

# Minutes of the Faculty Assembly

## University of North Carolina 138th Session of the Faculty assembly November 3, 2006

### Minutes of Faculty Assembly

November 3, 2006

**Present:** Brenda Killingsworth (ECU); Jimmy Reeves (UNCW); Sandie Gravett (ASU); Andy Koch (ASU); Martha Marking (ASU); Chip Arnold (ASU); John Dixon (ECSU); Kulwinder Kaur-Walker (ECSU); John Cope (ECU); Mary A Glascoff (ECU); Mark Taggart (ECU); Ken Wilson (ECU); Booker Anthony (FSU); Blanche Radford-Curry (FSU); Linda Wilson-Jones (FSU); Alvin Keyes (NCA&T); Cynthia Gillispie-Johnson (NCA&T); Derrick Dunn (NCA&T); Achameleh Debela (NCCU); William Lawrence (NCCU); Trish Casey (NCSA); Dennis Daley (NCSU); Catherine Warren (NCSU); Nina Allen (NCSU); Scott McRae (NCSU); Suzanne Weiner (NCSU); Catherine Mitchell (UNCA); Margaret Downes (UNCA); Judith Wegner (UNCCH); Bonnie Yankaskas (UNCCH); Joe Ferrell (UNCCH); Rosemary Booth (UNCC); Meg Morgan (UNCC); Yogi Kakad (UNCC); Cheryl Brown (UNCC); Celia Hooper (UNCG); Paul Duvall (UNCG); Eileen Kohlenberg (UNCG); Hazel Brown (UNCG); Jeffery Geller (UNCP); Bonnie Kelley (UNCP); Robert Mark Spaulding (UNCW); Tammy Hunt (UNCW); Gary Jones (WCU); Richard Beam (WCU); Jim Ullmer (WCU); Subash Shah (WSSU); Lilana Garcia (WSSU); Rita Edwards (WSSU); John Woodmansee (NCSMS).

*The next two paragraphs are an Executive Summary:*

**First Plenary Session:** Following general announcements by Chair Brenda Killingsworth and Vice Chair Bonnie Yankaskas, UNC President Erskine Bowles addressed the assembly. He discussed the tuition plan recently adopted by the Board of Governors, the proposed budget, and his plan to have faculty solicit and report the role of the University in the future of the state envisioned by various groups of North Carolinians. Next he opened the floor for questions. Mr Bowles was followed by Rob Nelson, Vice President of Finance, who described the process by which the budget had been put together, and the capital funding that had been requested. Then he replied to questions from the delegates. Finally Alan Mabe, Vice President for Academic Planning, discussed the process by which new academic programs are approved, the PACE committee recommendations on streamlining it, and questions from the delegates. At the conclusion of his remarks, Chair Killingsworth adjourned the first Plenary Session.

**Second Plenary Session:** The session opened with a report by Cat Warren, Chair of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee, detailing her committee's suggestions for the Assembly's response to the proposal for a mandatory textbook rental program. Next Chair Killingsworth delivered her report. She began by soliciting nominees for the Faculty Assembly Nominating Committee, then thanked delegates for their quick response to her calls for feedback on the tuition plan and nominations to the UNC Grievance Committee. She announced that the "University Day" at the Legislature would be held again in mid 2007, and that, based on our bylaws, two campuses would have an additional delegate in next year's Assembly. Finally, she asked each Faculty Senate President to provide three nominees for the proposed Task Force on the role of the University in the Future of North Carolina, emphasizing that she needed them as soon as possible because President Bowles wants the Faculty Assembly recommendations by Thanksgiving.

### Committee Meetings

Standing Assembly committees met between 9:30 and 10:30. Committees that wished to submit resolutions to the Assembly or felt the need to address the Assembly were asked to submit their requests in writing to Chair Killingsworth.

Following these meetings, delegates returned to the first Plenary Session.

### First Plenary Session

Minutes for the September 2006 meeting of the Assembly were presented to the delegates and approved without amendment.

Chair Brenda Killingsworth welcomed Faculty Senate Chairs who had been invited to attend the meeting and participate in a working lunch with Vice Chair Yankaskas and Self-Study Task Force member Gary Jones. The luncheon discussion would focus on ways to improve communication between the Assembly and Faculty Senates, and develop strategies for responding quickly to requests for input from General Administration. Vice Chair Yankaskas asked Committee Chairs to provide feedback to the Task Force charged with improving the efficiency of the Assembly

meetings.

### **Report by President Erskine Bowles**

After distributing coffee to delegates who had found the dispenser empty, President Bowles began his report by admitting that he had made the same mistake he made with other organizations which he lead: overloading the system. He said he believed that raising the standards would impel people to rise to the higher expectations.

He announced that the plan to manage tuition increases was approved by the Board of Governors and that he was confident that legislators understood their responsibility to provide sufficient funding so students wouldn't have to bear the burden of increased costs associated with expanding and improving the University. He also said that he had just received the PACE report on improving efficiency and lowering administrative costs. He indicated that he had not yet had a chance to read the report, and said that he would provide a copy to Chair Killingsworth today.

Next President Bowles addressed the budget that will be submitted to the legislature in January. He indicated that unlike past budget documents which frequently exceeded 300 pages and amounted to unprioritized wish lists, this budget is 32 pages and is written in plain English, with priorities clearly spelled out. As he said in his last report to the Assembly, the top two priorities are

- Ensuring that every student eligible for need-based aid gets it, and that these students are held harmless to any tuition or fee increases.
- Raising faculty compensation to 80% of peer institutions in two years.

He emphasized that although many long range plans had indicated the need for these salary increases, they had never been made a priority or associated with a time table, and they had never been addressed by the legislature. The budget request also proposes

- A 4% increase in salaries, and substantial additional funding for Endowed Professorships.
- Funds to provide programs to increase retention and graduation rates, including summer bridge programs.
- An increase in research support and the establishment of a competitive research fund similar to those in California and three other states. Competitive funds for support of graduate students will be part of this package.
- Additional support for liberal arts and programs that train teaches and nurses.

Mr Bowles said that Chancellors were in full support of this budget and he emphasized the need for everyone to work together to get the full budget adopted by the legislature.

Next President Bowles turned his attention to the University's role in the future of North Carolina. He referenced a newly released report by the Commerce Department indicating that NC was projected to need about the same number of well educated workers but a 30-40% increase in the number of workers with less than a high school education. He said that someone had suggested that this repudiated his contention that North Carolina's Universities were the key to its future. He replied that it showed that if we stay where we are, these projections are our future. We need to intervene to change it.

He announced that as a result of the recommendations of Chair Killingsworth and others, the University would not employ Eva Klein to conduct a study of the University's role in the future of North Carolina. He suggested we could do it ourselves. He said he was in the early thinking stage, and he envisioned a Board consisting of Chair Brenda Killingsworth, a student, 3 or 4 members of the Board of Governors, and 3 or 4 community leaders of stature. This Board would commission a report by a task force composed of ten faculty from the UNC system. The report would document the vision of North Carolina's future shared by University faculty and students, nonprofits, small business and community leaders, and executives of North Carolina's fastest growing industries. He included Marine Science, Marine Aerodynamics, High Speed Computing, Environmental Science, Photonics, and Bioengineering as examples of these industries.

These constituencies would be interviewed by the task force and their opinions about the University's role in the future of North Carolina recorded. He noted that he had always found that the one with the pencil was in control of the process. The task force members would report what they heard to the Board, who would add their comments and present the report to the individual Universities. Each University would respond with its vision of the changes it needs to make to influence this future as decisively as possible. Between January and May, 8 visits will be made to different regions of the state with two concentrated in western North Carolina, a region often overlooked, particularly west of Asheville. He asked Chair Killingsworth to recommend faculty for this project, and indicated that he had already solicited recommendations from Chancellors. He said he intended to pay these individuals at a competitive rate, and fund course releases for them. He emphasized that this work needed to be their central focus next semester and reiterated that he was still in the early stages of thinking about this. He said he hoped to have nominees before

Thanksgiving.

President Bowles then opened the floor for questions.

- The first delegate asked President Bowles where we were with regard to a system-wide textbook rental policy. He replied that to his surprise, this idea did not rise to the top of the recommendations in the PACE report, and he was now more in favor of changes that take advantage of economies of scale. He noted that the PACE report had looked at the cost of textbooks quite extensively, and had recommended that faculty be urged to place orders for textbooks several months before the beginning of the course so students would have ample time to get them as inexpensively as possible. He also envisioned sharing resources, and cited the example of the Chapel Hill Bookstore taking over operation of the bookstore at North Carolina Central University. Finally, he suggested that the University might start its own used bookstore.
- A second delegate noted that the Chinese Ambassador had recently been in North Carolina and he wondered if there was interest in pursuing biotech projects with them. Mr Bowles acknowledged that this was only common sense, and indicated that these types of projects would be pursued.
- A third delegate asked about support for graduate students in the proposed budget, particularly with regard to out of state tuition waivers. President Bowles assured us that we would be very pleased with the budget in that regard.
- The next questioner commented that he hoped the task force would urge faculty to be more pragmatic in their thinking and that the report would be written in down to earth language. President Bowles reiterated that faculty control the pencil, and would wield the power associated with drafting the report. To be successful, the project required significant faculty buy-in and while he would emphasize the need to make it easy to understand, faculty had control over writing the report.
- President Bowles was asked whether the task force would be communicating with grassroots organizations such as the NAACP and he assured us that it would.
- In answer to the question "do we know the focus yet?" Mr. Bowles replied that this too was up to the faculty task force. He said he was reminded of the idiom told to him by his father: "you don't buy a dog and then do your own barking".
- Another delegate complained that during the lean budget years, a lot of money was diverted from support of research, and indirect cost receipts were currently being used to support graduate students and plug holes in the operating budgets. Mr Bowles noted that this was a problem he was not aware of and promised to take a look at it.
- The next questioner asked if Mr Bowles believed that curriculum reforms would result from the task force efforts. He replied that he couldn't imagine how they wouldn't, but reiterated that it must be the faculty's call or it wouldn't be successful.
- Concerns about Post Tenure Review were raised. Many feel that these reviews have no teeth, and waste a significant amount of time. President Bowles confessed that he had little knowledge of the subject and deferred to Executive Vice President Harold Martin. He added that he was surprised that Public Service had so little impact in faculty reviews.
- Another questioner asked if it was a mistake not to include representatives from K-12 in the study. Mr Bowles acknowledged that he knew he made mistakes and that he'd proven he could handle rejection. He welcomes our criticism as he strives to push the organization forward. He cited a similar study done in South Carolina that included their Universities, Community Colleges and Department of Public Instruction. He acknowledged that he considered this a very smart move, but feared that if he proposed this for North Carolina he would be viewed as overstepping the bounds of his authority. He said he planned to keep these constituencies fully informed of our plans, but did not want to wait for them to decide how to participate. He worried that if the study got too broad, nothing would get done. He said he had positive responses about our plans from the community college system, and he was hopeful they will carryout a similar study.
- Another questioner wondered if we needed an assessment of the college going rate of North Carolinians as a function of their economic status. Mr Bowles indicated that this data had been collected, but had not been analyzed. He commented that this was true of much of the data collected by GA over the past few years and observed that there was little use collecting data that no one looks at. He said he had looked at the overall college going rates, but he had not reviewed the data with respect to economic circumstance, He plans to increase data analysis capabilities at GA, and will certainly consider this comparison as soon as possible.
- The next questioner returned to the topic of textbook costs by asking how long in advance textbook titles should be available to students. He replied that it wasn't a matter of years but months. Studies show that if the students have the information a few months in advance, they save significantly on the cost of the book. He emphasized there was no "heavy lifting" for faculty on this issue, and expressed his hope that we would realize the positive message such a gesture would send.
- President Bowles was asked his opinion of e-learning undergraduate degree programs. He indicated the he was a great believer in distance learning for four reasons:
  1. Enrollment in the University is forecast to increase substantially in the coming years and there are not enough dollars available to build new buildings to accommodate it.
  2. Counties like Washington have no University or Community College within 40 miles, and e-learning is the most cost effective way to deliver instruction to them.
  3. In ten years, students will demand it.
  4. It is a potential generator of income from students outside of North Carolina who will be attracted by our reputation as an outstanding University. He pointed out that we have over 90 programs currently on-line, but no one knows about it. He insisted that faculty who teach these courses must be appropriately rewarded and said he envisioned a future in which a student at UNCG might take a course from Western Carolina developed by someone from ECU.
- The last group of questions returned to the topics of research and bureaucratic red tape. A delegate commented that when dealing with government and industry, issues involving intellectual property had become increasingly difficult, with

lawyers insisting on protecting revenue at all costs. Mr Bowles replied that Forbs magazine had reported that he passed up \$110M because he refused to budge on intellectual property issues. He said he agreed that lawyers should not be deciding these issues. Another delegate expressed her frustration at spending significant time on paperwork required by companies who contracted to use her equipment. Mr Bowles said he hoped the self study would address these issues, and find ways to clean up the bureaucracy so faculty could put the time to better uses.

### **Report by Rob Nelson, Vice President for Finance**

Vice President Nelson promised to keep his remarks brief. He wanted to outline the process used to put together the budget, which is available online at the BOG website. He indicated that after all expansion and program requests had been entered over the Web, the data was sorted, and meetings conducted with Chancellors to explain their priorities. Next the list was reviewed and refined by President Bowles and his staff and returned to the Chancellors. After several such iterations, individual calls were made to each Chancellor and Provost. The process culminated in last week's unanimous approval of the budget by the Chancellors. The final document is now in the hands of the Board of Governors who will be holding a policy workshop next Thursday. He said that some discussion of the budget had also taken place at the October Board of Governors' meeting.

With respect to Capital projects, the budget requests full funding for construction of the projects given permission to plan in last year's budget, and planning money for the first priority in new construction requested by each campus. Vice President Nelson also said that funding requests to update and improve Information Technology had been in our budget requests since 2000 but had only been funded once. Now these funds were part of the Capital request. He said he regretted that he hadn't had our input before this part of the budget was drafted.

Vice President Nelson then opened the floor for questions:

- A delegate again complained about the major reduction in funding for research support, citing the closing of the NC Supercomputing Centers as an example. Another pointed out that a department at Virginia Tech now was a supercomputer larger than any owned by the UNC system. Mr Nelson replied that a Presidential Commission had been studying the problem.
- A second questioner asked if the budget included increased funds for summer school. Mr Nelson said no, but funding had been requested for bridge programs at five campuses and year round pilots at FSU and UNCW. He said the pilots were designed to better utilize space, and the results would indicate the effectiveness of such approaches.

### **Report by Alan Mabe, Vice President for Academic Planning**

Dr. Mabe said that he wanted to clear up confusion about process for approving new academic programs. He said that GA was often accused of being the slow step in the process, and that some thought it took up to six years to complete the process. He explained that planning for Baccalaureate and Masters programs only involved posting an announcement on our Website, and once the campus is ready to proceed, submitting a request to GA, who often forwards it to the Board of Governors after only a cursory review. By contrast, the UNC Planning Committee must approve any request to plan a new Doctoral Program, with outside reviewers typically involved in the approval process.

He indicated that expensive programs received more scrutiny, and faculty were the ultimate reviewers of degree programs. He said that outside reviewers were most often faculty, and everything turned on their recommendation. He said that while GA is often blamed for delays in the process, campuses share some responsibility. He reported that some Baccalaureate and Masters programs had been approved within a week of reaching GA, but Doctoral programs typically took about 18 months. He acknowledged that this may be too long and some streamlining of the process might be required so we don't miss opportunities. He said that the University of Phoenix has a six month approval process, and the Pappas report recommended that ours be trimmed by 25%. He does not agree with another Pappas recommendation which would eliminate the system-wide Planning Council however. He does like the idea of "incubator degrees" available to campuses without the need for an elaborate approval process, or trial programs run for a year or two before seeking formal approval.

Dr. Mabe went on to discuss other issues raised in the Pappas report. He said it distinguished between supply and demand driven programs, and questioned whether we have enough feedback from the people we will be serving. He indicated that advisory groups like those in Engineering were being created for other disciplines, providing the opportunity for industry PhDs to talk to faculty. He cited the example of Biotech companies who had been passing over our graduates because they were too difficult to train until we set up a training facility suggested by an advisory group. The report also suggested that GA has been passive in the process and should look systematically at where new programs are needed and issue RFPs to campuses to create them.

Dr. Mabe then opened the floor for questions:

- A delegate asked what effect on-line degrees would have on existing degree programs and how the redundancy issue

would be decided. He replied that it was clear that sixteen identical programs would not be reasonable, but some redundancy was necessary. He noted that serving the region was also a consideration, but in the age of e-learning, the nearest campus may not be the best one to offer a program to its region. He said GA would be paying particular attention to cooperative degree programs developed between or among campuses.

- Next he was asked if faculty were primarily responsible for developing new degree programs. He replied that only faculty could judge if the proposed courses were appropriate for the discipline, but campus administrators must render other judgments such as whether the campus can do it now.
- The next delegate returned to the question of program evaluation and wondered if there were provisions to sunset programs with low participation. Dr Mabe replied that we were in a time of rapidly changing circumstances and GA looks across campuses to determine if there are sufficient students to support programs. He commented that it would be very difficult to justify another PhD program in History, for example, because we already produce a significant number of historians. He indicated that a productivity study is conducted every two years and campuses are sent the data, sometimes resulting in the campus dropping the program or taking some other corrective action.
- Dr Mabe was asked if focus growth campuses had received a special push to develop additional programs. He said they had, and referred to data available on the GA website detailing the additional programs added by these campuses. He noted that Winston Salem State added a number of Masters programs, and had recently been reclassified as a Masters institution. He said trial funds were available so institutions could hire planning faculty from other campuses to assist in program planning.
- In a follow up, a delegate asked if there were plans to assist in infrastructure issues for the focus growth campuses to ensure that space was available for the additional students. Dr Mabe replied that one reason these campuses were identified as focus growth was that they had excess space, but he acknowledged that some had space issues.
- The last questioner noted the rapid growth of distance learning and asked how faculty would know the extent of redundancy that would be allowed. Dr Mabe replied that GA was working on an initiative to present selected distance learning programs to the world as a "special thing" but he anticipated that we would soon see a blend of traditional and distance learning that he hoped would result in economy of scale. He cited the example of programs for mathematics teachers, which were usually low in enrollment at individual campuses. He said we needed to collectively develop 25 courses that would be owned by UNC and made available on NCLearn ([www.nclearn.org](http://www.nclearn.org)) for campuses to use as needed.

At the conclusion of Dr Mabe's remarks, Chair Killingsworth expressed the hope that the information shared at this plenary session would get back to the campuses in a timely manner. She then invited Faculty Senate Chairs to a working lunch with vice clear Yankaskas and adjoined the plenary.

### **Summaries of Task Force Meetings**

#### **Second Plenary Session**

The Assembly reconvened after the task force meeting to review the day's events and consider resolutions and other business that the committees considered important. Chair Killingsworth reminded committee and task force chairs to submit requests to address the Assembly and/or present resolutions to the Secretary before the second Plenary.

Report by Cat Warren, Chair of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee: Dr. Warren informed the Assembly that because a mandatory textbook rental system is not being proposed, the resolution drafted by her committee opposing it would not be necessary. She reminded the delegates of resolution on Best Practices with regard to textbook adoptions passed by the Assembly on Nov 5, 2005. She reiterated the call made by President Bowles to notify students of textbooks required for courses at least six months in advance. She also suggested a "Swap Textbook" Internet site, and urged the delegates to review the other recommendations made in the Nov 5 resolution.

Report by Brenda Killingsworth, Chair of the Faculty Assembly: Chair Killingsworth began her comments by pointing out that President Bowles had been committed to developing a textbook rental program, but changed his mind thanks to input from the Assembly and the PACE study. She sees this as a sign that our voice is being heard. Next she reminded the delegates that the bylaws require that a five member nominating committee for next year's Assembly officers be formed at the second meeting of the academic year. Elections are to be held during the January meeting of the Assembly, and the committee is expected to provide two nominees for each position. The committee will appoint its own chair. The following delegates were nominated and approved without dissent to serve on this committee:

Cynthia Gillispie-Johnson (NCA&T)  
Yogendra Kakad, (UNCC)  
Denis Daley (NCSU)  
Gary Jones (WCU)  
Dee Dee Glascoff (ECU)

Chair Killingsworth thanked the Assembly for responding so quickly to requests from General Administration. We gave a solid response to the tuition policy plan proposed by GA, and the Taskforces are hard at working formulating their

responses to GA requests. She said we have until Thanksgiving to formalize our report on the proposed assessment measures outlined in the Accountability Matrix proposed by General Administration, and that approval of these measures originally scheduled to be considered by the Board of Governors in their November meeting had been postponed to a later date.

Next Chair Killingsworth reiterated her belief that President Bowles is listening to the faculty. She noted that time lines were being shared so the Assembly can get the big picture and be prepared to provide timely input into important initiatives coming from GA. She said that she would receive the PACE report today, and that she would pull out relevant pieces and send them with the timelines.

She announced that the University Day at the legislature, which was so successful last summer, will be repeated again this year. Judith Wegner will again coordinate the effort, and delegates interested in participating are asked to contact her. She said that she and Judith had "hand signed" 180 copies of a letter sent to legislators thanking them for taking "initial steps" toward making our salaries competitive. She also announced that the budget proposal from General Administration has been posted on the Assembly website, and delegates are asked to review it and provide feedback to the Assembly.

Next Chairman Killingsworth discussed the rules that govern the number of delegates to the Faculty Assembly allowed for each campus. She announced that UNCP and UNCG will each gain an additional delegate next year. With the inclusion of two delegates from the North Carolina School of Science and Math, that brings the delegate total to 60.

Chair Killingsworth thanked the delegates for their prompt response to her call for nominations to the UNC Grievance Committee, whose membership will be announced next week. A delegate expressed the concern that this committee's membership was heavily weighted toward administrators, and Chair Killingsworth promised to talk with Senior VP Martin about it.

Finally, Chair Killingsworth asked each of the Faculty Senate Chairs to provide three nominees for the Task Force on the Future of North Carolina. She asked that a justification and brief Vita be provided for each nominee, and indicated that the executive committee would decide whom to recommend. President Bowles expects a list of nominees from the Assembly before Thanksgiving, so the information from the Chairs is needed ASAP. She promised to send a description of the duties of the Task Force to Faculty Senate Presidents by email in the next week. A delegate expressed concern that finding qualified faculty who are not already committed for next semester could be extremely problematic, a sentiment shared by many delegates. Chair Killingsworth indicated that she planned to make the email detailed enough so that Faculty Senates are clear about the responsibilities of the Task Force Members.

Chair Killingsworth then asked if there were any new business, and hearing none, adjourned the Assembly at 3:53 PM.

Respectively submitted, James H. Reeves

(c) 2011