

Minutes of the Faculty Assembly

University of North Carolina 143rd Session of the Faculty Assembly November 16, 2007

Minutes of the Faculty Assembly November 16, 2007

Attendance: Brenda Killingsworth, chair, (ECU); Gary Jones, vice chair (WCU); Judith Wegner, secretary (UNCCH); Chip Arnold (ASU); Martha Marking (ASU); Susan Staub (ASU); John Cope (ECU); Catherine Rigsby (ECU); Mark Taggart (ECU); Ken Wilson (ECU); S.D. Stith (ECSU); Blanche Radford-Curry (FSU); Chet Dilday (FSU); Jon Mattox (FSU); Linda Florence Callahan (NCA&T); Derrek Dunn (NCA&T); Cynthia Carlton Thompson (NCA&T); Laura Onafowora (NCCU); Timothy Seigler (NCCU); George Wilson (NCCU); Trish Casey (NCSA); David McHugh (NCSA); Jamie Lathan (NCSSM); Dan Teague (NCSSM); Nina Allen (NCSU); Dennis Daley (NCSU); Ken Esbenschade (NCSU); Janet Hudson (NCSU); Scott McRae (NCSU); Gwen Ashburn (UNCA); Peg Downes (UNCA); Pete Andrews (UNCCH); Steven Bachenheimer (UNCCH); Joe Templeton (UNCCH); Bonnie Yankaskas (UNCCH); Rosemary Booth (UNCC); Sonya Hardin (UNCC); Sallie Ives (UNCC); Meg Morgan (UNCC); Hazel Brown (UNCG); Paul Duvall (UNCG); Ellen Jones (UNCG); Jeffery Geller (UNCP); Chet Jordan (UNCP); David Zeigler (UNCP); Tammy Hunt (UNCW); Mark Spaulding (UNCW); Raymond Burt (UNCW); Richard Beam (WCU); Sharon Jacques (WCU); Rita Edwards (WSSU); George Heilman (WSSU); Subash Shah (WSSU)

I. The FAEC met with President Bowles and Harold Martin at 8:30 a.m.

II. **First Plenary Session.** The first plenary session was called to order by Chair Brenda Killingsworth at 9:35 a.m.

1. **UNC Tomorrow.**

a. *Introduction by Tony Caravano.*

Killingsworth introduced UNC Tomorrow Deputy Director Tony Calavano and Scholars Council member Tom Ricketts (UNC-CH Sheps Center). Caravano reported that there will be updated summaries of the eleven faculty listening forums on the UNC Tomorrow website (<http://www.nctomorrow.org/>). He also said that everyone was very impressed by the attendance of the faculty at these sessions. Norma Houston also asked that he extend thanks for the work done in attending with little notice. They are still receiving input by e-mail and it is being pulled together into the overall database. He also wanted to thank Brenda Killingsworth for attending all community listening and faculty forums. Caravano said that the drafting of the report is now underway. The Scholars Council is working on the draft. The final report will be out by December 6 (and is now on the UNC Tomorrow website listed above). Caravano reported that during the last commission meeting, they had commissioners divide into four groups. They discussed public input and research from Scholars Council. The final commission meeting is set for December 6. Information will be available on their website. Caravano then showed a new video based on the community listening forums.

b. *Presentation by Tom Ricketts (member of the Scholars Council).*

Tom Ricketts said that he is on the UNC-CH faculty in public health and social medicine; he's also on the Scholars Council. The Council's charge is to advise the Commission. People have asked him what's going to happen. He believes that President Bowles will use the information to move toward strategic change. Ricketts explained that those who attended the community listening forums felt that the University would listen and do something. Those attending spoke from their hearts. They wanted the University to do what it could do, and also wanted to give advice about what the University should do. Those attending brought a sense of frustration and expectation. They asked for imagination, inspiration, application. The forums included comments on what was wrong (economy, schools, etc.). Frustration was created by losing jobs (university says it does something about the economy). They also spoke about culture (they wanted arts and culture shared in communities). They were frustrated by the alienation of young people and the inability of schools to engage them. They were frustrated by the lack of leadership in some communities (saying that there is a need for community and entrepreneurial skills; and indicating that they knew that there were gaps in skills). They had an expectation that the University would deal with the great problems of the day (they brought the problems and thought the university had the imagination to deal with them). They wanted inspiration for moving toward change. They wanted more than imaginative ideas, but wanted to bring about change.

Ricketts said that's where the application comes in. That's true with regard to K-12 education, the economy (and the need to create skills). Quality of life was brought up (they asked for arts to be included in outreach efforts of the

universities). They were also concerned about the quality of the environment, and want the University's science to make their local environment better. They were concerned about global competition (and asked that the University help them understand and act). They want the University to address the big problems. They had specific ideas. They wanted to have the University reach out to them, be open for access, consider using branch campuses, assure that admissions are open, affordable, and understandable. They also want access to masters' degree programs to get ahead. They think that the University should be concerned with continuity of education. They also think that there's need for entrepreneurship education but need it in their own communities. They're interested in areas in demand (health sciences, engineering). They're concerned that graduates be able to communicate. They want an emphasis on arts and humanities. They want the quality of graduates to be raised. They want workplace skills as well. They trust the university with their frustrations. They'd like a living/learning center in the mountains, and interdisciplinary approaches to aging. They saw themselves as customers, taxpayers. They were asking for service, and higher quality. They wanted faculty to do their jobs better. They know that there's an indirect benefit from the university, but they see that their problems are the big problems.

Ricketts said that he'd recently had a junior colleague say that it was difficult to address local problems and publish in international journals. Ricketts referenced the work of Cecil Sheps and his local contributions and international role. He thinks that in the end the things that will make a difference to faculty members as human beings concern making a difference in people's lives, in their hearts and minds. He's focusing now on getting the job done. It's important to structure the incentives.

c. Comments and Questions from the Floor.

Pete Andrews (UNC-CH) asked about getting the text of the earlier video (with statistics). Caravano said that's on the website and would make link available (see above). The statistics are drawn from Scholars Council papers. Andrews noted that what he'd heard from the film and from Ricketts was much broader than indicated in the business leaders' paper (which focused on job-market skills). Andrews thought that education for leadership and citizenship was important. Ricketts noted that citizenship had not come up very often, but many people talked about parks, communication, writing, and appreciating local conditions. Ricketts said that many business leaders understood the broader issues and spoke to those points in the community listening forums. Caravano said that there are many other avenues and other groups that have spoken.

Subash Shah (WSU) said that it might be well to have some of those entrepreneurs come to campus to speak with and motivate students regarding the importance of key skills Ricketts said that people in the field said they would like to help.

Steve Bachenheimer (UNC-CH) asked how the political process played into the discussion. Ricketts said the discussion was elevated, and suggested that the University needs to tell the politicians that. The mood was that things can get done if we contribute to the political discourse in the way that we can. The citizens want an intellectual process not a political one. The political forces were in a corner.

Scott McRae (NCSU) said that he asks questions on exams that involve policy analysis as well as quality of communication. Ricketts said that not everyone can do that. His junior colleague may need to get tenured and will see more options. There was not really an effort to challenge the ivory tower. The public felt that there was a conversation that could be had. They expected us to be an open system that could converse. Ricketts said that the UNC-CH student body president asked what they could do as students. Ricketts thought that he'd say that professors might tie in with community organizations, needs, problems.

Linda Florence Kelly (NCAT) said "what's the next step"? Caravano said that the first step is what needs to be done, then in the spring the question will be how to address needs. GA hasn't been prescriptive about how that should work, but will be appointing campus response teams early in spring semester. Killingsworth said that the Assembly would devote time this afternoon on that topic.

Ken Wilson (ECU) said that a sociologist had noted that there's no conflict between teaching and research if resources to do both. We do need the resources, and some of these goals may conflict. For example, there are expectations of greater productivity (so larger class sizes). Adding written assignments is more difficult with larger classes. These are legitimate conflicts. Ricketts said that people have commented that the legislature may have to address the funding issues. People said that there was a clear understanding of the value and the need for an exchange and support to make things happen. There are shared and interrelated responsibilities.

David McHugh (NCSA) noted that they'd had a speaker ("Out of Our Minds", Sir Ken Robinson) addressing global perspectives and the need for imagination (young children see themselves as creative/imaginative, but college graduates don't think of themselves as creative/imaginative). He strongly recommended the speaker's book. Ricketts said that there was more discussion about critical thinking at the forums than he's heard in years. People understand the importance of breadth and creativity and behavior in their comments. Ricketts thinks we're being asked to revive that creativity.

Caravano noted that Bowles will discuss faculty listening forums this afternoon. Killingsworth noted that people should send ideas to Caravano and Norma Huston.

2. **Rob Nelson, VP for Budget and Finance.**

a. *Sustainability.*

Nelson said he'd been asked to report on this topic. They've been moving slowly (he was apologetic). The number of initiatives going on has kept them hopping at GA and on the campuses. Sustainability has risen as an area of concern. There's an internal committee working on these issues, but it's going very slowly and needs to be more active. He noted that several Chancellors cautioned that GA should know what they're asking for (and think it through, including resource implications). He said that there has been a legal mandate for consideration of efficiency for some time, but what gets cut when push comes to shove is energy efficiency (he's been working with people in facilities on this). UNC Tomorrow has raised these issues. GA was involved during the legislative session with some key bills. They met with Senator Cowell from Wake County on these issues, and GA has charged campuses to report on how they're responding to guidelines in that bill. The state has a program in which energy providers come in and do a professional energy audit, and the savings are guaranteed, so that there can be bonds/borrowing against the anticipated savings with the borrowing them repaid from energy savings. The State Treasurer could authorize such certificates of participation (UNCG has pioneered this effort, it was difficult but appears to be successful). UNCG had to float their own loan since the State Treasurer did not. There's an estimated \$600,000 per year in savings. Their maintenance budget per year is \$5 million plus, and they will be able to keep these benefits. Nelson said that they can use owners' representative to get projects done (and capitalize those costs). UNCW is pioneering this approach. The Energy Savings Coalition and State Energy Office are available to assist. In late October, Chancellors were asked to advise GA on what they will do on energy performance contracts. Gary Jones noted that he's on the GA sustainability task force. He said that Nelson had urged him to keep pushing on these issues. Jones complimented the campus safety report and suggested that there are elements that might be of relevance here.

b. *Water conservation.*

Nelson has also been assigned to work on this matter. The Governor has been pushing this concern. Campuses have been asked to report what they're doing and their anticipated water savings. GA has not historically collected water data. The state reported such data but Nelson says the data is not very good (guesstimates). They now have a baseline from August/September 2007. There is work going on at the campus level and that's very important. It's important to think locally and bubble up to GA.

c. *Tuition and fee requests* will be coming in shortly.

d. *Budget planning for the legislative session.*

Work is being done to prepare for the 2008 legislative session (that will be fine-tuning from what's already there). The focus will be on faculty salaries, graduate assistants, research, campus safety, capital, and so forth. Killingsworth noted that Sandie Gravett (ASU) has been working with Nelson on developing faculty-oriented budget informational resources for faculty on the campuses ("Budget 101").

3. **VP Harold Martin.**

Martin complimented Chair Killingsworth on her work with the forums and other meetings.

a. *Code 603/604 Committee's work:*

Martin noted that he'd appointed a committee a year ago to work on cleaning up the provisions of the University Code. He said that they had taken into account the resolution and work of the Faculty Assembly with language submitted by Assembly Secretary Wegner on behalf of the Executive Committee and the Assembly. All campuses were asked to review the Faculty Assembly's proposed language and nearly all have responded. Martin said that they have had Chancellors and Provosts review the Committee's proposals, and that General Counsel Leslie Winner has presented to the campus general counsels at their last meeting. The general counsels have come back with some concerns in three areas. They are concerned with regard to (a) "clear and convincing evidence" standard which they regard as lacking in clarity; (b) the outcome of post-tenure review (what is "unsatisfactory performance"); and (c) the difference in grievance procedures for EPA non-faculty and faculty. These topics will be addressed at a meeting with some of the campus legal counsel representatives and Killingsworth and Wegner to meet on these matters on November 26. The language needs to be legally sound but also address these matters.

Several members of the Assembly commented. Dennis Dailey (NCSU) suggested that there be consultation with attorneys who are not aligned with management. Martin said he didn't intend to bring anyone else in at this time. If there are substantive differences of opinion he may consider that. Ken Wilson (ECU) asked what the questions might be with regard to unsatisfactory performance. Martin said he's only discussed the matter preliminarily. The legal counsel want language that is legally defensible if challenged in court. Martha Marking (ASU) asked who would attend the November 26 meeting. Martin said it would include himself, Larry Nielson (NCSU provost), Leslie Winner (GA General Counsel), Mary Beth Kurtz (NCSU general counsel), Killingsworth (Faculty Assembly chair), Leslie Strohm (UNCCH general counsel), Wegner (Faculty Assembly secretary), and Charles Waldrup (GA general counsel's office).

Nina Allen (NSCU) asked about the question regarding “clear and convincing” language. Martin said that he wants to bring everyone together to understand the key issues and be clear about what the concerns of the attorneys were.

Gary Jones (WCU) questioned whether adopting an evidence standard used in professional licensing (“preponderance of evidence”) is appropriate for discharge of tenured faculty members and wondered what Martin thought about this matter. Martin said that that he thought removal of tenure was different.

Scott McRae (NCSU) said that in most situations, grievance relates to employment issues. Is there any consideration of academic issues (e.g. decisions regarding academic programs or courses)? Martin said that he wasn’t clear about the question. McRae asked whether there’s an academic grievance procedure. Martin said that there is. McRae said that the grievance procedure relates to personnel issues. He’s concerned about situations in which a faculty member is told that they must teach a particular course (or not). Martin said that there is a process for grieving something that’s been taken away. There’s also a grievance procedure relating to pay raises, poor evaluation, lack of funding support for research or opportunity to teach a class, anything controversial. McRae said that he had searched for this procedure at NCSU and couldn’t find it. Martin asked whether people were aware of this and many didn’t know. Martin said that maybe there’s need to discuss and disseminate such information on the campuses. James Martin (NCSU) said that in his experience there are very narrow boundaries on what can be grieved (what is the “decision” being grieved, what is the time frame that must be observed, larger scale issues or more narrow ones). Harold Martin said that campus grievance procedures are not directed from GA, but are campus-by-campus procedures and are matters to be addressed through the faculty senates on the campuses. Scott McRae said that many of the campus provisions refer to the University Code. Harold Martin said that he would be open to further discussions. He asked delegates to refer comments and concerns to Killingsworth and Wegner and that he would be open to discussing whether there are needs for Code revisions or work on campus provisions.

b. *Enhancing retention and graduation rates for students.*

Martin said that GA and the campuses have been working on these issues, as well as on issues regarding accountability. They have set into motion work on these issues and as well as on minimum admissions requirements. The Board of Governors (BOG) education policy committee accepted the proposal in November, but since it’s a policy change, they have to take the topic up again in January.

c. *Articulation agreement with community colleges.* Martin said that there has also been significant time spent on the comprehensive articulation agreement (working with the community colleges). They have discussed core issues of concern. The agreement provides that students who complete associates’ degrees or core general education requirements will have those units transferred. There’s concern that there be consistent permission that these units transfer; enrollment management and admissions personnel need to consistently comply with the terms of the articulation agreement). They have also included in the comprehensive articulation agreement the Governor’s programs for high school students enrolling in community college offerings (learn and earn allows associate’ degree with 13 years of work linked into high school). There are also issues related to students transferring into the community college program with incoming transfer units; UNC campuses have sometimes revisited the decisions about acceptability of units coming in to the community college. The revised agreement calls for automatic acceptance of these bundled units if they are from an accredited school. There are additional questions. If a student simply takes some community college units (not completing the associate’s degree or gen ed), UNC campuses go back and look at these one by one (rather than taking them automatically). In some instances not all the community college courses have counterpart courses on UNC campuses (within general education requirements). They are working through this process now. The community college system wants to allow students with C- grades to have those units transfer (the current articulation agreement requires a grade of C).

Several Assembly delegates raised questions or offered comments. Sharon Jacques (WCU) said that they are having difficulties having transfer students admitted. Admission has been delayed on one of her students who doesn’t yet have her transcript in for January classes beginning. Martin said that that appears to be a campus issue and could be addressed through a conditional admission arrangement. Jacques said she had been told that this was a GA issue, but Martin said it was not. He also noted that he would raise this topic with the Chief Academic Officers at their meeting next week. Tammy Hunt (UNCW) said that she has also had difficulties in getting official transcripts from June and having them in hand by August. She also said that UNCW takes many students from several community colleges (some of which work more effectively with them than others). They’ve tried to inform the community colleges that there are requirements for math and science, etc. pre-requisites in order to be able to go into particular fields (e.g. nursing). Martin said they have to continue to work on advising. They hope to have a better web presence that will provide information for students. Hunt said that they need to know about levels of math and science. Meg Morgan (UNCC) referenced her work with the community colleges. She and her committee (faculty development) are working on developing “pre-major templates” for the community colleges. Hunt noted that UNCW has done that but it’s been ignored. Morgan said that she thinks it’s a problem that has to be addressed in other areas as well. Martin said that GA would continue to work on these issues.

4. **President Erskine Bowles**

a. *UNC Tomorrow.* Bowles noted that they’ve had 22 meetings (11 community forums and 11 faculty forums)

and Killingsworth and he have been to all. He said that the faculty listening forums had been very important, and he appreciates the Assembly's request that GA and the UNC Tomorrow Commission undertake these faculty forums. What was said at the faculty listening forums was along the lines of what was said at the community forums (so there are not many gaps). The forums were appreciated (he was surprised that this didn't happen very much). He said he'd also gotten follow-up emails. This has been a good process. He suggested that Killingsworth report on this, but she asked him to do it to see what he heard. Bowles suggested the need to also talk with Killingsworth and scholars council. Bowles noted the following themes:

1a. K-12 (birth-16): There's need for more and better teachers, more and better math and science teachers. Everyone wants quality. They stress that the university shouldn't reduce its quality or the quality of its graduates. They said that it's important to prepare teachers for the environment they'll teach in. One of principal reasons for teacher turnover is not simply poor pay but also a lack of real world experience regarding what classrooms are like today. Mentoring is important, as are partnerships with community colleges and the private sector. Best practices are needed from the education schools, and it's important to collect that kind of data and develop means for communicating that information.

2a. Health care: There was a real regional focus here, and in a number of regions people felt that we weren't doing enough to get them the services they need. People discussed diversity as well. We need to address the need for health care professionals in all regions of NC, diversity, and education of allied health professionals as well as nurses and MDs.

3a. Access: There were comments about the need for financial aid. Some areas (Hickory, Hendersonville, Rocky Mount, and Jacksonville) urged the creation of satellite campuses that would be more accessible to those living there. If there are available sites on community college campuses these might serve for night/weekend use (with a focus on advanced offerings). Summer school is also important. Even though faculty probably can't be required to teach on a 12 months, it may be possible to vary assignments and include summer months. People talked about the need for serious, rigorous summer bridge programs linked to conditional admission so that students enter ready to learn. It may be possible to make better use of the School of Science and Math. There's also a real concern for access for African American males and Hispanics. In state tuition is important for Hispanics, but there's not a ready solutions regarding African-American males (there's need community involvement, and there are family structure issues, but there's need to know from the campuses what possibilities there are here). Broadband access is needed in rural area to provide access to distance education. It's also important to improve articulation agreements with the community colleges. We need to keep low tuition but also recruit more smart kids from outside the state. We also need to use fixed assets/facilities more effectively (during summer and evenings).

4a. Higher education: Some use the term "soft skills" to describe what's needed (he disavows this term). What they're getting at is what we know is important (humanities and liberal arts, working in teams, analytical capacities). These capacities are even more important than math/science skills. Languages are important (and should be required). Math and science is essential, and so is training in entrepreneurship. Basic research is essential, and some should be focused on state and regional needs. People understand the importance of "the arts" including art itself (many people are upset that art is not required in the public schools). Many stressed that the university is not a trade/vocational school and they don't want us to start acting like that. Many are concerned and want us to mean it when we address environment/sustainability (walk the walk; not just talk, but act). People want us maintain (and increase) high academic standards and quality. They realize we have issues regarding kids from public schools and say we should not let down standards just to graduate people. Kids have to realize that they must work hard to get a degree. People want us to get more people through the pipeline but have them graduate with a diploma that means something. They understand that we're not running vocational schools. They want us to use limited resources as smart as we can. They want us to examine the campus missions in light of needs. Business people noted that nothing will happen if faculty members don't take ownership.

5a. Involvement in community: People know that intellectual capital is in the universities. They want us to lead in key areas of concern (racism, environment). They want us to promote community service (they know that this is currently treated as step child and also know that it is not applicable to every discipline or those who aren't inclined to do this kind of work). They understand that it's necessary to reward faculty for such work (compensation, tenure credit, time) if we want it to happen. It can't be an unfunded mandate. They stressed the importance of involvement in economic development of the state's regions, and asked that we develop partnerships with business/community/nonprofits. They ask that we focus research and create web portals to link work on the campuses so that someone coming to NC could determine whether we have expertise and where (e.g. robotics).

6a. Global awareness: People want to be sure that students are prepared to live and work with people from different cultures. That's critical for the future. More students and faculty should be involved in exchange programs. The virtual collaboration program at ECU was highly regarded as a good first step, but it's not substitute for real exchange programs. They commented on a recent rule from budget office regarding student travel (he's trying to get this rule fixed through the Office of State Budget).

b. *Drought.*

Bowles noted that he's checked with Chancellors on monitoring and reporting problems. GA has urged that there be

no irrigation from city water, no washing of windows, use of low flow toilet valves, etc. It may be good to invite faculty/students/staff to suggest ideas. The Universities have only reduced water use by 5.4% (and we need to reduce by 30%). We're the least effective of the state agencies but we're the biggest user of water.

c. Comments and Questions from Assembly Delegates.

John Cope (ECU). Listening is wonderful, but need people to stay in the room. Bowles said he's committed to stick with it. At some point there will be need for change. Mark Spalding (UNCW) asked if Bowles has been satisfied with the PACE initiative so far. Bowles said no and referenced a report from the Maryland system (in the Washington Post today). We've done some things on some campuses but not a very satisfying result.

Tammy Hunt (UNCW) said that she has a lecturer who has a masters and wants a Ph.D but will need to go out of state (operations research, very small programs at UNCC and Duke). Bowles said that that's the kind of thing that should come out of UNC Tomorrow. We make too many decisions based on our annual budgets rather than thinking strategically about needs. He's not qualified to say that there's need for an expanded or new doctoral program.

Ken Essbenshade (NCSU) asked whether there's a timeline on UNC Tomorrow. Bowles said that it'll be transparent, on the web, within timelines indicated by Caravano.

Scott McRae (NCSU) said he was interested in comments on quality versus graduation rates. Bowles noted that previously all the rewards, funding, and recognition were geared to enrollment growth (whether students retained or graduated or not). That's not smart. Now that he's gotten people to focus on retention and graduation, it's really important to be sure quality stays high. NCSU has developed a quality brand and shouldn't diminish quality by dropping academic standards. We need to provide support for students to do the work, provide the courses, etc., but never, ever reduce quality. McRae said that the problem started long ago. When he attended NCSU 40 years ago students who did the work graduated in four years. Bowles said that there's a different student profile now, including having to work and stopping out to work. McCrae said that it's important to allocate resources to working with the students.

Jim Martin (NCSU) said he appreciated the points made by Bowles. Martin said we're being forced to reduce quality because faculty lack funds to do what's needed. Funding has remained stagnant while enrollment has grown and productivity in research has gone up. He's in chemistry and they lack lab facilities and necessary teaching personnel. He'd like to hear whether there are ways to move beyond annual budgeting to achieve these goals. Bowles said that there's need for a real strategic plan with priorities, costs, time frames, and disciplined adherence to the strategic plan. That's the only way he knows how to do it. There's need for real leadership and buy-in.

Sharon Jacques (WCU) said that the UNC Tomorrow effort is really telling us that we need to make what we're doing relevant to today's and tomorrow's needs. She wants to hold up for attention the philosophy/religion program at WCU. They have rallied and shifted offerings so that they're wide-ranging, and relevant to today's world (e.g. bioethics). She would challenge all of us to be sure that what we're teaching is relevant.

David McHugh (NCSA) referenced quality standards. He had a student who was not doing the work in film composition. He made that known to the dean and provost. Both said the same thing, namely that he should pass the student through to the next level to avoid litigation. Bowles said that he's willing to take the heat when needed. We need to protect our brand and quality is what matters in the end.

Martha Marking (UNCC) noted concern about accepting C-s from the community colleges. Bowles said that's not going to happen.

5. Assembly Chair Brenda Killingsworth's Report.

Killingsworth first noted that the Executive Committee had developed a resolution honoring GA General Council Leslie Winner who is leaving to become Executive Director of the Z Smith Reynolds Foundation. She asked Assembly Secretary Judith Wegner to read the resolution (Resolution 2007-Nov #1). It passed unanimously. Killingsworth also addressed the Faculty Assembly's budget and the need for operating efficiencies. Killingsworth said that Sue Carpenter has done research on our budget, funding, and operational efficiency. The budget has grown from just several thousand dollars to the current level (\$40,000). Most of this money is related to travel expense reimbursement at \$.48 per mile rather than about half that amount when delegates use state cars or car pooling. It's necessary to reserve state cars in advance. Killingsworth said Sue will send out reminders about a month before the Assembly meetings to urge people to use state cars. Killingsworth noted that if people don't reserve state cars in advance, it's hard to get cars and save the money. She hopes that delegates will reserve cars and car pool if possible. Since delegates know of Assembly meetings well in advance, it's possible to reserve. It helps the Assembly's budget and our campuses want us to use the cars to help pay for them. If we need to spend the night, everyone should try to be economical (and not stay over if not needed). Killingsworth noted that the budget has been enhanced to allow five meetings a year, and that there have been more meetings (e.g. the Executive Committee). We have also included Faculty Senate Chairs. Jeff Parker (NCAT) asked whether state cars can be used out of state. It is probably a good idea to make more information on use of such cars available to delegates.

III. The Assembly broke for lunch and then held committee and task force meetings.

IV. The Assembly reconvened for its second plenary session at 2:30 p.m.

6. Minutes.

The minutes of the September 28, 2007 meeting were unanimously approved.

V. Committee Meetings/Task Force Meetings:

7. Committee reports:

a. *No reports:* The Academic Freedom, Budget, Technology, and Historically Minority Institutions said they had no reports to the full Assembly at this time.

b. *Faculty Development:* Meg Morgan (UNCC) reported on behalf of the Faculty Development Committee.

i. *Collaboration with Community Colleges: Report.* Morgan referenced a report co-authored by Morgan, Ann Russell (NC Community College Association). She moved that the Faculty Assembly endorse this report and transfer it to Vice President Martin. (UNC-NCCCS Task Force Report). This material is included in delegate packages. The motion was adopted unanimously and a copy of the report will be transmitted along with (Resolution 2007-Nov. #4 UNC-NCCCS Collaboration).

ii. *Resolution 2007-Nov. #2 Post-Tenure Review.* Morgan asked the Assembly to adopt a resolution addressing post-tenure review. She initially read the gist of the motion, and then distributed notes reflecting the intended text. There was some discussion of the proposal. Sharon Jacques (WCU) suggested language changes to refer to the "primary purpose" of post-tenure review as fostering faculty development. Jim Martin (NCSU) said that the AAUP has indicated that post-tenure review is to be a faculty development tool rather than a means for faculty members to discipline each other. David McHugh (NCSA) raised an instance from his campus relating to non-renewal of a contract. Scott McRae (NCSU) said that he'd seen instances in which what happened related to settling differences among faculty. He noted that the NCSU faculty members appointed on a contract basis do not have a right to the equivalent of tenure review at the end of their contract. The Assembly voted to support the resolution with perfecting changes in language to reflect the sense of the meeting. The revised version is attached. (Resolution 2007-Nov. #2)

c. *Governance.*

Committee chair Mark Taggart (ECU) reported that the committee is working on collecting best practices from the various campuses. He said that they are reviewing these materials in order to work on creating a handbook of shared governance, including information on what's effective and what is not effective. Important matters include: dealing with communication issues; dealing with disagreements (when faculty members or committees disagree with the administration); pitfalls and danger signs to be looked for and corrected before a situation gets too severe. They hope to visit all the campuses and discuss best practices for shared governance.

Several delegates commented. Jeffrey Parker (NCAT) said he thinks this work is overdue. Their faculty senate is concerned whether there is meaningful shared governance. There was a proposal for a university studies program that was brought to the Faculty Senate. The Senate opposed it overwhelmingly, but the proposal was sent on to their Chancellor, who gave no response to the Senate. The proposal was implemented anyway. Scott McRae (NCSU) recommended using the AAUP's materials as a resource. Taggart said that the committee would be looking at that and other resources. McRae said that there are campuses in which Faculty Senates have controlling votes rather than being advisory.

Chair Brenda Killingsworth (ECU) noted that she'd talked with Harold Martin about shared governance. At the time the shared governance statement was adopted by Faculty Assembly, there was no consultation or involvement of administrators. She has talked with Martin and asked Taggart's committee to find out about decision-making in the senates. Martin will assist in finding out about structures on the campuses from administrative vantage. There will then be an effort to find models. That requires working with administrators too. She noted that she gets to meet with the Chief Academic Officers and need to ask them the same thing (about barriers and possibilities).

Trish Casey (NCSA) said it was good to meet on the campuses. She asked who would be invited (faculty senates, administrators, others?). She asked whether GA met with the Chancellors about shared governance as she had thought she'd heard? Killingsworth said that there were numerous conversations. Casey asked for a report. Casey asked whether chancellors were evaluated on shared governance as part of their periodic reviews. Killingsworth said that was something they were finding out about that. Taggart said that the effort would be focused on the system and helping each other.

Scott McRae (NCSU) said that what we have now is shared listening, rather than governance. Killingsworth said that

looking at processes and structures are critical.

Mark Spalding (UNCW) said it was important to get GA or Harold Martin to endorse this project. If not, the handbook will be a larger document similar to the shared governance document (their chancellor says it's not binding, and there are conflicting expectations). Taggart said that the committee has the endorsement of Harold Martin. Killingsworth said that Martin understands it's one of the Assembly's foremost goals.

Subash Shah (WSSU) said that governance committee is considering not only structures, but also good practices in implementing shared governance, and strategies that are being used to undermine shared governance. On one campus a chairs' council has been created and may be functioning in order to undercut the work of the Faculty Senate on that campus. We need to be aware of pitfalls. Shah noted that the minimum standards statement has not been endorsed by GA. It's important not to assume agreement.

Mark Taggart (ECU) said the worse thing that could be done is to waste time, and said he thought that it would be possible to reach mutual agreement.

Gary Jones (WCU) referenced an article in *Academe* (AAUP) by former Assembly Chair Dick Veit. (Killingsworth noted it's available through the Assembly website on-line). Jones said that the point is not confrontation, but working together.

d. *Planning and Programs.*

Committee chair Catherine Rigsby (ECU) indicated that the committee wishes to go on record as requesting faculty representation on all task groups involving academic quality (such as articulation agreements, on-line quality, and so forth). It's not clear whether there are faculty members on these committees and if so how they're appointed. Killingsworth said that there are faculty members on some of these committees, and more are being requested. She said that it's clear that it's important to have delegates from the Assembly on these committees and task groups so there's accountability.

e. *Sustainability Task Force.*

Gary Jones (WCU) said that he serves on the GA task force on this topic, as well as a Faculty Assembly task force. There are national upcoming events in January and April. He will e-mail information on some of these developments.

f. *Senate Chairs Meeting* (Jones sits in).

Jones said that there was lively discussion, but they ran out of time. He said that the group talked about ways to involve faculty Senates in follow up on UNC Tomorrow efforts. They're very interested in giving feedback to the Scholars Council report. He said that ASU had developed a grievance procedure over the summer and there's possible interest across the system.

8. **Self-Study Task Force.**

Task Force Chair Bonnie Yankaskas reported on behalf of the self-study task force.

a. *Charter revisions.* The charter revisions submitted to the campuses last spring were approved by the requisite number of campuses and are now in effect (these relate to how delegate numbers are calculated).

b. *Proposed changes in Section 7 of the Bylaws.* These provisions relate to elections. They were presented at the September 2007 Assembly meeting, and are to be voted upon today. Yankaskas displayed the text of the bylaw provision. She noted that it was important for campuses to elect and certify Assembly members no later by May 1. The date of the elections will be changed so that instead of requiring them at the first meeting of the spring (now in January), the bylaws would require elections no later than May 31. Time for delegate statements will be extended to up to three minutes, and someone else may speak on behalf of a candidate. Committee chairs will be chosen by secret ballot at the last meeting of the Assembly. There is an option for a vice chair of each committee. Both could be self-nominated.

The term for committee chairs and vice chairs will be one year, and those in these roles may serve no more than two successive terms. Yankaskas invited comments and questions. Rosemary Booth (UNCC) asked that item (c) reference election of committee chairs and vice-chairs and Yankaskas agreed to accept the change as a friendly amendment.

Pete Andrews (UNCCH) asked whether there was a conflict in selecting committee chairs at or before the last meeting (so that it's in sync with election of officers). Yankaskas agreed.

Martha Marking (ASU) asked that the opportunity for someone to speak on behalf of a candidate reference allowing one person in addition to the candidate (so one minute for each). Yankaskas agreed.

Chip Arnold (ASU) asked that pronouns be brought into conformity (saying he or she or his or her).

Gary Jones noted that there would be also be an additional officer created (communications vice chair). Yankaskas noted that if that is not changed it would be necessary to revisit this section later.

Rosemary Booth (UNCC) asked about whether to have a vice chair or a chair elect. That matter will be addressed in the discussion of the balance of the bylaw proposals. The question was called as to the bylaw provisions relating to elections. The Assembly voted unanimously in support of the change of this section of the bylaws.

The revised portion of the Bylaws section 7 is attached as adopted with friendly amendments and is recorded as (Resolution 2007-Nov. #5 Admendment of Bylaws Concerning Faculty Assembly Elections).

c. *Other proposed bylaw changes.* Yankaskas proceeded to review each section of the proposed bylaws revisions. **The Power Point summary (to be attached).** She initially provided background regarding the membership of the self-study task force, the rationale for changes, the goals and approach used by the task force. She then highlighted key provisions including the following, and accepted questions and comments as she proceed through the key elements.

1c. *Membership and Officers.* It is recommended that members of the Assembly serve two-year minimum terms. If a delegate is elected chair of their faculty senate, that position can be filled by an alternate. Each campus should have at least one alternate. Officers would include an additional person to serve as communication vice-chair (responsible for web maintenance, creation of a newsletter, communications among delegates and communication between the Assembly and Faculty Senates). The chair and vice chair would serve two year terms (the chair would serve a third year as chair-elect) and then be ineligible for two years. The Chair will be elected as Chair-Elect to serve in that capacity for one year prior to taking office. The Secretary would serve a one-year, then could be elected to a second term, then must be off one year. A number of questions were raised by the delegates. Scott McRae (NCUS) asked whether GA would provide support for the website. Killingsworth said that it's a question of supplying the content. Yankaskas accepted a friendly amendment as removing "maintaining the website" and instead referring to content. Judith Wegner (UNCCH) asked about the responsibilities of the secretary. Yankaskas said that the secretary would handle minutes for the Assembly and prepare a yearly report of the Assembly. George Heilman (NCAT) noted that there was inconsistency between the slides and the documents relating to the functions of the Vice Chair for Communications (website maintenance, content; also about communication with faculty on campuses v. faculty senates). Wegner suggested that something should be added as to dealing with the situation of incapacity. Yankaskas said the task force would deal with this. McRae said that this situation should be dealt with by having vice chair serve as acting until an election. Another delegate said section 9 deals with this issue.

2c. *Committees and Meeting Generally.* Yankaskas summarized key aspects of the proposed committee structure. There would be an Agenda Committee including the officers plus one of the committee chairs (selected by the committee chairs). Under the new scheme the chairs would not necessarily be serving on the Executive Committee. As to meetings, Yankaskas said that it is probably desirable to meet at General Administration to allow involvement by GA representatives (rather than around the state). Rosemary Booth (UNCC) said that that UNCC prefers to have their faculty senate chair-elect attend Faculty Assembly rather than the chair, and asked that there be a revision to reference chairs or chairs-elect (as campus option). Yankaskas agreed and said that there will be an orientation for new members.

3c. *Executive Committee.* As to the Executive Committee, Yankaskas said the task force has suggested changes to include more leadership opportunities for delegates and redistribute work. The officers would include the chair, vice chair, vice chair for communications, secretary, and chair-elect. There will be six at-large members elected by-from within each of the following groups (based on size of delegations plus two at-large members) and a staff member from GA ex officio. For next year's delegate count, there are four schools with two delegates, five with three delegates, three with four delegates, five with five delegates (so that under the proposed system there would be an Executive Committee member from one of the schools with two delegates, one of those with three delegates, one with four delegates and one with five delegates; there would also be two elected at large).

Pete Andrews (UNCCH) asked about terms of members of the executive committee (Yankaskas said she'd assumed one-year terms).

Richard Beam (WCU) said that there was no reference to two delegates elected at large in the text of the bylaws. Yankaskas said she would remedy this omission. She asked if there should be one or two-year appointments. She said that one year and re-election for one year, then a year off would be desirable.

Ken Wilson (ECU) said he agreed.

George Wilson (NCCU) asked what happened if schools had two year term and had someone on the executive committee, there might be a question of continuing service for a second term and how it fit with the delegate term. Rebecca Jacques clarified that someone could serve for a year on the assembly (if a three-year term on assembly) then serve for two years on the executive committee.

Rosemary Booth (UNCC) said there should be a further review of references relating to "before May 31".

Yankaskas then commented on the proposed duties of executive committee. Yankaskas said that the description of the executive committee's duties were somewhat broader than in the past (since members were not primarily representing committees). They will be reviewing progress of committees and task forces, reviewing issue priorities, advising the chair, reviewing the structure and functions of committees, maintaining interaction with BOG, and making recommendations to the Assembly. Yankaskas also summarized the duties of the officers and noted the distinction between the duties of the proposed communications vice chair and the secretary (the latter would be responsible for minutes).

Yankaskas said that the parliamentarian would be appointed from among either current or former delegates. The parliamentarian would not be allowed to vote. Judith Wegner (UNCCH) asked about whether it should be explicit then that a non-delegate (former delegate) be appointed, since sitting delegates would expect to vote and would be unlikely to agree to serve as parliamentarian if that meant giving up their vote. Yankaskas said she will look further at this question since she thinks that most organizations require parliamentarians not to be members and vote. Richard Beam (WCU) asked about the role of the parliamentarian on the executive committee. Killingsworth said that this is an ex officio role.

Subash Shah (WCU) said it might be better to simply specify a former delegate. Yankaskas then agreed that the parliamentarian position should be kept as is (either a current delegate who would be allowed to vote or a former delegate who would not vote).

4c. *Other Committees and Task Forces.* As to other committees, Yankaskas noted that the nominations committee would begin work in January. Other committees are grouped by function as "academic committees" and "support committees." Academic committees include: academic freedom, promotion and tenure; faculty development and welfare, academic programs, research. Others are governance, budget, technology, historically minority institutions. Yankaskas said that task forces could respond more quickly to issues that arise in a timely manner. Task forces would be created by the chair in consultation with executive committee based on recommendations from delegates, committee chairs, the executive committee and General Administration. They will exist until task is completed and a final report is submitted.

Catherine Rigsby (ECU) observed that current task forces are unrelated to existing committees and asked what would happen if there were matters related to a standing committee, and how it would be determined when it would be necessary to have a task force. Yankaskas said that a task force would probably be appropriate if there's a time issue and it becomes necessary to pull from across different groups.

5c. *Reports and Procedures.* Yankaskas finally explained that the new bylaws would call for an annual report to be prepared by the Assembly secretary, and the report should be distributed to the campuses. If there are other questions, please send them to Sue Carpenter and Bonnie Yankaskas. Yankaskas said that there would also be a report from the Task Force including recommendations for procedural changes that would not be part of the bylaws.

9. **Faculty Assembly Chair's Report (continued)**

a. *Delegate numbers for the campuses.*

Chair Killingsworth reported that she is required to distribute information on the number of delegates for the campuses at the November meeting. Sue Carpenter distributed this information. Killingsworth noted that there are no changes in the number of delegates for any campuses, but we had committed to no changes in a current year (Charlotte and Greensboro would have dropped by one but that will not be in effect for 2008-09 given hold-harmless provisions). 2008-2009 Campus Delegates spreadsheet

b. *UNC Tomorrow.* Chair Killingsworth said she really appreciated having so many faculty members coming out to faculty listening forums. She thinks that faculty members who commented were impressive in their insights. Bowles commented on this point as well It's evident that faculty members were in tune with regional needs. Bowles had said that there were some exemplary programs (e.g. UNCW reaching out to middle schools regarding at-risk students in the sciences). She noted that there was an executive summary of the faculty listening forum comments (information has been distributed). Topics raised included quality of students, roles/rewards, research, faculty development and many other matters. The Scholars Council helped lead the commissioners' deliberations. The Scholars Council will write the report. Some of the Scholars Council did not believe that they would actually have that much influence. Their effort is paying off. The commission meets on December 6 to finalize the report that will be sent to the BOG at their January meeting. Jim Phillips will finish as BOG Chair in June, so campuses are to respond by May. See www.unctomorrow.org. In addition, we need to frame the role of the faculty on the campus and system level, share models on how to respond. The specific areas for faculty leadership and models include: curriculum, engaged university (what it means, P&T, reward structures, release time, resources). She also noted it's important to address ways to improve quality of education while also providing access. She believes that if there are to be satellite campuses, we need to attend to the type of faculty appointments (tenure-track?) and shared governance, She spoke about the issue of being sure students are prepared. The commission spoke about the possibilities of further Scholars Councils. There may be other questions about how we address these issues. She said that there's need to be sure faculty members have a chance to offer recommendations. There's need to include balance in selection.

10. Task Force on University Engagement.

Task Force Chair Judith Wegner (UNC-CH) presented a resolution on behalf of the Task Force and invited members of the task force to speak to the resolution. Nina Allen (NCSU) spoke to the first two clauses of the resolution, which called upon General Administration, Chancellors and Faculty Senates to involve rank-and-file faculty members identified through faculty governance channels in the UNC Tomorrow campus response teams. Trish Casey (NCSA) speaking for herself and for Sonja Harding (UNCC) spoke to the pre-K-12 section of the resolution, followed by comments from Ken Wilson (ECU) regarding the need for action relating to higher education, and by Judith Wegner regarding the need for engaging faculty members. Wegner stressed the function of the resolution as a means of focusing work by the Faculty Assembly and Faculty Senates during spring 2008. She then invited comments and suggestions from the delegates.

Catherine Rigsby (ECU) said she appreciated having a resolution presented and thinks we need to act promptly. She'd like to propose a friendly amendment: so as to include at least 50% of their membership drawn from the non-administrative rank and file faculty. Wegner accepted the amendment.

Gary Jones asked if there could be an item added on sustainability. Wegner said that there was an effort to focus on limited issues and invited concrete recommendations to be incorporated into the work during the spring. Jim Martin asked for sustainability to be included as well. Wegner said she'd incorporate it.

Laura Onafowora (NCCU) asked for prompt distribution of the resolution, and Wegner agreed to distribute an initial draft as soon as possible.

Jim Martin (NCSU) said that he felt K-12 efforts were unfunded mandates. He wanted to have this concern reiterated up front, and emphasize the need for support of all initiatives.

Ken Wilson (ECU) said that if we say "this is what we can do and these are the resources we need" we're more likely to move ahead (rather than saying we can't do anything until you give us money first).

Meg Morgan (UNCC) said that she had sent forward a proposal about writing across the curriculum (she sent to Bowles). She said that the report voted on today regarding to seamless transition was in that spirit.

Trish Casey (NCSA) spoke about sustainability and supports inclusion of this element. She said that she's not sure about how this concern should be incorporated and that it might be featured in the K-12 area as well as adding.

Martha Marking (ASU) also asked for sustainability to be included.

The resolution as amended was adopted unanimously. Killingsworth requested and Wegner agreed to provide copies of the resolution to Harold Martin, and others. Resolution 2007-Nov #3 (**UNC Tomorrow Initiative**) reflects revisions in keeping with the comments at the meeting and editorial suggestions following circulation to Faculty Assembly delegates.

The Assembly voted unanimously to adjourn at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Judith Wegner, UNC-CH, Faculty Assembly Secretary

Attachments:

Resolution 2007-Nov. #1	In Honor of General Counsel Leslie Winner
Resolution 2007-Nov. #2	Post-Tenure Review Recommendation
Resolution 2007-Nov. #3	Relating to UNC Tomorrow
Resolution 2007-Nov. #4	Resolution on Collaboration between the University and the North Carolina Community College System
Resolution 2007-Nov. #5	Amendment of Bylaws Concerning Faculty Assembly Elections
UNC-NCCCS Task Force Report	
Number of Delegates 2008-09	
Power Point Presentation On By-Law Amendments by Self-Study Task Force Chair Bonnie Yankaskas	<i>(to be attached)</i>

Submitted by Judith Welch Wegner, UNC-CH, Assembly Secretary (Judith_wegner@unc.edu)
November 16, 2007

posted on UNC Faculty Assembly Web site 1/2/2008

(c) 2011