAT) said that she’d like more history and information on the basis for the effort to move away from block tuition. Mabe said that the legislature funds on-line offerings by the credit hour. If on-line education is something that UNC wants to do, we need to make it possible for students to have incentives to take offerings elsewhere on-line. Block tuition incents students to take courses on campus, and they want to give incentives to take courses at other schools on line. He thinks that having on-line majors is desirable. Everything that supports high-quality majors is desirable.

Andy Koch (ASU) asked Mabe whether he really meant to say that GA intended to push for only some campuses to provide majors in physics or philosophy, and so that other campuses would have their students be served there. Mabe mentioned radiology. Koch said let’s get back to core disciplines in the liberal arts. Are you intending to farm those out too? Mabe said that there’s a German consortium because there are insufficient German majors on each campus. Mabe said that the existing system is not subject to generalization. Settings in which such an arrangement makes sense would be for high-cost majors or when faculty come together to suggest collaborations. Jim Martin (NCSU) asked Mabe about high-cost programs. Mabe said that typically high-cost programs involve high-cost equipment, labs, and intensive work that is not susceptible to on-line delivery. Mabe said that GA wants to figure out ways to do these things by moving students around (noting ECSU and UNCCH pharmacy program). Mabe concluded this segment by saying he wished that Vice President for Finance Rob Nelson had been presenting today. He said he would take the Assembly’s views back to Rob Nelson and others.

#### *Funding model review.*

Mabe said that there’s a task group working on the topic of funding formulas (linked to nature of academic field and level of programs). Chief of State Jeff Davies is chairing it. It’s common to do such a review periodically. For example, the last time a review was done, nursing was recognized as more expensive and was moved up in the funding formula to the same level as engineering. National data supported this move. Data for the UNC System showed that nursing cost more than engineering. The process is slowing down a bit and won’t be ready for the current legislative session. If the group has any recommendations, they’ll be vetted through various channels. Mabe said he thought the current formula is good and has carried the system through difficult times. That’s not the case in other states. This model includes costs beyond

instructional costs (UNC's covers libraries and so forth). UNC's base funding is now included in the continuation budget. He thinks it's best not to mess with something that functioning.

A delegate from UNCC said that many faculty on their campus feel that they're being funded at a very low level and are going to be expected to add substantial numbers of students without needed resources. Mabe said that the current model is based on student credit hours by level and discipline. It may be helpful to have a presentation on this at some point. GA uses data drawn from the teaching load protocol developed by the University of Delaware. He thinks there are different costs for engineering v. philosophy, and there are differences between doctoral level v. bachelors. The real question may be at what level and mix of degree programs exist on given campuses. If you're in a high-cost discipline you have to love this formula. No one ever says that there are enough resources. Another delegate asked whether the details of the formula, disciplines, levels, etc. exist somewhere. Isn't there a spreadsheet somewhere? Mabe said that the funding is by campus, and they sum the numbers. He said that a full-blown presentation might be wise.

Trish Casey (NCSA) asked how the funding formula worked for a campus with a high-school component. Mabe said that first professional schools are funded differently (not based on per credit hour). The School of the Arts is on a different funding formula. Why? Because it just is! The consultants in 1967 or so just held out the first professional programs. Any medical-related program is very, very expensive. They thought that including such fields in the overall formula would just distort the data for undergraduate programs. Mabe said that for campuses offering on-line courses to high school students, funding comes from the Department of Public Instruction and is not always received in a timely way. UNCG recently reported that they've just (May 1) received funding for spring term. But the funding approach includes the university formula.

Mark Spauling (UNCW) asked about projections for budget cuts. Mabe said that VP for Finance Rob Nelson thinks that the Governor may recommend a 3/4% cut, but often the legislature doubles or triples that. There have been changing projections. We're likely to experience funding cuts. When there are cuts, that money is used as a way to fund other things in election years. They also expect enrollment growth funding.

Brenda Killingsworth (ECU) asked about last year's experience with holding on to unfilled positions. Mabe said that the legislature may try to reclaim positions open for more than 6 months. GA's Finance Division is trying to suggest strategies to the campuses. Positions that have been open for more than a year may be particularly vulnerable. Chancellors have met and will do what they can to reduce such exposure. The General Assembly gets data on this kind of thing. If there is a percentage cut then campuses may allocate cuts as they choose.

Ken Wilson (ECU) asked about a Heritage Foundation report that purportedly says were' not teaching students or helping generate funds. It's a poorly done study. They have averaged student graduation rates across the whole system. GA is developing talking points for Erskine Bowles and hope to have that by this coming Monday. A professor from OSU (Vetter) is the one who did the analysis. Mabe said that it's very poor work and GA will be able to show the flaws. On the other hand, UNC is quite well funded (among the top handful in the country). What the report purports to do is to show that we're well-funded and that we have poor graduation rates. NC has an anomaly. Here in NC, public university graduation rates are higher than private universities (and this study blends them both).

#### *Branch campuses.*

Mabe then discussed branch campuses, standing in for Senior Vice President Harold Martin. Are we going to have a slew of branch campuses? Probably not. The earliest development will likely be at a couple of sites in the state (UNCW probably with Jacksonville and Coastal Carolina Community College on the latter's site). He wouldn't expect a lot of separate branch campuses. The UNC-Tomorrow report says that

UNC must serve all areas of the state equally, and he does not believe that the System does that now. UNC campuses are now offering degrees in 53 counties. UNC colleagues drive to teach away from their campuses, and we may be at the maximum in terms of viability of asking people to drive. There are more degree programs and certificate programs in the pipeline and that may be an answer in some parts of the state. They've also been working on on-line access centers. One of the problems may be for people who are middle-aged, who don't always think that on-line approaches work for them. Scott Rawls is the new president of the NCCC system. He'd like their system to be a partner and provide sites in various locales. For many people, if they get support for the first couple of courses they will be able to move on from there. Hickory has an on-line learning center where several campuses have offerings.

Jim Martin (NCSU) asked whether anyone has made the argument that it's just not possible to have university offerings at every point in the state. The community college system was geared to doing that. This starting point just doesn't make sense as to what the university system is? Mabe said, but what about the northeastern part of the state? Martin said there would be need for resources. Mabe said it's daunting, but we can't ignore it. Serving every part of the state doesn't mean that everything is available at every place. There might be some set of majors available but not others. There are also on-line offerings. As to nursing, there are face-to-face programs spread around the state, but you can get a masters' degree from anywhere on-line. He recognizes that there are some degrees that cannot be put on-line. There are 600 students in an on-line MBA program. People may not be prepared to take advantage of that. UNCC plans to put all the pre-requisites of an on-line MBA program on-line. Mabe said we can provide a good deal of teacher preparation on-line.

*Program Planning Process.* Mabe said that he appreciated that the Assembly had worked hard on this topic at its last meeting, and said that the points recommended by the Assembly for inclusion in the program planning policy had been carefully considered. Not everything was included. He thinks that the key aspects are there. He noted, for example, that language was added about involving faculty members in pointing to where their disciplines are going. The other point is that in these processes of review, faculty expertise is essential at the campus and system level. That was an effort to address key points raised by the faculty. Richard Burt (UNCW) said that the group last time had more detail regarding the content, design, priorities for degree programs. That really focuses on what the core elements of faculty role needs to be. Why was there a shift to generic language ("sound decision-making"). Mabe said that this document is not about changing anything that is going on at the campus level. It is a higher level general conception at the System level. The faculty role at the system level will relate to priorities and more. The BOG will address this topic at its May meeting. GA will then proceed with regulations with more detail and GA will consult with the Assembly.

## II. *Executive Committee Elections*

*Members elected from campus clusters.* The following election results were reported based on secret ballots taken within campus clusters during the lunch period: campuses with 5 delegates (Ken Wilson, ECU); campuses with 4 delegates (Raymond Burt, UNCW); campuses with 3 delegates (George Wilson, NCCU); campuses with 2 delegates (Jamie Latham, NCSSM).

*Members elected at large.* The following candidates were nominated for election to the two at-large Executive Committee seats: Sandie Gravett (ASU), John Dixon (ECSU), Jim Martin (NCSU), Richard Beam (WCU), Greg Starrett (UNCC). Jim Martin and Greg Starrett were elected.

## III. *Resolution on Potential External Influence of University Curriculum*

Greg Starrett (UNCC, chair of the academic freedom and tenure committee) and Gary Jones (WCU, vice chair) presented the resolution. Starrett stressed that the goal of the resolution is not to address the BBT/Ayn Rand controversy on some campuses. Instead, the thrust of the resolution is that there should be

a joint effort at the system level to develop guidelines. The resolution presented was originally developed by Gary Jones for WCU, but has been modified with particular input from Andy Koch (ASU) and Greg Starrett (UNCC).

Starrett noted that there were two changes in the resolution text as provided. The first two lines should now read: “Be it resolved by whatever process deemed most efficient, the UNC Faculty Assembly *approach* representatives of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and *work with* UNC General Administration Academic Affairs....”

Paul Koch (ASU) noted news articles on the BBT situation referencing gifts to a number of campuses in order to encourage exposure of students to the work of Ayn Rand. He had asked for written documents and was told there were none. The chancellor and provost have said that giving books to students is not “curriculum.” Koch urged faculty to really pay attention because these actions undermine the integrity of the curriculum. He stressed that advancement/development offices should be asked for information and said that these documents should be public record.

Starrett said that Gary Jones has put a good deal of information on Gary Jones’ website ([http://paws.wcu.edu/gjones/GIFTS\\_affectingthecurriculum\\_Links.htm](http://paws.wcu.edu/gjones/GIFTS_affectingthecurriculum_Links.htm)). The resolution was moved and seconded. The resolution was unanimously adopted. The resolution will be posted and distributed to CAOs as soon as possible.

#### IV. *Concluding Remarks by Outgoing Assembly Chair Brenda Killingsworth*

Killingsworth offered concluding remarks.

She first reflected on the contributions of past Chairs of the Assembly. She remembered Lolly Gasaway who did a good deal of work on intellectual property. Richard Veit worked on developing principles/best practices on shared governance. Jeff Passe worked on getting Faculty Assembly more involved with the Board of Governors and becoming a presence. The Assembly passed resolutions but they didn’t get much traction.

During Killingsworth’s time, with a new President being selected, the Assembly (particularly the executive committee), stepped in and developed a set of concerns/issues, then distributed these to a dozen people at GA. The priorities articulated touched on a range of GA offices.

Once Erskine Bowles arrived, things moved ahead significantly. Earlier on, there was just one meeting on one day with the President and Vice President regarding budget and nothing more. Bowles met with the whole FA Executive Committee (FAEC) and went around the room to hear concerns. There were many promises made. Bowles asked the FAEC to develop a booklet showing what faculty typically do with their time. He and the BOG used this booklet to lobby with the legislature for faculty support. Cat Warren (NCSU) was critical in this effort. Erskine Bowles and his staff agreed to meet with Faculty Assembly representatives more often and they agreed. Killingsworth said that it seems that the FAEC have more time with Bowles than the BOG or the provosts. This is important to get across a range of views.

Jeff Passe had urged that the Chair of the Assembly be invited to BOG socials. He had not had that opportunity. He’d been at MacDonald’s instead rather than with members of the Board of Governors, even though he attended the BOG meetings. Bowles agreed that the Chair, Vice Chair and officers could be invited as well. More opportunities to connect and share viewpoints resulted. She’d often get informal inquiries. The BOG really seemed to crave getting viewpoints even if they didn’t always enjoy hearing them. Changes in the FAEC will assure that all sorts of campuses have a voice. The FAEC has also been working with Harold Martin (senior VP) and urges inclusion of faculty on task forces and committees to avoid problems later. The Assembly now gets initial drafts, and the Assembly has a voice and has resulted in

changes. Jim Sadler was especially helpful in working through the post-tenure review policy. There is an opportunity for input instead of things being a “done deal.”

Killingsworth recognized the work of the self-study task force, particularly that of Bonnie Yankaskas (UNCCH) and Gary Jones (WCU). It is important to have responsive and proactive opportunities. Task forces generally did good work. We now have meetings of the faculty senate chairs as a group. Killingsworth said that in this way there was a chance to work more effectively with faculty senates. There’s now a workspace for Faculty Assembly (and BOG) at GA.

The chair of the Assembly now attends Chief Academic Officer meetings and social events. Provosts thus here Faculty Assembly issues and views. In addition, the Chair has been invited to sit at the table for Educational Policy and Planning meetings. We’re getting key documents at least as soon as BOG and Chancellors.

Killingsworth noted that the Assembly increased faculty presence at the Legislature under Wegner’s leadership and key members of the Assembly participated and made a difference. The Assembly also did work with the NC Community Colleges, and Killingsworth thanked Meg Morgan (UNCC), Eileen Kohllenberg (UNCG), Judith Wegner (UNCCH) for their work on key issues. She noted that there had the first formal gathering of Assembly leaders and leaders of the NCCC Faculty Association.

Killingsworth said that, through our success working with General Administration, and the the Chancellors see, we are creating a sense that the Assembly does good thorough work, and that it’s best to involve faculty early on.

Killingsworth said that the Assembly next needs to take this effort to the campus level. Our governance committee is going to continue to work on shared governance with CAOs to get buy in and implementation.

Killingsworth said that, as a body, the Assembly should always remember that these changes came about because we worked hard, systematically, with one voice, and based on assumptions of good faith. Erskine Bowles and Harold Martin have clearly shown good faith. Our contributions have really been taken to heart. We need to continue in this vein. We need to continue to work steadily toward change. Each individual in the Assembly can really make a difference and they will hear. There’s great leadership coming behind, and we need continue to work in good faith. She concluded by saying that it had been a privilege and an honor to serve as the Assembly’s chair.

Killingsworth received a standing ovation. A reception followed during which she was given a captain’s chair in honor of her contributions.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith Welch Wegner, Faculty Assembly Secretary

For consideration at the September 19, 2008 Faculty Assembly meeting