

Minutes of the Faculty Assembly

Minutes Faculty Assembly

November 6, 1998

The 107th meeting was called to order at 1:03. Forty-three delegates were present.

The First Plenary Session

Minutes of September 25 were approved unanimously.

Announcements

The Chair called attention to the materials that had been distributed, which included:

- A revised "UNC Faculty Assembly Directory"
- *Institutional Profiles, University of North Carolina, 1998-99 Edition*
- "Clarifying Tuition Policy Within the University of North Carolina", a paper by President Molly Corbett Broad
- "Report of the Task Force on Tuition Policy" to the Board of Governors, Final Draft
- "The University of North Carolina Senate/House Final Agreement – SB 1366" a summary of the University budget
- "UNC Faculty Assembly Biographical Directory 1998-1999"

All Faculty Assembly delegates participated in the biographical directory.

The Chair's Report:

More than eighty people attended the copyright colloquium on November 5. The Chair thanked Mike Pearson and Rich Litton, the other members of the organizing committee.

The chair announced the appointment of Faculty Assembly members to two committees: Keith Howell has been named to a committee to assess the impact of phased retirement and post tenure review on the faculty work life and Keith Howell and Jose DiArruda to a committee to study faculty benefits.

New Business

George Wahl reported the results of survey of faculty participation on campus Board of Trustees meetings. Two campuses (UNC P and ASU) have faculty representatives "at the table." Dr. Wahl made a motion that the Chair thank the President for her support of an earlier Assembly motion to include faculty members at Trustees meeting and to encourage the President to work with other institutions on this matter.

At 1:17, the first Plenary Session ended so the delegates could attend their committee meetings.

The second plenary session was convened at 3:31

Report of President Broad:

Copyright Colloquium: President Broad expressed her appreciation for the copyright colloquium, including the quality of the presentations, the turnout, the diversity of the group, and the hopeful possibility that we can move ahead on the issues related to copyright and an education program for the university.

The President's response to issues and concerns raised by the Assembly:

Regarding the need to improve fringe benefit packages for faculty:

There is no disagreement that we compare less favorably in the area of total compensation than we do in salary, especially in the areas of retirement and health care. The President has asked Kitty McCollum to head a group, including campus representatives, to examine our package of fringe benefits and compare these with other

states and to prepare an analytical basis from which to go forward. The University is considering preparing a legislative initiative on fringe benefits once it has an understanding of what might be achieved. Dr. Howell, chair of Faculty Welfare Committee, will be a member of the study committee.

Regarding extending privileges and benefits to retired faculty (for items such as recreational facilities at all campuses regardless of where the individual lives):

The President raised this issue with the Chancellors and it will continue to be discussed.

Regarding legal rights of faculty who are participating in phased retirement:

First, with respect to legal rights, the University Counsel and outside counsel have reviewed the university policy and each campus policy. It appears that there are variations among campuses on fringe benefits, but these differences apply to all retired faculty and not just those in the phased retirement program. Second, the language used on the forms that faculty must sign is typically used to insure compliance with federal laws regarding retirement and was not meant to have a chilling effect on faculty. In particular, the language is present to insure that individuals make an informed and unhurried decision. However, the legal staff will be making a general review of the release form to see if it might be revised to make it less intimidating.

Regarding the final budget agreement:

It has been an "extraordinary and positive" budget for the University. The biggest disappointment lies with the amount given to faculty salaries. Students who are served at a distance will now be included in enrollment growth. The new funding model which funds students according to the level and area of their program of study serves as an incentive for us to expand our ability to serve students at a distance. This will be a significant step in the way the university is funded. Funds to support information technology, which was requested in both operating and capital budgets, lead to 18.5 million (3 million recurring) in the operating budget and nearly 35 million in the capital budget for infrastructure. This is approximately half the required amount, but leads us to hope that we can complete the work in two years.

The reversion budget has been dropped from 2% to none. This year we will get the 1% approved last year in addition to the remaining 1% this year, so we will have 2% allocated this year. Additionally, the proportion of indirect costs given back to the State has dropped. These developments not only increase the amount of funds, but the flexibility we will have to use them in future years.

Libraries received 9 million to be distributed across campuses. Outreach efforts to public schools were also funded, including the "reading together program" at UNCG and money for UNC TV for a wide variety of programs and services supporting K12 programs. Graduate tuition remissions were given 8 million dollars in recurring funds, which will enhance our efforts to recruit graduate students on a national basis. Individual faculty members and graduate students aided the effort to obtain these funds. Distinguished professor matching funds were continued.

Overall, 131 million dollars were given to the operating budget and the capital budget was very good. Increases approach 335 million dollars, a new record. Clifton Metcalf, Associate Vice President for Governmental Affairs, was recognized for his efforts in budget matters.

Regarding the report on evaluation of student responses:

The President encourages each institution to study the report and look for those areas in which we might improve. Sophomores, graduating seniors, and alumni were surveyed to evaluate the quality of instruction. The overall quality of instruction was highly rated by all groups. However, there were differences between seniors and sophomores on many items, as well as variation among the campuses. The President highlighted the lower ratings by sophomores, and suggested that we insure that lower division students have access to our best faculty. Each campus will receive a report, and she encouraged that any item on which 30% or more of the students were dissatisfied represents an area that merit attention.

In response to questions:

Gordon Mercer: What is your perspective on new degree programs, given rapid changes in

technology and needs? Do we need to examine our process to approve new programs?

Judith Pulley, Vice President for Planning, outlined the process by which campuses submit requests every two years, which will be issued in January. Although a process that allows requests more frequently may be considered, we must also insure that the process is thoughtful and based on system wide strengths and needs rather than a "first come first serve" basis. Program planning must be integrated within academic planning. We do have the ability to plan new programs at other times.

Howard Neufeld: Given the pressing needs to expand enrollment quickly, have we considered the infrastructure limitations on the campuses and their ability to respond? Any sudden surge may change the campuses in ways that might harm the campus environment.

The President responded that no numbers were assigned to any campus. Each campus was asked to review its existing physical capacity to see if might accommodate any increases that might be anticipated based on demographic plans. Each campus was asked how many students it could accommodate based on current or planned facilities. The campuses were also asked how many students they would choose to have, assuming that the resources would be available to accommodate them. Therefore, three data points, demographic trends, current capacity, and ideal capacity, are considered in the context of each institution's mission, values and budget resources. For example, ASU has limitations that will probably prevent growth regardless of how many students might wish to attend.

The President believes we should try to accommodate as many undergraduate students who seek and who are qualified for enrollment as possible. We CANNOT NOT SERVE this growing population of undergraduate students. We must reconcile this with our desire to serve more graduate students. We hope to accommodate the enrollment growth over the next ten year period (40,000-50,000) using the existing campuses.

Dan Noland: Regarding the specter of competing educational providers (e.g. The University of Phoenix) – what would happen is we simply let people seeking distance education to obtain it from those private vendors?

The President says that we will continue to invest in distance learning techniques because it serves our current students, even if they decide to obtain those courses from others. Information technology will be a measure of quality in serving students on our campuses, not only those who we may serve at a distance. We probably do not know the impact of trying to offer an entire program at a distance. Many of the items on the current student survey probably would be impacted negatively by this approach, although it may work for some students, such as those finishing degrees, teachers in the schools seeking professional development. This population probably represents a large market that would take first rate programs from our institutions.

Mike Pearson: How does our articulation agreement with community colleges impact on planning distance learning programs? Will any of the projected enrollment increase be met during the first two years by the community colleges?

The President said that her impression was that relying on community colleges for this purpose is probably not wise because our transfer rates from them are still fairly low. Therefore, they are probably not the answer to the enrollment surge. The University has a commitment to the people of North Carolina to do everything it can to serve undergraduate students from North Carolina who are qualified and seek admittance. It would be a failure on our part to not accommodate the enrollment growth.

George Rabinowitz: If we increase in state enrollments, can we proportionately increase the enrollment of out of state students?

The President appreciates that out of state students do bring value to our campuses and recognizes that many of these choose to remain in North Carolina after graduation. Although there are no plans to modify the 18% policy, it is possible that it may be scrutinized in the future.

Bylaws Discussion – Gib Smith

Dr. Smith presented the recommended changes. These had been posted on our website. The motion was:

"The Bylaws be amended to reflect the changes indicated in the draft dated October 5, 1998 and the following additional editorial changes:

In Section VI B change "will" to "shall"
In Section VIII B change "Executive to executive committee"
In Section C H&I, change "chairman" and "chairmen" to "chair" and "chairs."

Questions and discussion followed:

IIA - The bylaws do not indicate that there will be a minimum of two members from each institution, although it is specified in the Charter. Move to amend (Rosenberg):

To include the statement in IIA that "Each institution will have a minimum of two members." (to be inserted after the second sentence.)

After discussion, the motion failed.

Section VIII J - Move to reverse the order of the two clauses in the addition. This will be done as an editorial revision. It will read "shall be a member of the Assembly and shall be appointed by the Chair of the Assembly."

The Assembly agrees that all "will be" will be changed to "shall be" as editorial changes; all "chairman" will be changed to "chair."

The motion to adopt the bylaws changed passed without dissent.

Discussion of Copyright colloquium

The second plenary session adjourned at 4:55.

The Third plenary session was convened at 6:50. Forty delegates were present.

The Assembly heard reports from each committee:

Executive Committee – Noland

The renovations to the General Administration building will begin soon, and the meeting room will not be available for our next two meetings. We don't know where the February meeting of the Faculty Assembly will be held. In April, we will try to meet in the Triangle area to be near the meeting of the Faculty Governance Association that will be held in Raleigh.

The Executive Committee discussed how to improve the new delegate orientation. It was agreed that the orientation will become the responsibility of the Assembly Vice Chair.

Dr. Noland reported the appointment of Keith Howell to the task force to review Post Tenure Review and a member of the committee to study faculty benefits

After some discussion, the Executive Committee proposes that the topic for the faculty colloquium next year will be the issues related to technology and teaching.

Reported that the President feels strongly that any copyright discussion should also involve sister institutions around the country, especially around the issues of fair use. She feels we must move quickly, although thoughtfully, on these issues.

Dr. Noland reported on the discussion with President Broad. The President announced the appointment of a new distance learning coordinator, Diane Oblinger, to help with the implementation of the ITS project. The University has contracted with a consulting firm, pending approval, to consider issues related to "Phase II" of the technology initiative. One part of that effort will be the establishment of a team on each campus to manage its IT initiatives. The President also mentioned the possibility of having a system-wide "help desk" to help in problems using the technology. The President suggested that she may consider issues of consolidation of services to better deal with technology, such as combining efforts of campuses located in close proximity.

Professional Development – Pearson

The Professional Development Committee discussed three issues. First, the committee discussed the recently completed report of the Professional Development Advisory Committee. This report is currently being reviewed by General Administration. We will be having a larger discussion of this report at our meeting in February. The second issue involved a discussion of the current committee charge. While there was agreement that the current charge was ambiguous, this gives the committee great flexibility. Third, the committee discussed whether it might examine the increasing time spent in assessment activities (e.g., peer review, review of administrators, etc.) This topic will be explored in greater detail at the next committee meeting.

Faculty Welfare – Howell

Acknowledged that the President's responses to our requests were not only positive but very timely.

Reported that the Chair of the committee had been appointed to serve on a new committee to study faculty benefits. The committee is expected to prepare recommendations by January. This is significant in light of an anticipated increase in BCBS premiums that may exceed 50% in the next two years. The implication is that faculty will become quite concerned with benefits, especially as the State Legislature's new tax cuts are implemented over the next two years.

The committee is concerned about the lack of access to medical care options, especially in the western part of the state where state employees only have access to the State Health Care plan, so when the increases are phased in these employees will not have access to less expensive alternatives. This issue will be presented to the new benefits committee.

The committee is also concerned about the percentage contributed into the optional retirement plans by the state. GA's benefits committee is expected to also address this issue.

The committee had requested that retired faculty have access to certain benefits on campuses throughout the system, including library, computer and recreational facility access. The President has discussed this with the chancellors and will continue to discuss it at their upcoming meetings.

Finally, regarding the wording on phased retirement agreements, the committee chair discussed the issue with Dave Edwards of the GA legal offices, who will continue to work on this topic at the President's request and share his information with the committee. Mr. Edwards reported that the form was prepared under contract with an external party to follow formats fairly common in early retirement documents, but that the wording will be reviewed. The committee has been asked to act quickly on this so the form may be revised before the deadline for phased retirement application this year.

The committee is concerned that the percentage of full time faculty may be decreasing because of the increasing use of part time faculty. Although campuses vary considerably in how they keep records on part time faculty, the committee will be requesting available information from GA on the extent of part time faculty use on each campus.

Finally, Fred Eckles has been serving on a committee investigating the addition of a mutual fund family, and this committee will be making a report soon.

Budget – Fogarty

The committee met with Ken Grogan to hear details about the budget and review proposals for the next biennium. The committee discussed how to help individual faculty become more active in budget planning on each campus. This committee will contact the chair of each campus committee charged with working on the budget to determine effective practices. They will use this information to develop a model of "good practice" that might increase faculty input into the budgeting process.

Because there appear to be many questions about budgeting, the committee hopes to develop a "FAQ" page for the Faculty Assembly home page devoted to budgeting.

Planning and Programs – Caton

The committee met with Jarrett Cummings, the Director of Special Projects, who reported on the Information & Infrastructure Technology Strategy (ITS) plan which will bring campus

networks closer to standard. GS is working with a project manager using input from each institution. Each campus will identify goals, objectives and capabilities, and each will empanel an IT planning taskforce. External consultants will work with steering committee, which has nine chancellors as members, to identify the highest priority initiatives. The purpose of Phase II is to bring faculty on-line by providing computers, faculty development, software and support. The results from Phase I will be available on the GA website in the near future.

The committee then met with Gary Barnes, who discussed using system wide survey data as part of demonstrating the University's accountability. GA reports results on a regular cycle to the Board of Governors Planning Committee. The surveys rate the overall quality of instruction.

Mr. Barnes also proposed that we consider using broader measures of efficiency instead of just the quality of instruction. For example, those campuses who are efficiently used during the summer, or those who encourage academic progress and who average fifteen student credit hours attempted in the fall semester might be rewarded by sharing some of the cost savings. Representatives from GA visit each campus at least once very three years to better understand how the surveys are viewed. They attempt to balance the measures used to avoid promoting reactive or inappropriate responses to perceived problems. Mr. Barnes suggested that the issues of accountability will be particularly important with distance learning programs.

David Claxton discussed why the review of new programs seems to be delayed. It appears that programs are not being reviewed if they are not part of the strategic plan. Also, the University is shifting how it classifies programs, and now uses the CIPA system. We are involved in classifying programs into the new system, and it may be that some of the new requests are not really asking for new programs but only new tracks. GA is considering whether to review new programs at times other than on a two-year cycle.

The committee also discussed distance learning issues, especially the need for faculty development. They hoped that either GA or the consultants involved might provide workshops on each campus.

Finally, the committee discussed the copyright colloquium held on the previous day. They appreciated that the meeting was focused and hoped that more colloquia could be held in the future.

Faculty Governance – Smith

The committee met with Mr. Richard Robinson, Vice President for Legal Affairs and General Counsel, to discuss grievance procedures, the model computer use policy and the public records law. Related to the computer use policy and the public record laws, and Mr. Robinson's suggested that GA may attempt to influence the Legislature on this matter, and the committee asks that Chair Gasaway keep the Assembly informed of the initiatives being made on these issues.

The committee also discussed grievances that are appealed to the Board of Governors – in the last six years there have been 80 appeals. One was reversed, 11 were sent back to campuses for further review, and the others were either upheld or not heard.

After these discussion, the committee suggested that a procedure be developed to advise faculty on each campus to make the process more effective. The committee asks Chair Gasaway to form a task force to examine grievance procedures on each campus and to recommend ways to make the procedures more effective.

Academic Freedom and Tenure – Mackey

The committee asked Dr. Judith Stillion to provide an overview of the criteria used create the post tenure review procedures on each campus. A state wide committee drafted the guidelines that each campus to followed to develop policies for faculty development.

The committee will examine the campus policies, paying particular attention to items that impact on tenure. GA will review the program annually to be sure that each campus is operating in compliance.

The five criteria of concern are:

- The plan requires a development plan and a timetable
- The plan includes imposition of appropriate sanctions

- The plan clearly shows peer involvement in the process
- The plan requires written feedback...and provides an opportunity for response
- The plan provides for due process in the case of sanctions in compliance with the code.

The other five criteria were seen as having a smaller impact on tenure. The committee will read each campus document before January and compile the information for the February meeting of Faculty Assembly.

Old Business

There is a Chancellor search being initiated at UNCA. The delegates were asked to submit nominations of individuals who may be good candidates.

Election of the Nominations Committee: Nominations were taken from the floor to form a Nominations Committee as required by the Bylaws. Five delegates were nominated:

Dan Caton
Dan Noland

Rita Reeves

Richard Bernhard

Pam Hunter

A motion was made to close nominations, and all candidates were elected by acclamation.

Regarding the site for the next two meetings of Faculty Assembly: Article V C of the Bylaws requires that the location of the meetings be voted on by the delegates. However, at this time no locations have been proposed, so the matter cannot be presented for a vote. The Executive Committee will with GA on finding suitable meeting facilities. The delegates affirmed that:

"Faculty Assembly will meet at a location suggested by GA, approved by the Chair." The meetings are February 19 and April 16.

The motion carried without dissent.

New Business

The discussion topic for February will be distance learning. The topic of committee charges will also be discussed.

It was suggested that the Senate Chairs discuss post tenure review at their meeting in February and meet with the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:59 p.m.

(c) 2011