

Minutes of the Faculty Assembly

University of North Carolina 141th Session of the Faculty Assembly May 4, 2007

Minutes of the Faculty Assembly May 4, 2007

Present: Brenda Killingsworth (ECU); Jimmy Reeves (UNCW); Sandie Gravett (ASU); Andy Koch (ASU); Chip Arnold (ASU); Sandie Gravett (ASU); Kulwinder Kaur-Walker (ECSU); John Dixon (ECSU); S.D. Stith (ECSU); Ken Wilson (ECU); Mark Taggart (ECU); Blanche Radford-Curry (FSU); Cynthia Gillispie-Johnson (NCA&T); Timothy Seigler (NCCU); Achameleh Debela (NCCU); William Lawrence (NCCU); Steve LaCrosse (NCSA); Catherine Warren (NCSU); Nina Allen (NCSU); Dennis Daley (NCSU); Suzanne Weiner (NCSU); Kenneth Esbenshade (NCSU); Trish Casey (NCSA); LeRoy Percy (NCSA); Gwen Ashburn (UNCA); Margaret Downes (UNCA); Lora Holland (UNCA); James Murphy (UNCCH); Judith Wegner (UNCCH); Steven Bachenheimer (UNCCH); Bonnie Yankaskas (UNCCH); Joe Templeton (UNCCH); Greg Starrett (UNCC); Cheryl Brown (UNCC); Yogendra Kakad (UNCC); Meg Morgan (UNCC); Rosemary Booth (UNCC); Hazel Brown (UNCG); Celia Hooper (UNCG); Paul Duvall (UNCG); Eileen Kohlenberg (UNCG); Bonnie Kelley (UNCP); Jeffery Geller (UNCP); Chet Jordan (UNCP); Jimmy Reeves (UNCW); Richard Beam (WCU); Sharon Jacques (WCU); Gary Jones (WCU); Subash Shah (WSSU).

I. Report of Self Study Task Force

Vice President Bonnie Yankaskas, chair of the Faculty Assembly Self Study Task Force, reported on the work of the task force using a PowerPoint presentation. She explained the purpose and charge of the task force, and outlined the process and what was learned. Early activities lead to a set of priorities and recommendations for changes to the charter, by-laws, officers, meetings and elections of the Assembly. Major restructuring recommendations involving the composition of the executive committee, the charges of the three permanent committees and guidelines for establishing the newly created of *Tasks Forces* (Sec XI) of the Assembly were then formulated. She commented that the Self Study Task Force vision was for task forces to be the *key way we function* in the future. Finally evaluation criteria were outlined and other recommendations were cited. Vice President Yankaskas then opened the floor for discussion.

A concern was expressed that without more permanent committees, the new structure concentrates decision making in the Executive Committee, and creates a more centralized structure. It was argued that committees had autonomy and could decide for themselves what their priorities were. Yankaskas replied that this was certainly not intentional, but was instead a response to the fact that many committees currently do little, and recommendations for the creation of a task force could come from any Assembly delegate. She also suggested that time be given to formulate the agenda of the Assembly Meetings during the full assembly, so that responsibility doesn't fall exclusively with the Executive Board. Finally a suggestion was made that any areas of concern about the changes should be emailed to the Executive Committee, and a paper copy kept as a record.

Another delegate asked how issues would be judged important enough to warrant the creation of a task force. Yankaskas replied that suggestions from delegates would be forwarded to the Executive Committee, which would debate and decide the issue.

A related concern was expressed by another delegate, who worried that every issue might warrant a task force, and that the process could quickly become unwieldy. Yankaskas replied that she was aware of that potential, but she thought that big issues would arise, and the choice would be fairly clear.

Finally Yankaskas encouraged delegates to be sure that Faculty Senate Presidents or their representatives attend the faculty senate presidents luncheons held every Assembly meeting, Hosted by the Assembly Vice Chair, these luncheons provide the presidents an opportunity to exchange information and identify concerns shared by other campuses.

II. Plenary Session 1

The first plenary session of the May 4, 2007 meeting of the Faculty Assembly began at 10:10 AM. Chair Killingsworth sought corrections to the minutes of the March 23, 2007 meeting of the Assembly, and Cat Warren asked that a typographical error in the report of Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee be corrected. With this correction, the

minutes were approved without dissent. She then introduced Rob Nelson, Vice President for Finance.

III. Report of Vice President Nelson

Mr. Nelson's report focused on the current state of the budget being developed by the Legislature for fiscal 2007/08, which he compared to making sausage. He indicated that in this two year budget cycle, the House had the responsibility of developing the first draft of the budget, and that the University had historically fared better with the Senate. He reported that the preliminary House budget had little new money for the University, and he that the surplus in revenues this year, estimated at over \$1 Billion, was one time money. He said he hoped the fact that the state had experienced revenues in excess of their expectations would result in increases in the projections of future revenues required to justify raising salaries. Nelson complained that the University didn't get as much of the new revenue as he had hoped, but they were currently sorting through the budget to get a more detailed picture. He said they did not yet know the salary increases that would be proposed (which were due to be released today), but that in the House version, faculty were slated to get the same raise as other state employees. Nelson emphasized that the budget process involved five steps including House and Senate conferences. He acknowledged that the preliminary numbers were disappointing, but hoped for improvement when the two bodies had a chance to work together.

Vice President Nelson also announced that in addition to cuts in the General Administration budget that were recommended by the PACE initiative and welcomed by General Administration, the legislature mandated an additional \$18M in "middle management cuts" to be solicited from the Chancellors. He was concerned although these cuts represented only 1% of the budget and were equally distributed, they appeared to bypass the PACE initiative. He vowed that they would work to get them restored in subsequent budget versions. He said that some funds were provided for the University of North Carolina On-line initiative, but none were allocated for summer bridge programs or the "competitive fund".

He noted that \$1M for graduate student stipends requested in the Governor's budget were not included in the House version, and that the North Carolina Research Campus, Kannapolis, NC had been awarded \$1M in non-recurring funds, far short of the \$12 M that had been requested. Other programs that received funding included the Lateral Entry Program for teachers (750K), the proposed ECU Dental School (\$1M), money for increasing the number and providing professional development of nursing college, disaster recovery (storing important data from each campus at a central location), indigent care, and support of North Carolina residents who choose private colleges in the state. The latter includes \$3.2M in contractual support for these institutions (about \$100 per student). He emphasized that we were still a long way from a final budget, and that efforts would continue to make legislators aware that average university faculty salaries were slightly less than 50% of those of their colleagues in peer institutions, and had to remain competitive, salaries needed to be increased to at least 80% of peer salaries. He then opened the floor for questions.

Vice President Nelson was asked if he knew the specific percentage raise recommended in the House bill. He replied that he understood the number to be 2.5%, the same as other state employees. He noted that public school and community college teachers were slated to get an additional 2.5%. He noted that General Administration had asked for a 4% raise to cover cost of living increases, and an additional \$43M (3%) to begin the process of raising salaries to the 80% over two years.

Nelson was then asked if Kannapolis can go forward with so little funding. He replied that he saw little choice but to continue, given the investment that has already been made. He expressed the hope that funding for it would increase in subsequent versions of the budget, but said if not the pace would have to slow, and additional dollars would have to be drawn from participating campuses.

Another delegate expressed the concern that the small allocation signaled that the legislature was not buying into the project. Nelson replied that there were a lot of politics involved with this issue, and that a deal would take time and persistence.

Finally, in response to a question about Capital funds, Nelson indicated that the University had picked up \$240M in on-time facilities requests. He reminded the delegates that GA had requested full funding of the building project on each campus with the highest priority, as well as planning funds for the second priority. He said a House panel had requested full funding for:

- A classroom building at NCA&T University
- A library project at the North Carolina School of the Arts
- A match for the Veterinary School renovation project at North Carolina State University
- A Genomics Center at UNC Chapel Hill
- Building requests for UNC Greensboro, UNC Pembroke and UNC Wilmington

He emphasized that although these funds had been requested, they were not yet verified.

IV. Report of Harold Martin, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs:

Vice President Martin said that he and his colleagues in General Administration were still having fun. He noted that the PACE initiative had resulted in a decline in their resource base, while the amount of work had increased. He praised the work of his talented colleagues, and said he had come to the Assembly to talk about two initiatives, shared governance and evaluation of administrators. He said the initiative resulted from conversations with delegate Blanche Radford-Curry of Fayetteville State University and he was searching for a process that would ensure that all campuses valued and were effectively engaged in shared governance. He also acknowledged that evaluation of administrators was a lingering issue, and noted that the Assembly had passed a resolution on administrative review six years ago (2001-Feb-#05, Request faculty involvement in review of administrators on all campuses).

Martin pointed out that shared governance also applied to his relationship with the Chancellors and he could not mandate that they embrace shared governance. He suggested that aggressive conversations would be more effective, and said it was on the agendas of his meetings with the chancellors and the chief academic officers last month. Discussions are also planned with faculty senates. He said he considered it a serious problem when faculty governance is invisible, and acknowledged that it has been an ongoing debate at the HBCUs (Historically Black Colleges and Universities). He pointed out that new chancellors had been recently hired for four of the five HBCU campuses. All of the candidates for these positions were asked for their views on shared governance. He assured the Assembly that discussions about shared governance would continue in chancellor administrative council, and that he planned to have specific conversations with each of the chancellors about the issue.

Martin then turned his attention to the topic of review of administrators. He said that most campuses carried out senior administrator evaluations, the exception again being the HBCUs. Methods of evaluation varied from campus to campus, and Jim Sadler (Associate Vice President for Academic Planning) was developing a questionnaire to be sent to all chief academic officers and faculty senate presidents to find out the details. He said they planned to use the data to establish a set of best practices that would be shared with the Assembly and with all of the campuses. In the spirit of shared governance, no campus would be urged to adopt any particular set of practices, but he would continue to involve the Faculty Assembly, and he felt that peer pressure would be effective. He said he had engaging conversations with the chief academic officers, and he was confident these measures would get results.

V. Report of Erskine Bowles, President:

President Bowles began by commenting that he was not yet used to an academic time frame, but he was learning. He praised the faculty for all of our hard work this academic year. He said he wanted to discuss three issues, UNC Tomorrow, safety measures on campuses, and faculty compensation. He suggested that he would entertain questions after each topic.

Bowles said he was very enthusiastic about the UNC Tomorrow initiative. He reminded the Assembly that since he has been President, he has visited every campus at least four times. To begin the UNC Tomorrow initiative, he has visited five of the campuses, and visits to the others have been arranged. He said he found great enthusiasm on every campus he visited, and he wished that the Faculty Scholars and Commissioners had been with him to hear about the great work being done on these campuses. He said they had looked at their missions over the long term, and were focused on the needs of North Carolina and the nation. He announced that the Scholars Council would be composed of 14 outstanding UNC faculty, chosen from a pool of sixty highly qualified applicants. Although he originally wanted the number to be ten, he "couldn't eliminate anyone. He indicated that no one represented a particular campus. He said the commissioners had also been chosen, and he expected the work of the Committee to begin next week. He then opened the floor for questions on this topic.

A delegate related his experience on a recent dissertation committee. He said the thesis documented interviews with officials from every town in the First Congressional District. He said that small towns tended to be overlooked, and he was concerned that this problem would also plague the UNC Tomorrow initiative. Bowles replied that he had been chair of the Rural Technology Task Force, and was well aware of these problems. He assured the Assembly that the initiative would visit small towns and hold meetings early in the morning and late at night to accommodate working people in these towns.

President Bowles then turned his attention to safety. He said we were all extremely affected by the tragedy at Virginia Tech, and that it brought home the recognition that it could happen anywhere at any time. He cautioned that it was important not to overreact, and that the University had an historic commitment to access and openness which he was loathe to change. He said tough decisions must be made. Even though campus crime rates at 1/6 of those of the state as a whole, recent incidents on UNC campuses had concerned him. Two weeks ago, he brought together chancellors, campus police chiefs and chairs of safety committees to discuss the issue. He said they considered options such as card readers, alarms on doors that were propped open, and cameras with live monitors on doors throughout campus and in residence halls. He related an experiment in which sixty adults who were "our age" were all let into the resident halls at UNC-CH and NCSU without identification, asked for directions and went the opposite way, and were never reported.

He commented that some measures were common sense, and others could be very low tech, such as sirens, flashing lights and PA systems. He said UNC-CH and NCSU tried to purchase sirens at about the same time, but the one who placed the order slightly later found themselves on a long waiting list because there are only two manufacturers of sirens in the US.

Bowles announced that Attorney Brad Wilson, former Board of Governor chair and current Chief Operations Officer at Blue Cross/Blue Shield would chair a committee formed by the attorney general to study the issue of campus safety. He said that ten additional members would be chosen from North Carolina universities and community colleges, and that an internal committee was also being formed. He pointed out that the issue involves local, state and federal authorities, because many incidents occurred as much as a mile from the campus. Bowles admitted that he had no expertise in the area of mental health, and was in no position to recommend where the balance should be struck between privacy rights and public safety. However, he realized that the faculty did have this kind of expertise, and recommended that the issue be thoroughly explored. Then he opened the floor for questions on the topic of safety.

A delegate pointed out that in the case of Virginia Tech, people were aware that the student was troubled, but there was no way to channel their concerns. He speculated that more student involvement in helping troubled students would have a positive effect on reducing school violence. Bowles agreed and said it had been his focus to date to reach out to as many constituencies as possible and draw on their expertise. He commented that one size does not fit all, and that he had learned that some campuses use dogs to sniff out drugs or guns. He said he'd be fired if he tried to do this on the Chapel Hill campus. He also said he's received many "nutty" ideas in emails involving increasing the number of guns on campus. The delegate followed up by saying he would like to see a national dialogue about privacy and gun access as it relates to the education enterprise. Bowles replied that he wished such a dialogue would take place, but pointed out that congress had avoided the whole issue due to pressure from groups such as the National Rifle Association, which had awarded him an "F" for his stand on guns. He promised that he would not avoid the issue.

Another delegate suggested that students were especially stressed now, and that counseling and other preventative measures were woefully under funded. Bowles replied that there were significant differences in resources among different campuses, and said this was a focus of the working group he had appointed. He also pointed out that many politicians expressed strong concerns about this issue, but they were the ones who provided the funding for these services.

Another delegate wondered how the Virginia Tech tragedy had affected his thinking on criminal background checks for faculty. Bowles replied that General Administration had not called for checks yet, but he personally saw nothing wrong with them. He said he'd have no objection if they ran such checks on him and everyone else who worked at GA. He indicated that he was aware that faculty were against these checks, but he couldn't understand why, and he was not in favor of exempting faculty, since teachers are human too.

The next questioner returned to the subject of under funded and overworked counselors. She suggested that meeting with the counseling staffs during his visits to the universities would instill good feelings and demonstrate our support of what they do. Bowles replied that it was an excellent idea, and promised that he would meet with counselors during his campus visits.

Another delegate expressed the fear that there would be an overreaction resulting in a giant step backwards. He wondered how privacy rules could be negotiated between students as adults sharing information. Bowles acknowledged that this was an important issue, and related the case of a Chapel Hill student who had committed suicide, despite being treated by counselors at the university. He said the student's parents were not informed of her crisis until after she died, and felt they could have helped if they had known of her problems. He sympathized with their view, but repeated that he didn't know where the line should be drawn. He acknowledged the need to talk, and said that common sense says we can do better without sacrificing privacy. Finally, a delegate pointed out that there is some case law concerning HIV that provides protection but allows information to be shared. He suggested that this could be used as a model. Bowles repeated his belief that our faculty had as much expertise as anyone, and he would seek our help to improve the situation.

President Bowles then turned his attention to the subject of faculty salaries. He told delegates that he raised the topic every time he testified to the legislature, suggesting that he didn't care if they didn't build a single building as long as they dealt with the two priorities GA had established, funding for needs-based aid and increases in faculty compensation. He indicated that the legislature had funded needs-based aids, and that he had explained to legislators that he could not hire high quality replacements for retiring faculty at current salary levels. He warned them not to adopt a high school model of providing inadequate salaries that make it difficult to attract high quality teachers. He said he didn't know where things would end up, but was confident that we would do at least as well as public school and community college teachers. He hoped for at least 5%, and pointed out that GA had requested 5% plus additional funding to increase salaries incrementally so that the average reached 80% of those of comparable institutions. He said it would cost approximately \$8M to accomplish this, and that a 1% raise costs about \$1.5M.

He also noted that the House budget included an \$18M cut in middle level administration from the provost to the comptroller across the campuses with no reallocation of these funds to academic needs and placed the blame on the fact that many campuses had failed to adequately respond to the PACE initiative. He said they were taking the initiative seriously now, and vowed fight the House cuts when the budget is taken up by the Senate. He is hoping to buy a year for campuses to revise their plan before the legislature initiates cuts. Bowles pointed out that the budget for GA had been cut by \$1.3M and the affiliate budgets were reduced by an additional \$1.8M, all proposed in the GA budget. He said he needed help from all university constituencies from students to the chancellors to stave off this cut

and convince the legislature to fund the salary increases needed to bring faculty to 80% of peer institutions. He suggested that HBCUs could be especially helpful by directly contacting Mickey Micheau, who had become an especially powerful legislator. He also indicated that Speaker Hackney had delegated considerable power to committee chairs, and emphasized again that this was their one and only priority, since the legislature had agreed to fund the needs-based tuition support. He then opened the floor for questions.

A delegate suggested that it was important for faculty to know how individual campuses performed with respect to PACE. Bowles indicated that all of the campuses had been "graded", and there were some As and some Fs. He suggested that campuses that had done poorly and did not improve would see their funding reduced. He said that Jeff Davies could give details about individual campus performances

Another delegate asked about the status of assessment instrument designed to measure student achievement, especially in the context of the potential threat to academic freedom posed by the policies of Margaret Spelling, US Secretary of Education. Bowles replied that he had a forty five minute conversation with Tennessee Senator Lamar Alexander in which he strongly discouraged federal regulation of academia. He reiterated that voluntary initiatives such as PACE were the only way to head off federal interference. He indicated that a plan that holds him and the chancellors accountable would be put before the BOG this month. He said that Senator Alexander was very impressed with this approach and indicated that if done properly, it would stave off federal interference. To a question about assessment of student learning posed by another delegate, Bowles replied that the plan adopted the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) as a "blunt instrument", because there had to be some method to assess critical thinking skills. He indicated that the CLA would be piloted, and if it proves ineffective, it would be changed or scrapped. Despite the often cited problems with the CLA, he saw no alternative, and indicated that Alexander said that if we do that, the federal government would hold us up as a model. A concern was expressed by another delegate that once the CLA is adopted, the political pressure would be too great to abandon or modify it. Bowles replied that we could stop whenever we want, and he was not worried about political pressures or newspaper editorials. He also noted that the CLA was only one of several measures that would be used.

A delegate noted that many jobs in North Carolina require education beyond the baccalaureate level, and wondered what we can do to further graduate education. Bowles replied that he had already learned a lot from the UNC Tomorrow initiative, but that few people knew of the great work done in our graduate programs. He said he felt confident that once the facts are known, additional funding would be forthcoming.

Finally, a delegate suggested that one additional metric that could be used to assess student learning is the number of who voted. Bowles replied that this was an excellent idea,

VI. Report of Kimrey Rhinehardt, Vice President for Federal Government Relations:

Chair Killingsworth next introduced the Assembly to Kimrey Rhinehardt, who represents the University at the federal level. She said she had found the Assembly meeting very enlightening, and indicated that she was in conversation with the federal authorities about modifying the restrictions imposed by the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). She said she spends a lot of time at GA, and she encouraged delegates to contact her about issues involving the federal government, including Pell grants, and NIH and NSF funding.

Finally Chair Killingsworth indicated that she would follow up with additional information about PACE in the afternoon plenary, and adjourned the morning session at 12:15 PM.

VII. Second Plenary

Chair Killingsworth convened the second plenary session at 3:30 PM. She introduced Jeff Davies, Chief of Staff at General Administration.

VIII. Report by Jeff Davies, Chief of Staff

Chief of Staff Davies discussed the campuses' response to President Bowles' PACE initiative. He explained that the initiative started with a memo from Bowles in March 2006, and that the PACE commission had issued a preliminary report in November of that year. He said that in separate letters, Bowles had asked the chancellors of all of the campuses to embrace the initiative and provide plans that speak to the specific issues of each campus. Using various methods, the chancellors submitted interim reports in February, with final reports due in June. Davies said that he and Bowles had evaluated all of the reports and provided feedback to every campus. He indicated that the "grades" ranged from A to F, and that UNC Charlotte had done an exemplary job by looking at the whole university and considering how they could do business differently. He said this report was provided to the other campuses, and that eight or nine other chancellors had also done an excellent job. He suggested that some chancellors had misunderstood the call for an analysis of the whole university. For example, East Carolina University had focused on the Brady School of Medicine, and even though the cost savings were good, the report hadn't been all encompassing. After a conference call, ECU had rewritten the report, which was now on a par with that of

UNCC. Another University (NCA&T) had misinterpreted the request, responding yes or no to individual suggestions rather than developing their individualized set of recommendations. Davies expressed confidence that all campuses now understood the mandate and that the reports due in June would be significantly better. He then opened the floor for questions.

A delegate asked if the June report would be made available to everyone. Davies replied that all campuses have all reports, and that the Staff Assembly had requested that they be posted on the GA website. He indicated that posting it on the Faculty Assembly website would also be a great idea. Another delegate commented that faculty could offer some real insights, and wondered if there would be a virtual suggestion box with the posting on the WWW. Davies replied that he believes there are still some campuses who think we are not serious, and that once the initiative is passed, ideas will come forward. He said that NCSU has such a link, but GA doesn't as of now.

To the question of who was responsible for PACE on individual campuses, Davies replied that the Chancellors through their CFOs and/or a PACE committee bore responsibility for the response to PACE. Another delegate wondered why we celebrate PACE, since the original idea of redirecting up to 10% of the administrative budget back to academics seemed to have been abandoned. Davies said yes and no. The initiative started with President Bowles' plan to cut 10% from the GA budget, and that reduction was part of the budget submitted to the legislature by GA. At the campus level, however, the initiative was not necessarily designed to result in budget reductions, but to develop plans to do business better. For example, campuses might consider replacing full-blown personal computers in computer labs with "thin clients" that are less powerful and about half the price. He said the emphasis was to think smarter and funnel savings into academics, and the plans were to be implemented over the next 18 months and would be on going after that. He noted that cuts in the budget just passed by the House duplicated the efforts of the PACE report, but in that case the savings were not redirected to academics.

A delegate wondered if the chancellors' reports would contain goals for placing those savings into academics, and Davies assured him that the final report will stipulate that, even if the interim reports don't. Another delegate observed that we were spending a lot of money in order to save, and wondered if we'd end up saving money in the long run. Davies replied that some savings required a long term investment with actual benefits in four or five years. Finally, a delegate asked if the proposed transfer of funds to academics would happen within the campus or be done through the General Assembly. Davies replied that GA's intention was to have the process be internal to the campuses, and that any other procedure would be inconsistent with the goals of PACE. He again referenced the cuts proposed by the House, and indicated that he understood that they were consistent with those proposed for community colleges, public schools and public health. He said he found it depressing to see these proposed cuts in the budget.

Next Vice President Yankaskas took the floor to express the Assembly's appreciation to Sue Carpenter for all of her hard work on our behalf. Sue was presented with flowers from the Assembly.

Chair Killingsworth then called for committee and task force reports.

IX. Report of Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee:

Cat Warren (NCSU), chair of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee, reported on the continuing discussions and the two paragraph recommendations that surround the issue of criminal background checks for faculty. She indicated that the resolution the committee was now proposing was a result of discussions from the last Faculty Assembly meeting and the call for a stronger statement than the one proposed at that time. Warren reported that 6 or 7 campuses had just instituted these checks for incoming faculty, while a few others, notably UNC Charlotte, were not even considering adopting them. She then opened the floor for discussion.

A delegate wondered what effect a resolution would have, given President Bowles position that he sees nothing wrong with the practice. Warren acknowledged that it would probably have little effect, but felt it was important to put the faculty on record as opposing a blanket policy. In response to the question of who pays for these checks, other delegates replied that it is usually the individual departments that foot that bill. Another delegate wondered what the "principle of proportionality" advocated in the resolution meant. Warren replied the resolution did not suggest that no one should be checked, but that checks should be initiated when the positions warranted them. The objection was to submitting new faculty and staff to blanket background checks regardless of their job descriptions.

Warren was then asked what we should do right now. She recommended that the two paragraph statement be forwarded to General Administration, but the pages of questions and answers accompanying them not be forwarded. She said that the University of Texas had put these checks in place with little faculty consultation, and were forced to withdraw them when faculty strongly objected. A delegate commented that the process associated with the checks was a real problem, as was the loss of privacy when results were announced. Another said she had been neutral on the issue until she was asked to do these checks on students, and found that results included dropped charges and speeding tickets. She suggested that the reports could result in honor code violations, and wondered what to do. Another delegate reiterated the concern that our efforts might be pointless given the position of President Bowles. Warren replied that she was also aware that Harold Martin had said "why not" when asked about background checks, to which she replied "why".

She expressed the hope that a full discussion of the topic would be taken up at individual campuses, and said that

extension agents at NCSU were already going crazy trying to figure out how students they hire will be able to drive cars if every one has to pass a check every time he or she is hired. Another delegate from NCSU complained the campus had instituted this major change in hiring practices without asking faculty, characterizing the practice as scandalous. The Faculty Senate had been given the new requirements two weeks before they went into effect and were told the changes "will happen", despite the fact that the Senate had forwarded a document citing the objections of AAUP to the practice. It was pointed out that university staff members were already feeling the effects of these requirements, and the concern of elitism was again expressed. One delegate pointed out that staff were typically recruited locally, while faculty were recruited worldwide by peers, which constitutes a very different situation.

It was proposed that a statement in opposition to blanket background checks be supported by the Assembly and sent with the questions and answers to the individual campuses. It was hoped that this would result in informed debate guided by the questions on every campus. Chair Killingsworth indicated that she would send the information to faculty senate chairs, staff members, provosts and Vice President Martin. The resolution was passed without dissent.

X. Report of Faculty Benefits and Welfare Committee:

Dennis Daly, Chair of the Faculty Benefits and Welfare Committee, presented three resolutions for consideration by the Assembly. The first,

Resolution on University Insurance Committees

Whereas University Insurance Committees are mandated by the General Assembly (GS 58-31-60), and

Whereas numerous UNC System schools have been lax in assuring the appointment and function of University Insurance Committees, and

Whereas benefit options are a fundamental asset in the recruitment and retention of faculty and staff, and

Whereas, University Insurance Committees are responsible for the important task of vetting Supplemental Retirement Account (403b) options, and

Whereas University Insurance Committees are also responsible for evaluating and offering other after-tax benefits for staff and faculty,

Therefore Be It Resolved That the Faculty Assembly encourages the President to remind all UNC system Chancellors of the legal requirements for active University Insurance Committees

was deemed necessary because University Insurance Committees have not been given appropriate attention at some campuses, and they serve the important role of providing faculty the power to affirm or reject changes in insurance coverage. Daly pointed out that these committees were instrumental in the development of the current NC Flex option in health insurance. He argued that this resolution encourages chancellors to fulfill their obligation with respect to them. The motion passed without dissent.

The second resolution involved optional health benefits for domestic partners:

Resolution on Domestic Partners – Optional Benefits

Whereas, the UNC System espouses the ideal of inclusiveness, diversity, and nondiscrimination, and

Whereas, the recruitment and retention of knowledgeable and dedicated faculty and staff is of vital importance for the health and well-being of the UNC System, the students it serves, and the citizens of North Carolina, and

Whereas, after tax benefits are an important strategic tool in recruitment and retention, and

Whereas, the purpose of benefits is in part to provide employees peace of mind, especially with regard to loved ones, and their unavailability may distract and divert employees from optimally performing their duties, and

Whereas, many individuals are not associated with traditional family structures, and these individuals share the same interests regarding their loved ones as those in traditional family arrangements, and

Whereas, at UNC System schools where domestic partner benefits are not offered, those in nontraditional families are thereby deprived of benefits, and this can adversely effect recruitment and retention of faculty and staff,

Therefore Be It Resolved That the Faculty Assembly recommends that the President to encourages all UNC system Chancellors to offer domestic partner after tax benefit options in order to afford all faculty and staff equal protection.

This resolution also passed without dissent.

Finally, Daly introduced a resolution involving domestic partners and health insurance:

Resolution on Domestic Partners – Health Insurance

Whereas, the University of North Carolina espouses the ideals of inclusiveness, diversity, and nondiscrimination, and

Whereas, the recruitment and retention of skilled and dedicated faculty and staff is of vital importance for the operation of the UNC System, the quality of instruction for the students it serves, and the public service it provides to the citizens of North Carolina, and

Whereas, compensation benefits such as health insurance is an important strategic tool in recruitment and retention, and

Whereas, the purpose of benefits is in part to provide employees peace of mind, especially with regard to loved ones, and their unavailability may distract and divert employees from optimally performing their duties, and

Whereas, many individuals employed in the UNC System are not associated with traditional family structures, yet share the same concerns regarding their loved ones as those in traditional family arrangements, and

Whereas, access to health insurance coverage for domestic partners is not currently allowed under state law, those in nontraditional families are thereby deprived of an important benefit, thus adversely affecting recruitment and retention of faculty and staff,

Therefore Be It Resolved That the UNC Faculty Assembly encourages the President and Board of Governors to advocate for inclusion of domestic partner in the existing Health Insurance Plan in order to afford all faculty and staff equal protection.

This resolution was also passed without dissent.

XI. Report of the Faculty Development Committee:

Meg Morgan, Chair of the Faculty Development Committee, discussed two areas of business, the response to last years' mandate to increase communication between the university faculty and those of community colleges, and Post Tenure Review. She said that her committee had worked with Ann Russell of the community college system to develop a conference between university and community college faculty to be held at the Mckimmon Center at NCSU June 18 to 20, 2007. She said they anticipated sixty participants, but that the response to date had not been overwhelming, and she passed around a sign-up sheet so Assembly delegates could suggest additional names. She said a focus of the conference was to work on ways to make the transition from community college to the university seamless and as easier at all levels.

Morgan then turned her attention to the issue of Post Tenure Review. She said that general administration was revisiting the topic, and that several versions of potential revisions to the current policy were being discussed. She expressed the fear that the impetus for these revisions was the perception that too few faculty were being cited as unsatisfactory. She pointed out that a proposed revision that had surfaced in language circulate on April 25 would mandate that the initial review of PTR cases be done by an administrator, with a full review by a faculty peer committee only when requested by the faculty member being reviewed, the administrator or the committee itself. She said it was her understanding that the idea had originated with one individual (a Provost) who suggested that it would expedite the review process for the faculty involved. Morgan reminded the Assembly that faculty had always been responsible for peer review of our colleagues, and this represents a potential slippery slope for faculty governance. She also pointed out that the time consuming part of the PTR process is collecting the evidence for the dossier to be filed by the faculty member, not reviewing its contents, and she urged faculty to stay involved. She recommended that the Assembly pass a resolution calling for this new provision (section 7 of the April 25 document version) to be removed from the guidelines. In the debate that followed, a delegate said that this provision would be "dreadful" and another suggested that the resolution, along with a clear rationale that is easily understood, be brought to the attention of the Board of Governors. It was pointed out that in meetings today, representatives from General Administration seemed surprised that opposition to the provision was so universal, with both the Executive Committee and the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee in unanimous agreement that the provision must be eliminated. It was also suggested that someone present our concerns at the Board of Governors meeting on June 4, and be prepared to give a hand-out at the appropriate committee meetings.

A delegate raised an additional concern about guideline #2, which indicates that PTR must involve an additional assessment beyond the compilation of the five yearly reports. The delegate wondered where the guidelines for these assessments were delineated, and suggested that it would be better to say that the assessments would be carried out "as described by institutional policies". Another delegate concurred, finding the wording "vague and troublesome", and a third suggested that the words "additional assessment" should be replaced with "peer assessment".

It was suggested that the resolution passed today should call on General Administration to comment on their response to the resolution at the first Fall 2007 meeting of the Assembly. Morgan replied that the committee did address the need for a timeline in the resolution.

XII. Report of the Legislative Task Force:

Judith Wegner, chair of the Legislative Task Force, reported the legislative day for the UNC system was May 9. Faculty who planned to participate would meet at General Administration at 9:30 for training. The group would travel to the General Assembly by car pool at about noon, and spend the afternoon meeting with legislators. The day will end with a reception at 5:30 PM. Wegner said she would collect names of faculty and send them materials in advance. She also announced a plan to work with community college faculty to populate tables at General Assembly describing programs and research at our institutions related to health care (May 30) and the environment and natural resources (June 6). She suggested that the total coverage (9 AM to 3 PM) might involve morning and afternoon shifts. She asked delegates for names of appropriate faculty, and suggested that this was a test run that might lead to more collaborations of this type.

XIII. Report of Brenda Killingsworth, Chair of Faculty Assembly

Chair Killingsworth began by soliciting suggestions concerning the reorganization of the Faculty Assembly recommended by the Self Study Task Force, and indicated that the executive committee would work on the recommendations this summer. She said she was pleased with the Assembly's spirit of perseverance, and commended the hard work of many members in response to the multitude of initiatives from General Administration. She then acknowledged members who would not be returning in 2007-08: Yogi Kakad, UNCC, Cat Warren, NSCU, Acha Debela, NCCU, LeRoy Perry, NCSA, Cheryl Brown, UNCC, and Jim Murphy, UNC-CH. She emphasized that we need to fill these slots, and expressed the hope that these veterans of the Assembly would honor requests for advice.

Killingsworth pointed out that a lot had changed this year for the Assembly, largely due to the significant increase in faculty involvement with General Administration. She said the executive committee would carry out a three part end of year review consisting of 1) reviewing all committee reports in consultation with the committee chairs; 2) meet in June to assess ourselves and find ways to make the Assembly even more effective; and 3) meet with President Bowles, Vice President Martin and other GA officials to review the year and discuss our access and influence.

Killingsworth emphasized that our meetings with the University President had gone from one a year under President Broad to nearly one a month under President Bowles, and that our involvement with other senior officials had increased significantly as well. She said the Assembly had asked input from the campuses on seven important issues, including nominations for the Faculty Scholars (a final list to be released May 9; at least half of whom came from our recommendations), and Post Tenure Review. She also reported that the four officers (Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary and Parliamentarian) had attended functions with the Board of Governors, something former Assembly Chair Jeff Passe had requested in vain from the past administration, and the while the loss of Betsy Brown as Assembly liaison had been significant, we were able to keep the services of Sue Carpenter, whose hard work and history with the Assembly contributed significantly to its continuity. Killingsworth commented that when she expressed her concern that the Faculty Assembly had no space at GA to work or store historical documents, Vice President Martin and Chief of Staff Davis were able to procure it for us. One key recommendation put forward by the Self Study Task Force was that the Assembly approach change from one of responding to initiatives from GA to a more proactive role in shaping policies and initiatives.

Killingsworth also cited the increased visibility of faculty and their key role in educating the Legislature and Board of Governors, and highlighted their participation in last year's Legislative Day, as well as a conference with community college faculty focusing on common issues. She noted that the Executive Committee meets every month. She pointed out that she and Judith Wegner had played key roles in convincing President Bowles to abandon plans to employ Eva Kline and Associates to conduct a comprehensive study of the UNC System, suggesting instead that faculty expertise in the UNC system be tapped for such an undertaking. After some resistance, these efforts lead to the appointment of the Scholars Council which is to play a key role in the UNC Tomorrow initiative. Funding has also been made available for focused reports that would be solicited from faculty nominated for the Council but not picked.

Killingsworth acknowledged that there have been times when we had been forgotten, but as soon as we make them aware of this, they brought us into the discussion. She pledged to be at GA more often, and expressed the hope that other faculty would also become more involved. She pointed out that in addition to the Scholars Council, we had been asked for faculty nominees for the Joint Task Force on Public Service and the Campus Safety Task Force (for which we are currently seeking faculty, due to her by May 10, 2007). Finally, she applauded the work of the Assembly in making General Administration aware of issues involving shared governance, particularly among the Historically Minority Institutions (HMIs). She said that Vice President Martin had become directly involved in promoting shared governance as a direct result of his discussions with Assembly delegates. She also said that chancellors are paying more attention to us, as are the Board of Governors. She acknowledged that we were not 100% effective yet, but we have made significant progress. She stated that the "jury is still out" with regard to our real impact on General Administration, and vowed to keep working, reminding us that President Bowles was committed to providing us with information at the same time the Chancellors and Board of Governors receive it. She also said that Vice President

Martin had pledged to get information concerning the Board of Governors directly to us, and the Board had noticed that we're paying attention.

Killingsworth concluded her remarks by asking delegates to forward suggestions now for other topics the Executive Committee needs to work on this summer, and thanked the delegates again for their commitment and hard work. She then adjourned the Second Plenary at 4: 50 PM.

*Respectfully submitted: James H. Reeves, Secretary
May, 2007*

(c) 2011