Minutes of the Faculty Assembly

Minutes of the Faculty Assembly 112th Session April 7, 2000

The First Plenary Session, meeting at the UNC General Administration, was called to order at 10:05. Thirty-five delegates were present.

A. Welcome:

Chair Howell welcomed all delegates. Several items were distributed: 1) an article from the *Charlotte Observer* regarding recent proposals for tuition increases; 2) a letter from the members of the Steering Committee of the Carolina Colloquy for University Teaching to the Vice President for Academic Affairs; 3) a list of comments regarding the change in meetings times; and 4) a list of future meeting dates for the Assembly. Subsequently, a copy of the remarks made by Dr. Gretchen Bataille, the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, at the Faculty Forum on Instructional Technology were also distributed.

The dates for future Faculty Assembly meetings will be:

2000 - 2001, meetings 113 - 116

September 15, 2000 November 17, 2000 February 16, 2001 April 20, 2001 2001 - 2002, meetings 117 - 120

> September 21, 2001 November 16, 2001 February 15, 2002 April 19, 2002

B. The minutes from the February meeting were approved without change.

The Agenda was modified so that the group could consider a resolution honoring Roy Carroll. The resolution was read and approved unanimously and is attached as a part of these minutes.

C. Presentation of the proposed new admissions requirements by Gary Barnes, Vice President, assisted by Morris Dean.

Background: The Board first adopted minimum requirements in 1984. Before then, students needed only to apply to the university. There were concerns that entering students were not adequately prepared, so a set of minimum standards was imposed that outlined the coursework that students had to complete in high school before entering the university.

What is being proposed to the Board next Thursday is to increase these requirements:

By 2004: require two years of one foreign language

By 2006: require an additional unit of mathematics beyond algebra II

These additions were adopted only after an examination of requirements in other states indicated that North Carolina requires the lowest number of courses overall. Because previous studies have shown that there is a strong link between what students have done in high school and their later performance in college, it is expected that attendance, persistence rates and performance will increase if standards are raised. In general, students "step up" to meet the new requirements and high school graduation rates are not adversely affected.

Looking at what happened when the system increased the requirements previously, it was found that attendance rates continued to increase, and that the gap between white and minority student attendance actually decreased. Looking at persistence rates, the gain for black students has increased dramatically while the persistence rates for white students have remained fairly level.

Data also show that the correlation between SAT scores and high school record is strong, so it is predicted that increasing the requirements will increase the average SAT scores; similarly, those who exceed minimum requirements are more likely to be accepted. In general, the pattern suggests that having a stronger high school curriculum results in stronger college performance on almost any criterion.

Had these requirements been in place for the Fall 1998 class, 95.3% of entering students would have met the language requirements; 78.7% would have met both the math and foreign language requirements. The impact does vary among the campuses. There is some differential impact by race, especially in meeting both requirements. Although this does merit concern, one way to consider the issue is that the increasing the rigor in the curriculum will better prepare all students, especially those who may not be getting support from home. The University will highly publicize the new requirements among educational leaders and legislators so that all will understand the new requirements. The university also recognizes the need for many new teachers of mathematics, either by teacher training or through in-service training. The university will collaborate with the schools on the new math curriculum and will monitor student progress carefully each year to determine how many students are meeting the additional requirements.

In response to questions:

What about the ability of rural high schools to meet these: All high schools currently offer the required courses.

Does the data actually show causality? Several analyses seem to support the impact of increased requirements, especially with minority students.

Why wait until 2006? To insure adequate publicity and to give schools and students time to respond.

What is the status of teachers being prepared? That data are not at hand, although there is clearly a problem that will force us to consider other ways to prepare students than traditional face to face instruction. In general, instead of thinking of this as a barrier, consider it to be recommendation: instead of taking these courses in college, take them earlier in high school. In general, these requirements can be met by students using fewer than half of their high school hours.

How will this affect the community college transfer students? These requirements do apply to transfer students. The articulation agreement with the community college does allow us some flexibility in waiving these requirements.

Regarding our ability to meet the new requirements: The Board seems committed to being top in education. The major challenge will be to meet the new mathematics requirements; most students already are meeting the foreign language requirements.

In general, delegates applauded the new requirements, and supported even more challenging ones.

In general, curriculum and requirements are set by faculty on the campuses – these seem to have been generated without faculty input. In the future, is there a role for faculty in designing new requirements? It would seem to be difficult, because the requirements are based on a database that is systemwide. The policy of the Board is to delegate decisions regarding admission requirements, EXCEPT when the Board wishes to impose a minimum. Other than that, campus decisions should remain local.

Will there be a social science requirement increase? The current requirement is now two units – moving to a third would be difficult for out of state students to meet and may have less of an impact on future performance.

Can the schools accommodate yet another requirement? This is difficult, and the university's support will be welcomed.

How will these impact on student athletes? In general, we have had fewer than 50 exceptions to the requirements over the years, and none was for a student athlete. The university does not plan on waiving requirements for student athletes.

D. Chair's report:

The Chair mentioned the meeting on technology held the previous day, thanking the Vice Presidents for their support and the Assembly members who made presentations. Notes from the meeting will be distributed. The Chair announced that the North Carolina AAUP will meet tomorrow, and Hugh Hindman briefly described

the agenda.

The Chair reported that the nominations committee was unable to distribute the list of candidates by email as had been proposed. Various openings remain on the ballot, and delegates were encouraged to nominate themselves for the election to be held later during the meeting. Delegates were to inform the Secretary by the end of the lunch period.

Chair Howell thanked the GA staff, especially Sue Lindsey, for help in scheduling the meetings of the Assembly this year during a time when our regular room was being renovated. The change in venue, in the time of the meetings, and in the overall personnel at GA has made it a difficult year.

Chair Howell reported that he had visited UNCP and Elizabeth City State. UNCP clearly had a strong governance system.

Chair Howell, reflecting on his attendance at Board of Governors meetings, continues to believe that the Assembly must consider how it can have a greater impact on the legislators on issues that affect the University as a whole. He believes that legislators would welcome our input, in addition to what they hear from Chancellors and Trustees. Members asked if Dr. Bataille and Vice President Millikan might speak during lunch about upcoming efforts that faculty may become involved in over the summer.

The Executive Committee is working on a proposed budget that would support the Faculty Assembly. They hope to have a budget proposal ready for next year.

- E. With the arrival of Roy Carroll, the Assembly turned its attention to its earlier resolution. Vice President Carroll was given a plaque commemorating his contributions.
- F. During lunchtime:

Vice President Millikan described the issues that he believes will be addressed during the Legislature's short session. The most important thing in lobbying is coordination of strategy and timing. Because of the lack of funding, it is anticipated that the session will be short, but will include:

Adjusting the budget, probably meaning budget cuts. Priorities of the University include: 1) the capital facilities initiative – this needs to be addressed now – another year cannot go by. This is supported by the recently completed campus tours. The University will not propose how these needs should be addressed – that is the role of the General Assembly – but the University will work diligently on any proposed effort. At the moment, it might be predicted that a referendum would be proposed. It is important that we work with the Community Colleges on this issue.

In our packet was an article from the *Observer* and a list of messages that are important for the University to convey. A website will be on line next week related to these issues. The website may become a vehicle to communicate quickly with members of the faculty when input is important on issues. The URL for the website is: http://www.uncbuildings.org/.

Many of the University's requests are for commitments to address problems, and as such do not propose immediate costs, so the legislature may be able to approve them in spite of a tight budget year.

Regarding whether or not faculty members are being encouraged to lobby on issues, in today's environment it is important to have broad input from constituents. Such "grass roots" networks are often more effective, because legislators are most concerned with issues at their local levels. Therefore, the university welcomes the help of faculty on lobbying, although effectiveness will depend on having some level of coordination. That is the purpose of the website. Faculty are encouraged to work with the individual on their campus who has been designated to work with lobbying activities. Top priorities include: capital facilities, excellent university act, and financial aid. Increases due to enrollment growth are also an important priority.

Each campus has a Legislative Liaison, which is a spreading out of our lobbying efforts from GA alone. However, this has led to some confusion about who is to be seen as the "official" representative of the University. The Board had to balance the enhanced role of each campus in lobbying while maintaining a centralized position under the President. Therefore, the VP at GA now participates in the appointment and the annual evaluation of each campus Liaison. This will help to insure that the Board of Governors priorities are conveyed as the University position.

One concern is that the smaller campuses do not have someone in Raleigh at all times, and probably shouldn't spend all of their resources to do so. One advantage of the new reporting relationship is that it does create a team to lobby for the university, so if a campus does not have the resources for full time lobbying they are still

being represented.

Delegates went to committee meetings at 1:00. The second session began at 3:15

Committee Reports

A. Nominations Committee, Bill Siegfried for Mike Pearson

The candidates were:

Chair Keith Howell, UNCG

Vice-Chair Jeff Passe, UNCC

James Smith, ASU

Secretary Beryl McEwen, NCA&T

Faculty Benefits and Welfare

Jill Harp, WSSU Don Lisnerski, UNCA

Committee on Budget

George Wilson, NCCU Carl Hughes, FSU

Faculty Governance Committee

Henry Ferrell, ECU Ken Gurganus, UNCW

Planning and Programs

Ali Kahn, ECSU Stephen Lilley, NCSU

Faculty Development

Allan Rosenberg, ECU Richard Swanson, UNCG

Academic Freedom and Tenure

Jose D'Arruda, UNCP Robert Morrison, ECU

After one runoff election for the Chair of the Faculty Development Committee, the Executive Committee for 2000 - 2001 was determined to be:

Keith Howell, Chair
James Smith, Vice Chair
Beryl McEwen Secretary
Don Lisnerski, Faculty Benefits and Welfare
Carl Hughes, Committee on Budget
Henry Ferrell, Faculty Governance
Ali Kahn, Planning and Programs
Richard Swanson, Faculty Development
Robert Morrison, Academic Freedom and Tenure

B. Executive Committee, Bill Siegfried for Mike Pearson

The Executive Committee prepared for the day by discussing the nominations and decided that delegates would be asked to submit their interest to the Secretary by lunch. The committee prepared the resolution honoring Roy Carroll, and briefly discussed the delegates' comments about the change in meeting time. Finally, it was decided to pursue having a separate assembly budget by asking for a record of past expenses.

C. Planning and Programs, Linda Nelms

At the last meeting, the committee was asked to discuss how programs are approved, so the committee met with Judith Pulley who described the process. Highlights include: submissions are invited only every two years, unless there are special conditions, because GA wants to insure that program approval is not based only on when it was received. This may be reconsidered and next year's committee may be asked to provide input. The GA staff reviews first, but they may request advice from others. With graduate programs, external consultants are used before the proposal is given to the graduate council and graduate deans. The President, on the advice of Chancellors, appoints the graduate council. The process attempts to conserve resources and eliminate duplication and to seek cooperation among campuses when possible. In a typical year, thirty programs are brought before GA. If the committee were to be involved, it would be a fairly large process. The committee feels it is important to examine the means and issues related to approval rather than to examine and approve programs themselves.

The committee prepared a resolution (attached to the minutes) regarding access to education. After some discussion and editorial suggestions, the resolution carried without dissent.

The committee discussed the MAR report and found it interesting. The committee also discussed some issues that may be examined by the committee next year, and will provide a list to the incoming Chair.

The following motion was made from the floor: The Faculty Assembly enthusiastically endorses the proposed Minimum Admissions requirements presented by the General Administration to the Board of Governors.

After discussion and seconding, the motion approved without dissent.

D. Academic Freedom and Tenure, Bob Morrison for Dick Bernhard

The committee discussed post tenure review. The procedures seem to vary among campuses and the committee is interested in being involved with the study that GA will be conducting. The GA study related to part-time and fixed term faculty has not yet begun. The Academic Freedom and Tenure committee recommends that the process begin with the membership already identified, although changes may be made later. The average length of time in a part-time position is nine years. Discussing web-based instruction, the committee wondered how these courses would be designed and taught, and whether the diversity among courses would be lessened. They hope these issues will be discussed next year. A delegate questioned whether or not fixed term appointments are limited to five years, which is a policy initiated on his campus. Discussion among the delegates suggested that there is no standard GA policy on term limits.

E. Budget, Nancy Fogarty

The Budget Committee met with Vice President Davies, who indicated that the office of budget management has requested a 2% budget reduction for each campus next year. To respond, GA has offered a .5% reduction from non-recurring funds, and the office of Budget Management is considering this favorably. The chancellors have asked that the reduction be managed at the campus level, and that is the plan. Legislators seem to be willing to consider paying the intangibles tax settlement in alternative ways, such as borrowing money, so the budget picture may be better than anticipated. GA has requested money based on the new funding model for enrollment, which lead to a 21.3 million-dollar request for enrollment increase and 14 million for distance learning. In future years, these two requests may be combined. The 6% salary increase seems to be unrealistic, with a 3% increase seen as more likely, in addition to 1% for teaching excellence.

Looking at the budget questionnaire results, the committee has prepared a letter to Chancellors, Senate Chairs, Delegation heads and others, which gives the results of the survey. Recipients are asked to examine the results and to encourage all campuses to solicit faculty input into the budgeting process.

The FAQ sheet will be prepared by Nancy Fogarty over the summer and will be put on our website. The chair thanked her committee members for their hard work and dedication.

Discussion ensued about the disparities that have resulted from the mandate to award teaching merit money to a fixed percent of faculty. Delegates understand the desire to reward good teaching, but made suggestions about how the system might be made more flexible so that the ultimate outcome will become fairer for faculty and departments. After extended discussion, the Chair declared that he will meet with Vice President Bataille to encourage that this issue be addressed at the first fall meeting.

F. Faculty Governance, Hugh Hindman

Following up on the discussion at lunchtime about political affairs, the committee believes that the Assembly may become more politically active in the future; therefore the committee suggests that we begin thinking

about a faculty liaison or a committee in the Assembly dealing with government relations. In the meantime, it was pointed out that not all campuses have faculty listservs, and the committee encourages senate chairs to have them established to facilitate communication about these issues (and others) in the future. The committee also requests that the Assembly Chair invite the Speaker of the House and the President protem of the Senate to attend the Assembly next year to engage in a dialogue with faculty about legislative issues related to higher education. After discussion, a motion supporting that request passed with no dissent.

The committee discussed faculty representation and interaction with governing boards, and the group urges that senate chairs and delegates continue to press for a "seat at the table" at those meetings. Next fall, when the call for nominations for the Boards of Trustees is distributed, it will be sent to faculty senates and the Assembly. The committee discussed grievance procedures, briefly, and expresses its frustration at the slow pace of movement examining this issue. The committee appointed at GA has made little progress. At the first Assembly meeting a resolution was made; at the second meeting, the Chair was asked to inquire about the progress but has gained little information. Therefore, the committee presented a motion that:

"The faculty assembly reaffirms its commitment to its 'Resolution expressing faculty expectations regarding fair, just, and effective faculty dispute resolution procedures' adopted on November 11, 1999, and requests that the Chair of the Assembly obtain a specific response from the General Administration regarding that resolution." After discussion, the motion passed without dissent.

The committee also discussed how the Assembly meetings might be formatted so that delegates could learn more about what is going on the campuses.

G. Faculty Welfare, Don Lisnerski

General issues were discussed, including post tenure review. When post tenure review was introduced in other States, many faculty decided to retire rather than face review. The committee will be interested to see if this trend has happened at UNC. They are also interested in what happens to those who have chosen phased retirement. Other issues included day care availability, health and wellness facilities and how they are funded, and retirement. The committee wonder if there are issues related to retirement, and recommends that the chair of the Assembly assign to a committee the task of exploring whether positions in the Assembly could be added that would be given to retiring faculty, such are retired Assembly Chairs or officers. They recommend that this issue be explored next year.

H. Professional Development, Allan Rosenberg

The group met with several guests, including Ms. Mary Wakeford and Ms. Beth Bowser. The committee discussed its future activities, especially in light of the technology conference yesterday. They set priorities for consideration next year: 1) to advocate for faculty in development of new instructional technology; 2) encourage that next year the committee reconsider the issue of chair development, especially following the earlier recommendations of the PDAC committee; 3) to consider the activities of the colloquy and its relationship to professional development, the TLT centers and other initiatives in the system; 4) after briefly discussing that faculty were not involved in the determination of how money was spent in Phases I and II of the information technology studies, to encourage that faculty be involved in future distributions. The group was also concerned about the status of the campus teaching and learning centers and how they relate to information technology efforts.

I. Ad Hoc technology committee, Laura Gasaway

Distributed the report of their annual activities, which is attached to these minutes. One critical issues is that faculty are concerned that the "technologists" are making decisions with little faculty input when those decisions impact directly on faculty members (e.g. decisions to require students to have laptops, or decisions about what software to purchase.) Who is making such decisions, and how can we insure that faculty priorities will prevail? The charge to the committee has evolved, and it suggests that it be enhanced by adding the sentence that "The Ad Hoc Technology Committee shall ensure faculty input and decision making on technologies that affect teaching and learning."

The first task next year will be to work with Vice President Oblinger to monitor how technology is being installed on campuses. Also, the committee recommends that there be another conference on technology next year, including workshops with hands-on experience for faculty.

Old Business

The chair asked delegates about the change in meeting times. Delegates discussed the advantages and disadvantages. One suggestion was that the meeting times alternate next year, to try out both approaches, before making a more permanent decision.

The chair acknowledged those who were completing their six years of service. In particular, he thanked former President Lolly Gasaway for her service, mentoring and her work with the Technology Committee. He also thanked the Secretary. He acknowledged Nancy Fogarty for her work on the Budget Committee, suggesting that her presence may be responsible for the increase in membership on that committee. He also thanked Linda Nelms for her continual help and quidance.

The meeting was adjourned at Respectfully submitted:	6:05.
William D. Siegfried	
	Resolution Honoring Dr. Roy Carroll
C	hair Howell will insert the resolution at this point.

Resolution Regarding Access to Education

Whereas, the access of capable students from every economic level to higher education is a long standing and valued aim of the UNC System

Whereas, the value of such access is directly related to the quality and reputation of the University

Whereas, quality and reputation require appropriate funding

Whereas, as a public institution, the University System has and should properly be able to rely on the Legislature to meet critical needs for capital repairs, technological innovation, competitive faculty salaries, and the ordinary and ongoing cost of operating

Be it therefore resolved that;

The Faculty Assembly supports the goal of access to excellent education and, In order to maintain the goal of access to excellent education,

The Faculty Assembly urges that the President impress upon the Board of Governors and the Legislature their responsibility and their role in achieving these goals for the people of the State of North Carolina through their support of all campuses in the University System.

UNC FACULTY ASSEMBLY

Ad Hoc Technology Committee ANNUAL REPORT, 1999-2000

April 7, 2000

Background

For several years members of the Faculty Assembly have discussed their concerns about how technology has been implemented on their campuses. Chairperson Keith Howell created the Ad Hoc Technology Committee to review a variety of issues related to technology, to give focused attention to technology and teaching, and to help focus the University's technology effort on instructional use of technology, meeting faculty needs and assisting them to adopt and utilize instructional technology to enhance teaching, research and service. The Assembly had expressed interest in a colloquium or forum dealing with technology, considering whether a permanent committee on technology would be appropriate to ensure that meeting faculty needs are paramount in developing technology capability on the campuses. Faculty continue to be concerned that technologists rather than faculty members are driving these efforts and the needs of faculty are too often ignored or made subordinate. Efforts to require the purchase of laptop computers on the part of students are often done without adequate faculty input or training for faculty will so they change their teaching to utilize this increased technological capacity.

Committee Charge

The Ad Hoc Technology Committee shall ensure faculty input and decision-making on technologies that affect teaching and learning. The Committee shall monitor technology implementation on the campuses to ensure that faculty have adequate equipment, software and staff support to use technology for effective instruction and professional development. The Committee shall work with the General Administration staff and the Professional Development Committee to create opportunities to assist faculty in incorporating technology to enhance teaching, research and service.

Manifesto

The Committee identified faculty use of technology for instruction, research and professional development as its primary priority. To that end, the Committee will develop a document that identifies a floor for faculty computer equipment, networking and support staff. While there is some danger that a manifesto will create expectations on the part of faculty members, the fact that this is a document developed by faculty as opposed to administrators, means it will be perceived more as a "want list." The manifesto might include:

Faculty Computing

- A high-end computer that runs modern software
- Rapid access to the Internet 24 x 7
- Particular platform minimums
- Appropriate mobile technology
- Free (site licensed) software for all widely used applications & databases
- Specific levels of service
- Regular replacement schedule for equipment
- Regular upgrades for software

Classroom Technology

- Computer access (fixed or portable)
- Computer projection equipment
- Internet access in all classrooms
- Adequate classrooms, equipment and software for distance learning courses
- Staff support for classroom technology on call when classes are in session
- Adequate maintenance of classroom technology
- Specialized equipment for discipline specific purposes

Staffing Issues

- Sufficient staff to support faculty use and adoption of technology
- High skill level for staff
- Professional development for staff to continuously upgrade skill levels
- Salaries sufficient to attract and retain staff
- Use of outside consultants for maintenance and service
- Utilize specialized internal resources (e.g., School of Filmmaking, legal, statistics, research, software evaluation)

Assisting Faculty to Use Technology (Strategies)

- A website at General Administration with materials to help faculty (e.g., teaching with technology, where to get free Internet access, etc.)
- Links to other resources
- Short, targeted instructional sessions
- Multi-institutional workshops on specific teaching with technology topics
- Online courses to teach faculty to use technology
- An annual hands-on enference for faculty to upgrade skills
- Course administration support (class rolls, automatic listservs, grading, courseware

(c) 2011