

Minutes of the Faculty Assembly

Minutes of the Faculty Assembly 110th Session November 19, 1999

The First Plenary Session, meeting at the Carolina Inn, was called to order at 1:26. Forty-three delegates were present.

A. Welcome: Chair Howell welcomed all delegates, and asked new delegates to stand for recognition. Several items were distributed to delegates, including: a list of delegates, committee assignments, the agenda, the classification system for campuses within the system, an organizational chart of the University, and the general mission statement for the University of North Carolina.

B. Announcements:

The Chair reminded delegates that the campuses vary widely in their issues and in the quality of work life faculty members have. This is seen in the role and function of faculty governance on each campus, and the Chair offered the aid of the faculty assembly where needed.

The Chair (ungraciously) pointed out that delegates are older and reflect the maturity of the Faculty Assembly as well as the members of that body. Indeed, the average age of faculty members in the system now approaches fifty. The Assembly, reflecting this trend, will be a group that will establish procedures that will influence those who replace them in the future, as this cohort of faculty begins to retire.

The Chair then introduced the chairs of each of the standing committees. The Chair reminded delegates that they had been assigned to committees but encouraged those who wished to change to ask for another committee assignment.

C. Minutes: Corrections were proposed, and a motion to accept the minutes with those corrections was made and supported without dissent.

D. The Chair encouraged delegates to address questions to the President during her session this afternoon. Chair Howell also volunteered to continue the tradition of the Faculty Assembly Chair visiting each campus senate, and offered to visit if invited.

E. Delegate Ferrell pointed out that the organizational chart of the University, previously distributed, incorrectly listed ECU as a comprehensive level institution.

At 1:40, the session was adjourned, so that delegates could attend their committee meetings. The Second Plenary Session convened at 3:42.

A. Report of the President

1. The President expressed her eagerness to work with Chair Howell during the year and looks forward to continuing the good working relationship she had with Dr. Gasaway.
2. In response to her meeting with Dr. Howell, the President expressed her willingness to address the issue of non-tenure track faculty.

3. The President presented the highlights from her workshop on the previous day with the Board of Governors regarding the competitiveness of faculty salaries. The Legislature had asked the Board of Governors to study faculty salaries and overall compensation and evaluate these for each institution in comparison to peer institutions within the state, region and country. The Board is to make recommendations for appropriate adjustments to salaries and other compensation, and to identify revenue options for funding such adjustments. The current study focused on faculty salaries of four professorial ranks. The non-salary portion is more difficult to address, although the optional retirement program may be one area that might be considered.

The study stresses the University's goal to maintain the highest level of academic excellence, and the need to have competitive compensation to be able to recruit and retain faculty to meet that goal. After discussion with the Chancellors, the goal to be in the top 20% of all institutions was established.

The key to the study was benchmarking. For each of the sixteen campuses, a comparison group of 15 or 16 peer institutions was identified, based on an array of characteristics including mission, research character, and other standard measures. This was done twice. The first set of comparison groups was chosen from comparable public universities as the primary benchmarks. When compared against this benchmark group, it was found that to bring faculty salaries for every campus into the top quintile of public institutions, the cost would be 28.3 million dollars. Each of the sixteen campuses required additional funds to reach this level.

In a second phase, each campus was compared against a cohort that went beyond public institutions to include a sample of private institutions selected nationwide. Each campus agreed to the peer institutions selected for it. When compared against this benchmark group, nine of the campuses would need even more funding to bring them up to the top quintile. For the other campuses, no additional funding would be needed to raise salaries to the top quintile of this peer group. The total cost to match this benchmarking group would be almost 39.2 million dollars.

The strategy is to select the higher of the two results as the target. It may be that State sources will be used to reach the level of public peer institutions, and that private or non-state funds may be required to reach the level of selected peers. The Chancellors and the Board seem receptive to these recommendations.

The plan was presented to the Board on November 18, 1999, and further discussed today. In January, revenue sources and an implementation plan will be presented to the Board of Governors during a workshop. The report will identify sources of revenue that might address faculty salary issues, including any recommendations for tuition changes. Following the workshop with the Board in January, the Board will make its budget request to the General Assembly in February.

4. The second major initiative was to address student financial aid. North Carolina is one of the few states not to have a state financial aid program. Students' debt has increased. The university has recommended to the Board a plan to introduce a program of student financial aid, which will leverage all sources of aid for students. Federal aid, such as tax credits, could be combined to increase support. The program is built on the expectation that students will provide some self-help. Freshmen would be expected to supply less help than upper division and graduate students.

5. The President responded to Keith Howell's question about how the Faculty Assembly might be more involved in the university's legislative efforts. Mr. J. B. Milliken, Vice President for Public Affairs and University Advancement, responded that the University is interested in using all its resources, but that the efforts must be coordinated in terms of both message and timing. Efforts are underway to initiate communication networks on each campus. The goal is to have a cadre of informed advocates on each campus. Vice President Milliken outlined one initiative coming up in the Legislature: The Joint Select Committee on Educational Needs, a twenty member committee appointed to study university and community college needs is being formed. This is a group that we need to inform. To do this, all groups, including faculty must be informed about the key initiatives, talking points, and messages that the University wants to convey to all constituents. The Vice President suggested that we form a communications group to convey these messages among faculty. The University will prepare information about our needs, talking points, and messages. The faculty may be one of the most informed and effective advocates for the University.

In response to questions:

1. On many campuses, salaries for administrators are included in the data about faculty salaries. These higher salaries often distort the information, making it appear that the salary needs are less than they really are.

The President responded that the AAUP guidelines require that the salary data include only those faculty who meet the AAUP definition of full time faculty. The goal was to have only professorial ranks, nine-month appointment faculty whose major effort is teaching.

2. Would it be possible to break the peer institution salary data down by rank and discipline?

The data were broken down by rank, and the mix of disciplines was incorporated to the extent possible. The intention was to select a fair average for comparison, but recognizing that the allocation of any resources would be specific to the mix of disciplines on each campus.

3. Would money be allocated just to bring the campus average up to the norm, or would it attempt to bring each rank up the norm.

Each campus would have the freedom to allocate money, but the intention is to bring each campus up to the norm.

4. The campuses that joined the system in the 1970's have always lagged their older peers. To compound matters, the effect on inflation has been great, such that faculty salaries often have less buying power now than when individuals were hired in the 1960's. There may be a scarcity of faculty in the future. The older members of the system may be able to compete for replacement faculty, but attention must be paid to those schools at the bottom of the list, because they will be unable to survive unless salaries are raised. Raising institutions up to their peer group may not be sufficient for some of our campuses to survive.

5. Three items: a) Regarding the initiatives for technology and for professional development, including instructional teaching centers: Although the technology initiative has received support, development has not. Faculty, teaching, and learning seem to be taking second seat to technology. What has happened to the recommendations from the professional advisory committee?

These were not funded, and we are also stymied by the change in leadership with the retirement of Judith Stillion. This is a real concern, but will not be addressed until Roy Carroll's replacement is named. One of the action items taken by the Board today was to approve the appointment of Gretchen Bataille, Provost and Academic Vice President at Washington State who will replace Dr. Carroll.

Secondly, given disaster relief funding, what effect will this have on the university budget next year?

The President has worked with the legislature because the University's budget is at risk given the needs to meet disaster relief. The one-percent reversion for flood recovery has been reduced to about thirty million, so that no additional reductions are anticipated. Hopefully the funding for each campus will be released, although if Congress fails to address our needs, the head of the State Budget may be forced to take further action.

Finally, the President addressed an issue specific to ECU's salary data.

6. The Salary data seem to address only a snapshot salary data and not include issues related to retirement and other competitive issues. Will the staff and the Board address the larger compensation issue. This is particularly important given the large number projected retirements.

On an ongoing basis, the larger issue must be addressed. However, this study is a first step that may gain support of the legislature. The benchmarking process may be used in the future to address other issues. The problem must be addressed in small steps rather than in a single effort that may be open to criticism. The anticipated need for faculty, as replacements for retiring faculty and to meet growth, is a critical need.

7. Are we disadvantaged by be included with other state employees rather than separately?

The benchmarking process may help us define our separate needs.

8. What are the implications for the state system from the actions taken by UNC CH and NCSU to raise tuition?

This is a complex issue. First, NCSU is a one-year proposal to increase tuition by \$300 that would be reduced if there were a tuition increase for the system. NCSU does not plan to use the tuition to address faculty salaries, but to identify priorities related to student aid and other services. The proposals from UNC CH and NCSU, although similar amounts, are quite different. The Board will have to address these proposals. The President does not see how small increases in tuition can address the larger issues related to faculty salaries. However, if the legislature does not commit resources to the University, we will be able to address none of the important initiatives.

9. Would it help if legislators would meet with some of the committees of the Assembly?

The staff welcomes the opportunity to meet with committees.

10. As salaries were studied, what was the effect of gender? Was Nursing excluded?

The nursing professions were included in the analysis. The effects of gender were not specifically considered.

11. What are the differences between affecting the public and the legislators?

We probably have contacts with legislators, and we need to use a variety of strategies to get our message out. Key people will be identified to work with legislators.

12. In the last few years, some faculty have expressed concern about the distribution of merit raises to faculty for excellence in teaching. Do you feel that you should communicate to the legislators that the impact of the raise is hurting morale? Specifically, the rule that only 25% of the faculty can receive such raises has caused problems.

The twenty five percent rule is a Board of Governors rule. The legislature does not dictate this. We could probably not convince the legislature that we were targeting teaching excellence if we gave a raise to everyone. This is one instance where we have been treated differently from other state employees. It does cause some issues with morale, however.

The afternoon session was adjourned at 5:02. The evening session was convened at 6:58 with thirty-eight delegates present.

A. Scheduling a make up meeting: The September meeting of the Faculty Assembly was not held because of Hurricane Floyd. The question was whether to schedule a third meeting during the spring, so that the Assembly would have its usual four meetings in 1999-2000. Several dates for a make up meeting in March were proposed. Chairman Howell asked the delegates whether they wished to meet in March, and a straw poll of delegates indicated that a majority of delegates did want to have a make-up meeting. A ballot listing several dates was distributed, on which 27 delegates indicated that they preferred March 3, 2000. March 10 and March 17 were selected by five and by two delegates, respectively.

B. Nominations Committee: Given the uncertainty about a fourth meeting, the nominations committee was not constituted.

C. Committee Reports

1. Executive Committee: Mike Pearson

The Executive Committee has met twice, once today and once two weeks ago in Greensboro. At those meetings, each committee chair outlined the issues that would be addressed during the year. Mike quickly outlined those agendas:

Academic Freedom:	Post tenure review Part time faculty
Faculty Governance:	Bylaws changes Grievance procedures Faculty representation on governing boards Liaison with Legislature Evaluation of Administrators
Faculty Welfare:	Health benefits (spouses) Part time faculty Day care needs Retirement benefits – transferability within system
Planning & Programs:	Tuition increases
Professional Development:	Capital expenditures Disaster planning Plan for enrollment growth Exploring how to coordinate with IT initiatives

The committee briefly discussed the possibility of restructuring the committees of the Assembly, but

has no recommendation at this time.

Finally, the committee discussed how members of the Assembly could do a better job working with the faculty senates and councils on the campuses, so that the Assembly can better represent the needs of the institutions.

2. Budget: Nancy Fogarty

The committee is compiling surveys from the campuses regarding input into the budget process. The committee has identified campuses where the process seems to be working well, and will distribute this and the survey information to the Chancellors, Provosts and faculty governance on each campus. There seems to be uneven participation across the system, ranging from none to quite a bit. The committee reports that all campuses desire to have a web site to address budget questions, and a subcommittee of two will work on this project. Staff at General Administration to insure correctness will review the site.

The tuition issue was discussed briefly, but will be addressed later. The committee was unable to meet with a representative from General Administration to discuss budget issues, due to conflicts resulting from the Board of Governors meeting being held today.

3. Professional Development: Allan Rosenberg

Michael O'Kane, special advisor to the Vice President for Information Resources, discussed how the technology initiative relates to professional development. The professional development initiative did not get funded. Also, the Carolina Colloquy will cease to exist in June for lack of funding.

The instructional technology initiative received \$10,000 to examine collaborative campus wide workshops to look at teaching, learning and technology centers. The professional development committee is concerned about the lack of funding for professional development related to teaching and instruction, concurrent with the increase in funding for technology initiatives. Therefore, the committee asks that a letter from the Assembly to the President be written which would: a) support the idea that teachers and students are the keystone of the university, and that the Carolina Colloquy be funded; b) ask that former PDAC members meet with the IT collaborative group to see if professional development concerns can be integrated into the IT initiatives; and c) based on the work of a professional development committee last year, that the committee be provided with an update of the campus work related to teaching centers and professional development.

From the floor, Dr. Ferrell suggested that faculty who teach distance learning classes often must engage in a heavy workload to prepare and deliver them. He suggested that those courses receive more weight in the faculty workload mix and asked to committee to discuss the issue of faculty recognition for engaging in distance learning.

A motion was made (Everett) that a letter be sent by either the PD Committee or the Chair of the Assembly to the President supporting the committee's request for support for the activities of the Carolina Colloquy.

The motion passed without dissent.

4. Planning and Programs: Linda Nelms

James Sadler, Assistant Vice President for Planning, met with the committee to discuss the strategic plans and invited input from the committee about the trends the committee felt the University should be planning for.

Regarding growth, it is currently as expected except that the college going rate declined this year, which may influence future projections if it continues. This may reflect the strength of the economy. The committee discussed the role of faculty in planning the amount of growth on campuses. It appears that this issue has been discussed on some campuses, but that on others administrators have assigned growth targets without consultation.

An update on the Eva Klein "space study" was presented. Given the Legislature's rejection of the request to fund the space needs, and the financial burdens brought on by the recent flooding disaster, the initiative is on hold. About one third of the 1.5 billion dollars needed for flood relief will come from the federal government, which means the State may have a significant commitment next year. If the federal government does not increase its contribution, it is

unlikely that space needs can be addressed. A joint house/senate committee will work on these problems. The House has asked for a cash flow analysis for project costs related to the space projects. The chancellors were apprehensive about using donations to address space needs, because they do not wish to constrain their flexibility to use these funds in other ways. The future is uncertain. Although direct costs related to the flood may not be as high as originally thought, these needs must be addressed and are top priority for the Governor and legislators.

5. Faculty Governance: Hugh Hindman

The committee discussed how it might influence legislative affairs. The Assembly, by its charter, is to devise appropriate channels to monitor events that affect education. The committee discussed how faculty might advocate for the university and how faculty might become involved in issues early enough and deeply enough so they may help. The upcoming discussion about faculty salaries and the recent failure to obtain funding for space needs are examples of initiatives that impact on faculty life. The committee will explore developing a mechanism to interact with the General Assembly and will meet with Vice President Milliken to discuss the issue.

A second issue that will be addressed this year is the evaluation of administrators. The general consensus is that such evaluations should be done regularly, and the committee wants to identify models of administrator evaluation procedures that have worked on other campuses and distribute these to delegates for use on each campus.

A third issue to be addressed will be faculty representation on governing boards. There have been few cases where faculty senate chairs have been allowed to sit as ex officio members of boards. The committee wants to suggest another approach, which is that emeritus faculty members or alumni who are faculty members elsewhere be nominated for boards of Trustees because they could represent a faculty perspective. The next call for nominations will be in October 2000, and the committee hopes that we can make such nominations then.

The committee presented two items: A proposed Bylaws revision, which is presented tonight so they can be voted on next time; and a Resolution regarding faculty dispute resolution processes. The proposed Bylaws revisions change the committee names and charges based on the advice of delegates last year. No new committees are proposed and no present committees are eliminated.

The committee brought forth the a resolution expressing faculty expectations regarding effective faculty dispute resolution procedures. Discussion included these points: Whether the first point intruded on the freedom of administrators; who would receive the report (Faculty Assembly and GA); whether the format should be changed; to whom it should be directed.

After the question was called, the motion to accept the resolution passed without dissent. The resolution is attached in its entirety to these minutes.

Howie Neufeld reported that his examination of boards of trustees indicates that most members are male, most are white, and most are individuals who have been successful in business. Therefore, these boards may not represent the composition of our student bodies or faculties. He suggests that perhaps we should encourage chancellors and others to consider these points when constituting these boards.

6. Academic Freedom: Dick Bernhard

Considered two issues: First was the increasing use of non-tenured and non-tenure track faculty. GA has appointed Ms. Mary Wakeford to study this issue and the committee desires to aid that effort as needed. Second, the issue of post tenure review was discussed, and the committee wants to determine what is happening and whether or not it is effective. To date, GA has presented no update, so the committee has no information.

With regard to the respective two issues being addressed, committee members received copies of the following two papers, the contents of which will be among the things considered at the next committee meeting:

Gappa, Judith M. & Leslie, David W. Two Faculties or One, Inquiry No. 6, Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards, American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D. C., 1997.
Licata, Christine M. & Morreale, Joseph C., POST-TENURE REVIEW: POLICIES,

7. Faculty Welfare: Howie Neufeld

The committee heard from Kitty McCollum, Associate Vice President for Finance and University Benefits Officer. Some highlights include the fact that staff positions returned to campuses are now funded at only 70% of their level and that changes in prescription privileges plans should save money.

The phased retirement plan instructions have been rewritten and will be released later this month. The committee continued to discuss merit raises for excellent teaching, especially how much freedom each campus should have in how to distribute the money.

Finally, the committee did discuss staff and technical support for faculty, and wonders if GA could study the relationship between staff support and faculty performance by discipline. The committee would like Chair Howell to raise this issue. In the future, the committee will examine retirement benefits, the phased retirement plan and its impact on those who do not retire, the issue of giving benefits to part time faculty and the impact of part time faculty on full time faculty.

8. Technology: Jose D'Arruda (for Lolly Gasaway)

Today was the initial meeting of the ad hoc Technology Committee. The committee accomplished three things: 1) it drafted a charge; 2) it focused on the overall tasks for the committee, and 3) it developed a workplan for the next committee meeting. Recognizing that the charge still needs refining, the committee proposes the following:

The Faculty Assembly Technology Committee was created to focus the University of North Carolina's technology efforts on instructional use of technology and faculty needs. The committee shall monitor technology implementation on the campuses to ensure that faculty have adequate equipment and staff support to use technology for effective instruction and professional development. The committee shall work with General Administration staff and the Professional Development Committee to create opportunities to assist faculty in incorporating technology to enhance teaching, research and service.

The committee will present a revised charge to the Assembly for its approval at the February meeting.

At the Faculty Assembly meeting in February, the committee will present a written report outlining its plans for the year. These include:

- a. Developing a manifest that specifies a technology floor for each faculty to include equipment, networking and staff support.
- b. Recommending strategies such as a conference on technology in teaching with the Professional Development Committee.
- c. Insuring that campuses have funding to provide a backbone for technology indeed to function as a backbone and not as a skeleton.

D. Old Business

E. New Business

Chair Howell asked for new delegates to share their comments with the him about how things might be improved in future meetings. He also thanked Ms. Felicia Russell, a graduate student at UNC G who helped prepare materials for the meeting and who worked throughout the day to insure that the sessions ran smoothly.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:54

Resolution expressing faculty expectations regarding fair, just, and effective faculty dispute resolutions procedures.

Whereas,

1) the Faculty Assembly has long endorsed fair, just, and effective internal grievance procedures for all sixteen University of North Carolina campuses, dating from its 1981 resolution and most recently expressed in the appointment of an a-hoc task force to study the effectiveness of campus procedures for resolving matters of discipline and discharge, non-reappointment, and general grievances; and
2) the Board of Governors, having provided a process giving faculty a role in dispute resolution, has long been concerned about its own role in the dispute resolution process, dating from its 1995 statement of policy in Administrative Memorandum # 355 to its more recent requests for information on functioning of the process; and

3) the University of North Carolina General Administration recently appointed a Task Force on Internal Dispute Resolution.

Therefore, Be It Resolved that the University of North Carolina Faculty Assembly urges the General Administration Task Force on Internal Dispute Resolution to adopt the following principles:

1) In accordance with the 1996 joint statement on university governance of the American Council on Education, the Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities, and the American Association of University Professors, that:

The governing board (Board of Trustees) and President (Chancellor) should, on questions of faculty status, as in other matters where the faculty has primary responsibilities, concur with the faculty judgment except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be communicated in detail.

2) While each campus should remain free to adopt its own dispute resolution procedures, timely due process should be guaranteed and groups for appeal should be standardized throughout the university system.

3) Members of faculty hearing committees, chancellors and members of governing boards should receive appropriate training and assistance in fulfilling their roles.

4) The University of North Carolina General Administration should prepare an annual statistical summary report on formal hearing activity that includes each case processed by each faculty committee.

(c) 2011