

Minutes of the Faculty Assembly

FACULTY ASSEMBLY UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

Minutes of the One Hundredth Meeting

February 21, 1997

The one hundredth meeting of the Faculty Assembly of the University of North Carolina was held in the Board Room of the General Administration Building in Chapel Hill on February 21, 1997. The meeting was called to order by Chair Peter Petschauer at 1:00 with 42 delegates in attendance.

Dr. Petschauer noted that Earnest Boyer stated that our universities should be "purposeful, open, just, disciplined, caring, and celebratory." In light of that last admonishment, this day marks a celebration of the one hundredth meeting of the Faculty Assembly. He recognized President Spangler, President Emeritus Friday, John Sanders, Ray Dawson, Mrs. Arnold King, Benjamin Ruffin, and former Assembly Chairs: Shirley Browning (UNCA), Vince Foote (NCSU), Alan Hauser (ASU), Jim Smith (ECU), Fred Hinson (WCU), Ken Wilson (ECU), Helen Caldwell (ECSU). Chairs of the faculty governance bodies were also recognized.

Benjamin S. Ruffin, Vice Chair of the Board of Governors, brought greetings from the Board of Governors.

Mr. Ruffin saluted the Faculty Assembly and thanked it on behalf of Chairman C. C. Cameron and the entire Board of Governors. He gave special thanks to Dr. Friday for creating the Assembly and for all his contributions. He urged the Assembly to continue to challenge, teach and mold the lives of young people.

John Dervin presented a Resolution from the Association of Student Governments recognizing the milestone. (A copy is attached. (Not available on the web.))

Dr. Friday, former President of the University, addressed the Assembly. His salute to President Spangler for his leadership led to a standing ovation. Friday then spoke of the importance of the Assembly and his pleasure at its growth and development. Formation of the Faculty Assembly recognized faculty as part of the decision process. Before the Faculty Assembly, there was no sounding board for faculty. He gave a special word of thanks to Roy Carroll. He was spokesman for the group, then became a part of General Administration. There could be no finer leader.

With that lead in, Chair Petschauer recognized Bonnie Kelley (UNC-P) who presented Dr. Roy Carroll with a resolution honoring Dr. Carroll. (A copy of Resolution 96-6 is attached.) She presented him with an antique tray from Boone to hold coffee mugs representing each of the sixteen campuses.

Dr. Carroll thanked the assembly for the recognition, Dr. Friday for giving him the job, and President Spangler for giving him the opportunity to continue to work with the Faculty Assembly.

To honor those who have done the work behind the scenes, Pamela Hunter (NCA&T) presented Sue Lindsey and Margaret Torbert with a resolution of appreciation and a coffee mug. (Copies of Resolutions 96-7 and 96-8 attached.)

President C. D. Spangler's Report

President Spangler opened by stating that it was wonderful to honor Roy, Sue, and Margaret. He gave recognition to Ray Dawson. As his last act, he expects to give Roy a pardon from his lifetime membership in the group. Dr. Carroll's care helped gained respect for the group and it is a tribute to him that faculty want to be here. (A copy of the rest of President Spangler's report is attached. (Not available on the web))

Questions and Answers

Q. David Olson (UNC-G). With the establishment of a systemwide international exchange program with Germany, what is the interest of the Board of Governor's in faculty and student exchange.

A. Spangler. There is real interest but the issue is funding. There is an interesting dilemma as to how to justify taking money from one program to put into another.

A. Jasper Memory. The Board of Governors approved the new program making it the first time for the entire system to be involved in an international exchange effort. The Board is asking \$75,000 to get it going.

Q. Gilbert Smith (NCSU). The President of NCSU's student body reported that President Spangler has an interest in setting the academic year at 160 days. What is the reason?

A. Spangler. He has recommended that it be studied after noticing the decrease in days that students interact with faculty within a classroom at the same time knowledge was needing to grow. While the Board of Governors will make the decision, he thinks students will benefit from additional work with faculty.

Q. Jane Brown (UNC-CH). Isn't there a potential conflict with the initiative to increase the summer school offerings?

A. Spangler. There were once Saturday classes and the students did not suffer. The explosion of knowledge requires time to disseminate.

George Rabinowitz (UNCCH) challenged the premise. Much learning on the college level is most effectively teach by intense courses and intensity requires time to research, prepare and digest. In the competitive world academic world, first class scholars need time for research and students must have the capacity for student to regenerate and reprise.

Rabinowitz, Henry Farrell(ECU), Olson, Lolly Gasaway(UNC-CH) and others voiced concerns that it be noted faculty are working outside the classroom. Being teaching oriented makes it necessary to have time off in order to learn new material. Electronic communication opens student access in nontraditional ways of learning.

Spangler stated that the General Assembly would be most likely to calculate dollars based on student contact. They would see sending out classes over the Internet or on tape as cost effective. His concern is out of respect for importance of faculty. The Legislature wants faculty teaching students.

Farrell noted that in his experience with the profession, no one else has this opportunity for faculty input. He recognized Friday, King, and the old Faculty Council as important in starting the process and appreciated Spangler's continuation of the tradition.

Q. Farrell. Is the Budget published and can it be used as a reference in the libraries of the campuses.

A. Kennis Grogan(GA). There are 20 page summaries available and the entire document can be given out to the university. It was approved by the board in October and will go before the Education Subcommittee in the next two weeks.

Chair's Report

The Chair has continued his visits to governance bodies. The most recent visits were to UNC-CH, UNC-C, and NCA&T. He noted differences in reporting format, attendance of administrators, and focus of issues. He spoke to the groups about the Faculty Assembly and post-tenure review, and phased-in retirement.

There has been no positive response on continued requests for input into the Search. The process continues, status unknown.

A report from the Phased-in Retirement Committee went before the Personnel Committee and the President. It suggests a number of alternatives for phased-in retirement and a recommendation that lump sum incentives for early retirement be investigated by another committee.

A special session of the Assembly will be convened at 5:00 to discuss post-tenure review. Several members of the committee are present to assist in the discussion. Two strong conclusions are apparent: Teaching centers are necessary to the process and chairs of departments must be more intensively trained. At the American Association of Higher Education, Judith Stillion and Petschauer concentrated on post-tenure review and chair leadership training.

At 2:20 the afternoon Plenary Session was dismissed and the committee meetings took place in their customary locations.

=====

SPECIAL SESSION ON POST-TENURE REVIEW

A special session to discuss Post Tenure review was called to order at 5:07. There were 42 members in attendance.

Before the discussion, the Assembly created a Nominating Committee: Charles Mitchell(UNCC), Mike Perry(ASU), Jim Nichol(WCU), Ken Chambers(NCCU), Peter Petschauer(ASU).

Petschauer recognized Ken Chambers as chair of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee. On behalf of the committee he recommended the draft presented by the Post-Tenure Review Committee with changes from the Faculty Senate at UNCW.

Petschauer gave the background of the report stressing faculty involvement. It has been sent out to administrators, to senates, and is now also with the faculty assembly. Parts I and II are guidelines for campuses to develop their own procedures based on their respective missions. He asked Browning to report on behalf of the committee.

Browning addressed some of the questions from the floor saying that the process is designed to be primarily formative but would be summative under the specific circumstances of those faculty members who cannot be returned to productivity.

A lively discussion followed.

Funding requirements are not included in the document but could be considered in resolutions. Annual reports will be used, but they should not be the exclusive evaluative instrument because the review should include input from peers as a safeguard. Extent and nature of peer review is an issue for the campuses to decide.

Administrative overload is an ongoing concern.

Some terms in the document need to be changed to follow The Code and the wording of The Code should not have to be changed.

Farrell stated that the document was unamendable. Permanent tenure is the term in The Code to contrast it to contract tenure. The post-tenure review document lacks clear definition but will be used to alter what has been well reviewed. The only argument is one of necessity and he doesn't see the necessity.

Ten campuses do not have systematic administrative review.

The Assembly was recessed until 7:00 and a buffet was served.

=====

EVENING PLENARY SESSION

The session was called to order at 6:45 PM with 40 delegates in attendance.

In light of the depth of concern with the post-tenure process and the need for discussion, the Chair proposed that committees present their Resolutions for discussion, but abbreviate the reports. A transcript will be supplied with the minutes.

Faculty Welfare(James Nicholl)

The Assembly passed Resolution 96-9 "Change of Enrollment Schedule Dates for State Health Plans." (A copy is attached.)

Faculty Welfare also proposed and the Faculty Assembly passed Resolution 96-10 "Change in Open Meeting Law's Criteria for Definition of Professional Staff." (A copy is attached.)

Budget Committee(Laura Gasaway)

The Assembly approved Resolution 96-11. (A copy is attached.)

There is \$54,000,000 less money in Governor Hunt's proposals than the budget the Board Governors.

There was a note that the Universities are still required to pay state tax while one of the private universities is exempt.

The new funding model is going to be presented in April.

Planning and Program(Dan Noland)

Because the Committee had a report only, he deferred to those presenting resolutions.

Faculty Governance(Gordon Mercer)

The Committee thanked Peter and those who participated in phone survey. Most issues discussed in universities are brought before the senates. Many campuses noted a desire to establish more clearly establish involvement with their board of trustees. Half the campuses have office facilities, but not all are adequately staffed or supported. In response, the Committee proposed Resolution 96-12 which was adopted. (A copy is attached.)

Professional Development(Bonnie Kelley)

Using information from the Carolina Colloquy Steering Committee, the Committee discovered that several campuses still do not have teaching centers. Some administrators have found money to support the centers, but others have not found it. Support ranges from \$40,000 per year to \$488,000. To address the issue, the Assembly passed Resolution 96-13. (A copy is attached.)

Larry Hough(ECU) moved the Minutes and they were accepted. The discussion returned to post-tenure review.

Academic Freedom and Tenure(Kenneth Chambers)

Much discussion revolved around whether a faculty resolution supporting the report should be passed when there was so much dissension about post-tenure review and about the post-tenure review process. Positive arguments centered on the concern that the Board would be creating such a review if faculty did not and that it would be preferable for faculty to have input. Negative arguments urged that any resolution be referred back to committee to allow the group to speak with more unanimity. Also the issue came up that we already have post-tenure review as the post-tenure review document itself shows.

Dr.Carroll said that the report goes back to committee February 24, to the President on March 6, and to a Board committee March 13.

Farrell asked that the minutes reflect his comment that no faculty that he represents would agree to a motion that abridges any contractual agreement.

In compromise, Rabinowitz proposed drafting a resolution that goes on record as not supporting post-tenure review but supporting the Committee's report with the Wilmington revision if it is to happen.

It was noted that some of the body of the document was more specific than it needed to be and that there were some comments within it that were not in line with the thinking

of the Assembly. The motion is intended to support only the wording of the executive summary.

Resolution 96-14 was passed.

Dr. Carroll took a few minutes to address the Assembly. He spoke to the process the committee went through and the motivation for the work. He also spoke out strongly for shared governance.

Olson spoke of the value of the opportunity to provide input into the process and hopes for more of such opportunities. Dr. Carroll mentioned that timing has permitted this. At times legislative deadlines have not allowed it.

Having no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:43.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Nelms, Secretary

(c) 2011