

Minutes of the Faculty Assembly

Minutes
Faculty Assembly of the University of North Carolina--114th Meeting
November 17, 2000--UNCGA Building

I. First Plenary Session (10:30 a.m. to noon)

A. Welcome and Call to Order

Chair Howell called the meeting to order at 10:35 a.m. with a warm welcome for everyone present.

B. Announcements and Introductions

Chair Howell asked new delegates/alternates to stand and be recognized. He asked one person from each campus to confirm who is the delegation head, from the campus, and to give him the name of the Faculty Senate Chairperson. He also asked that corrections be made to the list of delegates and alternates, and then returned to him. Delegates are required to attend all meeting. When there must be an absence, the delegation head is responsible for getting an alternate to attend.

He suggested that all delegates be elected in the spring so the Assembly can be notified during the summer or early fall.

C. Approval of Minutes of September 15, 2000

The minutes of the September 15, 2000 meeting were posted on the Faculty Assembly Web site. Chair Howell asked for corrections to the minutes. Hearing no suggestions for changes, the minutes were approved.

One delegate thanked the Secretary for the quality of the minutes. Chair Howell also acknowledged the excellent work of the Faculty Assembly Secretary.

D. The Chair's Report

The Chair's report covered the following main points:

No significant changes in Web pages, because we do not yet have someone

maintaining the page. The General Administration (GA) has offered to provide someone to assist us. Some changes have, however, been made including posting of the minutes.

Jeff Davies, VP Finance and Pres. Broad will talk about the bond issue. Chair Howell informed the meeting that he plans to openly thank the Pres. For her support of the bond issue.

Fixed term faculty issues will be discussed by Snr. VP Bataille at this afternoon's committee meeting. Two committees will get together for this meeting --Academic Freedom and Tenure and Faculty Benefits and Welfare.

Chair Howell discussed the following matters with President Broad during their meeting on Friday, November 10, 2000.

Lapsed Salaries. Reports have been submitted by the various campuses. These reports are now available and should be accessible on our campuses. They are public documents.

Tuition Waivers. The Governor's announcement of tuition waivers for children of public school teachers is not being actively pursued. President Broad is not confident that it will become a reality. Funding such a program could be very costly. Chair Howell suggests that we only move forward if one of our committees wants to pursue it--possibly the Faculty Benefits Faculty and Welfare Committee.

Promotion and Tenure. There are issues of fairness in the promotion and tenure process on the various campuses. Also information is not always provided to faculty, especially to new faculty. Too often they get do not receive information about the process on their campuses. Snr. VP Bataille will work with Chief Academic Officers (CAOs), to make the process better.

Faculty Searches. Searches often begin too late--sometimes in the Spring semester--some start early but others delay, with hiring not being completed on time. This can mean that best people are not being employed, leading to the hiring of fixed-term or part-time people. This is an issue that needs to be pursued, possibly by the Faculty Benefits and Welfare.

Faculty Attrition. There is need to conduct study on faculty attrition, to see why people are leaving UNC institutions for other positions. Currently no data exist to support view that people leave our campuses because of issues related to salaries and benefits, etc. The Faculty Assembly can call for such a study, but the GA staff is swamped. Therefore, if a committee takes on this issue, it will need to come up with a realistic way of proceeding, to make it a reality. The question is, why are good faculty members leaving our campuses to take positions elsewhere.

Chair Howell was not able to cover two items in his discussions with President Board. They are faculty involvement on Boards of Trustees, and faculty involvement in Administrative Planning Retreats--key step that is done during the summer, with its main purpose being to make decision on programmatic issues.

E. The Budget Process and Effects of Bond Vote Results (Jeff Davies, VP Finance)

Chair Howell introduced VP of Finance, Jeff Davies, to present on the budget process.

VP Davis and his colleague, Laura Young, made an extensive presentation that focused on UNC Financial Matters. The 31-page handout included two slides per page.

The main elements of the presentation included:

The Board of Governor's role is to work with the Legislature to get the budget approved. The goal is "A single, unified budget for all public senior higher education."

The statute provides for three categories of requests: (1) continuing operations, (2) academic salary increases, and (3) expansions/improvements items.

Statutes also dictate that appropriations by the General Assembly be as follows: (1) continuing operations go directly to the institution, (2) academic salary increases are given as a lump sum to the Board of Governors, for allocation to institutions, and (3) expansion/improvements go as a lump sum to the Board of Governors to be allocated to institutions according to the Board's "Schedule of Priorities" and any directives from the Legislature.

Eight key steps were shared: (1) UNC President receives general instructions from Governor via State Budget Office, (2) Budget works are conducted with the President's Cabinet, Chancellors, and Board of Governors, (3) Chancellors, with the involvement of their campuses, prepare budget estimates that reflect their campus priorities, (4) President confers with Chancellors throughout the process, (5) Board takes final action then submits to Governor and Advisory Budget Commission, (6) President represents universities at hearings with the Governor and the Advisory Budget Commission, (7) Governor, in consultation with the Advisory Budget Commission, sends recommendations to General Assembly, and (8) President or designee represents UNC in Legislative hearings.

2001-03 Budget Request include \$2.087 billion for 2001-02 and \$2.253 billion for 2002-03. These include requests for 6% salary increases in each year. Much more details are available in the handout "UNC Financial Matters," November 17, 2000. The Faculty Assembly Secretary has a file copy that can be made available to members.

The schedule of priorities for the 2001-02 year--\$148.9 million is allocated to the five priority areas as follows: Access--\$64.7 m (43.4%), Transformation and Change--\$21.5 m (14.4%), Creation and Transfer of Knowledge--\$26.1m (17.6%), K-16 Initiatives--\$7.1 m (4.8%), and Intellectual Capital Formation--\$29.5 m (19.8%). For the 2002-03 years, the figure is \$230.7 million, with similar distribution ratios.

The handout goes into great detail about the breakdown of various parts of the budget, including special programs.

Questions to VP Davies

Jose D'Arruda asked: Do we have access to what our Chancellors proposed for budgets, e.g., research?

Snr. VP Bataille responded that the budget books are available on our campuses--should be available in our libraries. Often decisions are made at high administrative levels with little involvement from faculty. Budget requests need to come up from faculty, through Department Chairs, to Deans, and to CAOs. The process needs to start much earlier.

VP Davies noted that the next budget cycle will be started much earlier to get more involvement. Chief Financial Officers (CFOs) and Information Technology (IT) people will also be involved in the process.

Gordon Mercer asked about plans for space while buildings are being renovated.

VP Davies responded that, on most campus, there will be new construction before renovations. New buildings need to be ready to accommodate faculty and staff before old ones can be renovated.

Henry Ferrell noted that most of the academic budget seems to be focused on science and technology, with no provisions for humanities, etc.

Snr. VP Bataille responded that since this is the first time research dollars were being sought the decision was made to focus on areas where we already have substantial corporate and Federal funds supporting research, to match funds that the state might provide. Hopefully, this will send a message to the state, that it needs to start supporting research. She also noted that a large request for the libraries also means that there will be support for other areas, besides science and technology.

George Conklin asked about the possibility of providing access to more and better databases, e.g. some medical databases.

Snr. VP Bataille responded that we need to work with campus librarians to make sure that access is available to needed databases. There is also a system to get hard copies to every county in the state, overnight. Campuses will tend to have access to the databases that are most relevant to the programs offered, e.g. NC A&T and NC State will be the most likely campuses to have access to the engineering databases. Every campus will not have access to the same databases.

Ralph Scott asked whether the 3% of current replacement value of facilities that is set aside for repairs and renovations each year is enough to keep our facilities in a good state of repair.

VP Davies explained that it will probably be enough as we eliminate the backlog of needed maintenance.

Subash Shah asked whether deferred maintenance is a factor Chancellors who are not planning for regular maintenance.

VP Davies responded that there is probably enough blame to go around--both above and below the Chancellors, and including them. Legislators tend to prefer to appropriate funds for new facilities, but the reserves (started in 1993) is an excellent step to provide for renovations and repairs.

In her presentation, Laura Young focused on the "Enrollment Change Funding Model" and made the following points:

Under the new funding model, initiated by legislative action in 1993, and implemented in the 1998-99 academic year, FTE was replaced by student credit hours.

The characteristics of the new funding model include: (a) a revised mathematical model that recognizes program costs and degree level differences; and (b) continued ability to request expansion funding based on special needs and initiatives. More details are contained in the "UNC Financial Matters" handout of November 17, 2000.

A new resolution that requires accountability for lapsed salary funds was passed. The plans are due in August and in October of each year is the due date for the report on how funds were spent. This year's reports are currently available and should be accessible on the campuses.

Approximately \$30m, have been carried forward from 1999-00 year to this year. Approximately 16% of this will be used to pay wages to cover vacant positions. Details are on page 30 of the handout. It is estimated that for this year's lapsed salaries will total about \$92m. Project expenditure for these funds is on page 31 of the handout.

Reports of how last year's lapsed salaries were spent have now be received at GA and will be share with Assembly at the next meeting.

Questions/Answers:

Jose D'Arruda asked whether any portion of the funds were being used for student recruitment. The answer was "yes," on some campuses. But, system wide it was not a significant amount.

Hugh Hindman wondered whether this [the opportunity to use lapsed salaries for other projects] provide an incentive for Chancellors to leave positions vacant to produce lapsed salary. The answer was "probably not," since money associated with new positions is not available until August and it takes about a year to fill these new positions.

Bob Morrison asked whether the reports include both carryover and lapsed salaries. Yes, they do.

Carl Hughes asked whether all institutions are now special responsibility constituent institutions. The response was "yes," though they did not all become flexible at the same time. There is a maximum of \$250,000 that the Board approves for flexible purchases.

Mark Venable asked if lapsed salaries can be used for start up of new positions and Howard Neufeld wanted to know what are the limitations.

Lapsed salaries cannot be moved permanently from one instructional line to another. It can only be allocated differently for one year. However, it can be used to hire temporary faculty year after year, thus freeing up some of these dollars. The length of time that positions remain vacant is being reviewed to see that this is not deliberately being done, for long time.

A delegate asked about the availability of lapsed salary reports--where can we find them? It was noted that when reports have been provided and accepted they become public documents. The General Administration has received reports from all sixteen campuses. The lapsed salary report is part of the Annual Management Flexibility Report.

Another question was: "What happens to overheads that are collected on grants and contracts?" The response was that these funds remain on our campuses. They are in trust funds at the institutions and are budgeted and spent on our campuses.

Carl Hughes, Chair of the Budget Committee noted that the committee will ask other questions related to lapsed salaries, during their committee session, and report later. He invited delegates to leave him their questions.

At 12:15 p.m., Chair Howell rose to end the meeting for the lunch break. He made the following announcements:

To facilitate a networking lunch, delegates are not grouped by campus. He asked that delegates let him know if they do not like the new arrangement.

The Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee and the Faculty Benefits and Welfare Committee will meet together for the afternoon's committee meeting. Snr. VP Bataille will visit to speak with the groups.

Delegates who are still not on a committee should select one. Committee Chairs should report new members. He encouraged delegates to try to maintain balance in terms of numbers of committee members and involvement of small and large campuses on each committee.

Chair Howell introduced Ms. Lisa Adamanson, who handles travel reimbursements. He encouraged delegates to get this semester's reimbursements in soon after this meeting, to be reimbursed for this semester, then start again next semester.

II. Lunch Break (noon to 1:00 p.m.)

III. Standing Committee Meetings (1:30 p.m. to 3:15 p.m.)

After lunch, delegates went directly to committee meetings.

IV. Second Plenary Session (3:30 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.)

A. Presentation by President Molly Broad (3:30 to 4:15)

Chair Howell called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m. He introduced President Molly Broad and thanked her for her support of the Faculty Assembly.

(32 delegates seated)

He noted that she was very tired when he met with her last Friday (November 10, 2000) because of her work with the bond issue and other activities, but that now she is planning to take a vacation.

President Broad's Comments

President Broad indicated her pleasure at being able to welcome the Faculty Assembly back to the General Administration building, after the renovations. She expressed her hope that the space is effective and efficient for us to carry out our work and that we like the student art on display in the lobby.

In her reflections on the bond referendum, she noted that it was a truly historic moment. North Carolina was the buzz everywhere. Other were noting how high the bar was. North Carolina has now become the model for other states and university systems. The bond issue passed in every county, indicating a resounding vote of confidence by the people of North Carolina. The citizens were thinking about opportunities for their children and grandchildren. This is an unheard of, extraordinary accomplishment that was achieved because of handwork of all the campuses. It was a deeply grassroots campaign, though there was also an excellent electronic campaign. Every county passed the bond issue, with at least 60%--an average of 73%. This was a stunning outcome and an excellent statement about the values of North Carolinians. President Broad thanked each delegates for our efforts in making the bond issue a success. Student involvement was also extraordinary.

There was enormous support from the General Assembly--unanimous support from both houses and they carried the support into their election campaigns. Also, Governor Hunt supported the bond issue and visited many community colleges and universities. The Chambers of Commerce in the state made this a priority at over 23 regional meetings. There was much business support. The Board of Trustees also worked hard to for the bond issue. Partnership with Community Colleges are now deeper because of this. Over 1.8 million citizens voted for this bond. We all owe them a great debt of gratitude.

President Broad shared details of the about the financial status of the University and noted that the challenge is to achieve balance in the mission of our campuses and to respond to current enrollment projections.

Budget requests are focused on our strategic directions, as were carefully outline in the

September minutes. President Broad noted that one of the major priorities is the support of libraries. There is need to do a better job in explaining why libraries need resources. For example, there is need for better databases.

Additional initiatives will include:

- a model teacher education consortium to provide training to increase the numbers of certified teachers.
- major multi-institutional and multi-disciplinary research in such areas as health education and public service.
- efforts to bring academic salaries into the top quintile of salaries of peer institutions. As such, a 6% increase is being sought for each year of the biennium.

The enrollment report for the fall 2000 shows nearly 7,400 distance students. This is a 21% increase over last year. Some of this number represents a shift of students who were on campus and now take classes at a distance. The 10 year enrollment plan envisions that 15% of the enrollment growth will be through distance education.

The Copyright Use and Ownership policy was approved by the Board of Governors last Friday (11/10/00). This policy came out of conversations with this Faculty Assembly over 18-24 months ago. Following the colloquium a taskforce was formed and the policy emerged. The Policy protects the campuses without stifling creativity, that is so valuable to the academy. She thanked the Faculty Assembly for its contribution to this effort and noted that other universities may look to our policy as a framework for establishing their policies.

Leslie Winner (former state senator from the Charlotte area) is now the University Attorney, replacing Dick Robinson who retired after more than 30 years. She comes to us after being Attorney for the Charlotte/Mecklenburg school system.

Questions/Answers

Delegate Neufeld asked whether campuses had any flexibility in how they spend the fund awarded from the Bond Issue.

Not without approval. The Bond referendum defines how the money is to be spent--project by project--on each campus, therefore, approval would be needed to move funds around.

VP Davies noted that project estimates were developed very carefully, with 5% added for project management/inflation. We need to build early, within scope, and hold saving for flexible decisions.

Another delegate asked when the bonds will go on sale. The response was that there will be meeting with the State Treasure. Bonds can't be sold until next year--first quarter of 2001.

Another question was asked about difficulty in getting contractors. The thinking is that a number of national firms working in North Carolina may expand their branches. We don't want to be bidding ourselves up because we have a limited number of skilled crafts people.

Delegate Neufeld suggested that it might be wise to sign a single lead contractor who oversees the others. It may also be helpful to streamline the process for all the campuses.

Delegate Subash suggested that to guard against shoddy construction, someone will need to play the role of watchdog--supervising at the front end and doing construction auditing at the back end.

Delegate Henry Ferrell asked whether any thought has been given to including plaques

that state that this building is built by the people of North Carolina. President Broad thought it was a great idea.

One delegate noted the approval of the bond issue is being associated with faculty salary being increased, and asked whether there as much efforts will be put into getting improvements in faculty salaries and benefits as were put into getting the bond issued passed.

The response was yes. A great of effort was made these past two years, though it was not totally successful. Efforts will continue to be made--Excellent Schools Act.

Chair Howell read President Broad an expression of appreciation from the Faculty Assembly. Get text from KH.

She was visibly moved, and thanked everyone.

B. Committee Reports

The presentation of committee reports started at 4:20 p.m. Chair Howell asked presenters to help us stay on time. He reminded us that we need to elect a nominations committee and encouraged everyone to consider participation, both on the nominations committee and also for service next year.

1. Budget (Carl Hughes, FSU)

Carl Hughes thanked Chair Howell visiting his campus. Good things will result from the visit. He then shared copies of the Executive Summary of the 2001-03 budget request. He noted that changes will be made before the final document is released.

Two new members joined the Budget Committee, Philip Bromberg--UNCCH and Gerald Ponder--UNCG. All other members were present.

Items discussed:

Laura Young and Jeff Davies visited and shared further on budget issues.

92m Total lapsed salary is \$92m for 1999-00. It includes all EPA and SPA positions and associated fringe benefits.

Any teaching position that is allocated state funds and is not permanently filled by tenured or tenure-track people are considered vacant.

Up to 2.% of appropriated budget can be carried forward to the next year. Clarification is needed regarding the position number assigned to faculty in the phased-retirement program. While the program frees up money to hire others, it does not seem to free up a position number for a tenure-track person.

Instructional salary rate for each campus is determined by the Carnegie Classification for that campus.

Academic operating expenses, associated with the spending lapsed salaries, is campus specific.

Questions/Answers

How do you find out what your campus considers to be "academic operating expenses?"

Ask the Chief Academic Officer or Chief Financial Officer on the campus. The report on how this year's funds will be spent and how last year's funds were spent may also answer that question. Some campuses have put these documents on their Web page; others may want to do so also.

2. Faculty Development (Richard Swanson, UNCG)

The Committee received a report from ASU on possibilities for sharing scholarly presentations, seminars, etc. via the Internet and other instructional technology among the UNC campuses. Dr. Venable will pilot a proposal on the ASU campus.

The Committee is continuing to gather information regarding campus policies and practices related to paid leave, new faculty development, and faculty exchange programs. These will then be compared to policies and practices at the peer institutions, already identified by each UNC campus. The Committee hopes to present this report in April 2001.

3. Planning and Programs (Ali Kahn, ECSU)

Delegate Allan Rosenberg, from ECU, presented the report.

It is now easier to propose new undergraduate programs. Procedures for Program Development or Modification are on p. 6 of the Policies and Procedures for Planning and Establishing New Academic Programs which was sent to each campus by Snr. VP Gretchen Bataille, together with Administrative Memorandum 406, from President Broad. Campuses no longer need authorization to plan new undergraduate programs. Request for new programs can now be done in about one year.

Delegate Rosenberg asked the Assembly to indicate whether their campuses have faculty participation in new program development. Snr. VP Bataille asked that only one person from each campus respond, so that the General Administration can know if there is faculty involvement. Most people do have faculty senate participation in new program development, however, several campuses do not.

The campuses indicated as follows:

ASU Y

ECU Y

ECSU N

FSU Y

NCA&T Y

NCC N

NCSA Y

NCS N/Y (two people responded differently)

UNCA Y

UNCC Y

UNCG Y

UNCP Y

UNCW Y

WCU Y

WSSU N

There is need strategic plans that explain areas of emphasis, in order to plan. How many

schools do not have a strategic plan? Snr. VP Bataille suggested that this plan starts at the departmental level and outlines where we are going and what kinds of hires we need to get us there. Must be consistent with the mission of the institution.

Thirty to forty new programs were submitted and about 50% were approved for planning this year.

Graduate programs must be approved for planning. MA programs are included with the undergraduate process.

Question/Answer

If we want to reinstate a program, is that a new program? The program was dropped because of duplication.

No programs were dropped because of duplication, but because of low productivity. These can be reinstated but the campus will have to be able to prove new need, to support the program.

4. Faculty Governance (Henry Ferrell, ECU)

The Committee had two guests--Leslie Winner and Leigh Copepper. Dispute resolution was the emphasis. VP Leslie Winner will rework the committee, hold it to its task, and add agenda items.

There are still problems with responding to grievance quickly, thus avoiding frustrations. Frequently administrators do not respond on time. What can be done about administrators who do not follow university policies?

Mediation as the normal resolution process, before going to grievance. Some campuses train faculty to be mediators. Main focus of the committee is dealing with grievance resolution.

If mediation occurs, no need for grievance process. NC State has trained two people in effective mediation.

The Committee Chair asked why the Speaker of the House has still not yet visited the Faculty Assembly? He suggested that if we can't get the Speaker, maybe we can get the President Pro Tempore of the Senate. Chair Howell noted that he will wait until February 2001 to see who the new Speaker is and then try to get him/her to visit the Faculty Assembly.

One issue that has remained on the agenda for a long time relates to getting faculty involvement on Boards of Trustees. A resolution to that effect has been around for a long time.

Another one for a long time on hold, is reviewing administrators. Need to hold to the function of the office. Want to bring up again--resolution passed about 3 years ago.

The Faculty Assembly Web site should include faculty governance issues, including academic committees and links to faculty senates and other relevant committees on the campuses. For example, governance committees will be able to see what is happening with similar committees on the other campuses.

What is the process for reporting problems on campus. The whistle-blower policies need to be more widely distributed. The Committee suggested that the General Administration ask that it be widely distributed on the campuses. One delegate suggested that the policy might be on the State Auditor Web page.

Carl Hughes shared that his Chancellor had indicated that the Faculty Senate Chair would be invited to Board of Trustees meetings and each committee. He will let the Assembly know, in February, if it has been implemented.

5. Academic Freedom and Tenure (Robert Morrison, ECU)

Delegate Mary Adams of Western Carolina University gave report.

This Committee met jointly with the Faculty Benefits and Welfare Committee. Snr. VP Bataille visit and spoke with those two committees.

Issues discussed include:

Some campuses begin their hiring too late--as late as March--and so don't get the best faculty. Sometimes these very positions become a part of lapsed salaries. Snr. VP Bataille offered to share a document on The Ethics of Faculty Recruitment and Appointment--copy distributed. This was adopted by the AAUP. There is need to discuss this on our campuses.

Tenure and Promotion practices on our campuses are not consistent. Decision can stop at various levels on various campuses. There is need to make the practices more consistent. The General Administration is now asking for documentation, at every stage, so they will know if someone overrides an earlier decision.

There will be a new VP for Academic Affairs, in February, to be responsible for, among other things, issues including fixed-term positions.

A phased-retirement study is being done, to make recommendations to Board of Governors.

Post Tenure Review is being applied differently on the campuses. It should be developmental and not punitive. Often, it can damage morale. Many feel that accountability is taking more and more of faculty service time--greatly increasing work time.

There is need for a mechanism to report to faculty what is covered in the Faculty Assembly. There is limit to what the General Administration can do to effect changes if faculty are not involved in making them happen.

Questions/Answers

What is the time-table for phased-retirement; we are now in the third year of a five year program?

There is a researcher in the system who is studying and sharing information on phased-retirement. The next report is due in the spring and a decision will be made on how to proceed--discontinue, modify, or start a new pilot. A decision is forthcoming, this spring.

Snr. VP Bataille will send communication to each campus stressing the need to begin the hiring process as early as possible, to ensure high quality faculty.

One delegate expressed the view that maybe late hiring is a deliberate effort to leave positions vacant and to have the salaries lapse.

Snr. VP Bataille doesn't think anyone in his/her right mind would waste money in that way. WSSU does--noted their delegates.

Historically the General Administration has had no record of what support tenure and promotion packets received along the way, only the Chancellors' recommendation. They are now asking for the feedback along the way. There needs to be a record. They are considering asking for explanations where there are discrepancies.

We need to get numbers on phased-retirement. This year's numbers are not yet on the Web site.

The Committee is considering the possibility of a University-wide day-care funding request. This would allow for the development of day-care centers and/or expansion of existing centers.

Illness and maternity leave policies have been collected and are being reviewed, with the intention of getting a standard policy.

There is a perception that some campuses have optional benefits. It was noted that any such benefits, if campus specific, must also be employee funded. Further information will be shared at the next meeting.

The question of tuition benefits for faculty children, spouses, etc. might be explored later.

Merit pay guidelines will be reviewed and reported at the next meeting.

7. Ad hoc Technology (Jose D'Arruda)

The Committee is considering a Technology Conference--system wide--at the end of the spring semester.

They have received indications of interest from nearly all campuses. Many have offered to help. The Committee has also met with Robyn Render, Interim VP of Information Technology, who has offered to help plan the conference. The TLT (Teaching and Learning with Technology) Committee sponsored a conference last year and is planning another this year. May plan a joint conference. They have it on their agenda for their November 29, 2000, meeting .

Two members, George Conklin and Jose D'Arruda--will be attending the meeting. The TLT bylaws allows for an ex-officio member and George Conklin has been nominated to fill the position, pending approval the Committee.

It will probably be a two-day conference, at end of spring semester, before summer school starts. It will probably be held on a campus, with large computer rooms and also lodging. The Ad hoc Technology Committee will do a call for papers and will need reviewers. They hope this group will participate in the meeting.

Committee Chair, D'Arruda formally nominated George Conklin as the Faculty Assembly Representative on the TLT (Teaching and Learning with Technology collaborative). There was no objection and he was elected by a unanimous vote.

Questions/Answers

Delegate Coates noted that faculty on campuses are not usually the ones "driving the technology car." There is need for faculty standing committees that deal with this issue. Curriculums needs to be serviced--not just registration and other administrative processes.

TLT members are Chancellor appointees--a Board. The intent of the committee is to be a facilitator between many entities that are involved in technologies on the campuses. It is a Board to oversee programs. Delegates were invited to visit the Web site. Interim VP Render distributed a document titled IT Strategy Annual Report, August 2000.

Delegate Hughes asked how many campuses have CIOs and what are their roles? What is the common model in the system or is there one?

It was suggested that we check to see if they exist on our campuses and report later. Time needs to be set aside for members of at the General Administration visit the Faculty Assembly to spend some time discussing these issues.

There is a distinction between TLCs (Teaching and Learning Centers) and the TLT. TLCs have been funded for each campus.

Delegate Harp of WSSU noted that on some campuses, the Tenure and Promotion process does not consider use of technology, so people don't want to take the time to include technology in teaching and learning.

Delegate Subash noted that if faculty are not involved in decision making we may end up with technology white elephants that will be very embarrassing.

C. Election of Nominations Committee

Chair Howell noted that this is usually done by the Vice Chair, but Vice Chair Jeff Passe is out of town. Committee Chairs--Dick Swanson and Don Lisnerski will handle the nominations. He turned the meeting over to them.

The Nominating Committee, to include five people, must identify a slate of officers for next year's Faculty Assembly, to be presented at the February meeting and voted on at the April meeting.

The following people were elected to the Nominations Committee.

Harriet Griffin--NCSU

Barbara Moran--UNCCH

David Claxton--WCU

Jill Harp--WSSU

Enid Jones--FSU

The new committee was asked to stay after the meeting to elect a Committee Chair and decide how they will accomplish the goal--getting a slate of at least two people per position, to be presented at the February meeting.

The Chapel Hill delegation, which has been having difficulty attending the Assembly meetings because of conflict with their Faculty Senate meetings, asked about proxy votes. The Parliamentarian indicated that our bylaws do not allow it.

D. Old Business

David Claxton asked people interested in serving as Committee Chair to let the Nominations Committee know. Chair Howell encouraged everyone to consider running for a position.

E. Adjournment

There being no further business, a motioned to adjourn was made and accepted. The meeting ended at 5:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beryl C. McEwen, Ph.D.
Secretary, UNC Faculty Assembly

(c) 2011