

Minutes of the Faculty Assembly

University of North Carolina 137th Session of the Faculty Assembly September 29, 2006

Minutes of Faculty Assembly September 29, 2006

Present: Brenda Killingsworth (ECU); Jimmy Reeves (UNCW); Sandie Gravett (ASU); Andy Koch (ASU); Martha Marking (ASU); DeLacy Stith (ECSU); Kulwinder Kaur-Walker (ECSU); John A. Dixon (ECSU); Mary A Glascoff (ECU); Ralph Scott (ECU); Mark Taggart (ECU); John Cope (ECU); Blanche Radford-Curry (FSU); Linda Wilson-Jones (FSU); Tom VanCanfort (FSU); Cynthia Gillispie-Johnson (NCA&T); Derrick Dunn (NCA&T); Timothy Seigler (NCCU); William Lawrence (NCCU); LeRoy Percy (NCSA); Trish Casey (NCSA); Dennis Daley (NCSU); Catherine Warren (NCSU); Nina Allen (NCSU); Suzanne Weiner (NCSU); Catherine Mitchell (UNCA); Gwen Ashburn (UNCA); Judith Wegner (UNCCH); Steven Bachenheimer (UNCCH); James Murphy (UNCCH); Joe Templeton (UNCCH); Greg Starrett (UNCC); Meg Morgan (UNCC); Cheryl Brown (UNCC); Celia Hooper (UNCG); Paul Duvall (UNCG); Anna Marshall-Baker (UNCG); Bonnie Kelley (UNCP); Jeffery Geller (UNCP); Robert Mark Spaulding (UNCW); Tammy Hunt (UNCW); Dan Noland (UNCW); Sharon Jacques (WCU); Gary Jones (WCU); Richard Beam (WCU); Subash Shah (WSSU); Janice Witt-Smith (WSSU); Rita Edwards (WSSU).

Committee Meetings

In an effort to improve efficiency and the effectiveness of the Assembly, a revised schedule was implemented in which standing Assembly committees met between 9:30 and 10:30 to discuss their goals for the coming year, and develop a timeline for their implementation. Committees were asked to fill out questionnaires designed to identify priorities as well as individuals from general administration whose input would be valuable to the process. They were also asked to comment on overlap between their committee and others and whether it might be prudent to merge some committees. These materials will be linked to these minutes. 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

Judith Wegner served as parliamentarian for this, the 1st meeting the North Carolina Faculty Assembly during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Minutes for the April, 2006 meeting of the Assembly were presented to the delegates and approved without dissent.

Chair Brenda Killingsworth presented brief remarks that highlighted the work of the executive committee and other Assembly delegates during the summer. These events included meetings with legislators to advocate for the priorities identified by general administration and meetings with community college administrators and faculty to explore common goals and facilitate President Bowles' call for increased cooperation between the universities and community colleges. She then introduced Dr Harold Martin, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Report by Dr Harold Martin, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

Vice President Martin first asked the other members of general administration present during the session to introduce themselves. These officials included James Sadler, Associate Vice President for Academic Planning, Frank Prochaska, Executive Director of the Teaching and Learning with Technology Collaborative, and Robert (Bobby) Kanoy, Senior Associate Vice President for Academic & Student Affairs.

Dr. Martin began his remarks by stressing that the Faculty Assembly was extremely important to general administration and he hoped for significant input from the Assembly on critical issues facing the University. He commented that general administration was being restructured and this had required significant adjustments consuming much of the attention of him and his staff during the summer. One important task was the development of a draft of performance measures for the University to be considered by the Board of Governors, chancellors and chief academic officers and the UNC faculty. During the summer, the priorities and objectives were adopted, and general administration is now seeking input on how they will be measured. The deadline for input is November 1, when recommendations are presented to the Board of Governors. Once these measures are endorsed by the BOG, all entities in the UNC system will be held accountable to them.

Next Dr Martin focused on one of the key objectives, improving retention and graduation rates. He reviewed the PowerPoint presentation he recently made to the Board of Governors and the Chief Academic Officers of the sixteen campuses. It contained graduation and retention rate data for the campuses listed according to their Carnegie Classification, as well as data from their peer institutions. He noted that the rates were generally good in comparison to national averages, but there was room for improvement and there had been discussion among both the Board and CAOs focusing on ways to increase them. He stressed that each campus would develop its own plan so that individual campus differences could be taken into account, and acknowledged that an important factor is student preparation. He also noted that most studies have shown that engaged students tend to stay in school and move more efficiently to graduation. He expressed his support for Summer Bridge Programs that focused on academic skills especially at the Growth Campuses" (Elizabeth City State University, Fayetteville State University, NC A&T State University, NC Central University, UNC Pembroke, Western Carolina University, and Winston-Salem State University).

Dr. Martin then opened the floor for questions.

-One delegate expressed the concern that a major push to increase retention and graduation rates could increase pressure to inflate grades. Dr. Martin responded that one of the main goals of instituting accountability measures was to ensure that programs would maintain their high standards and discourage practices such as grade inflation.

-A second questioner noted that universities were underutilized during the summer and asked if the funding model for summer school could be changed. Dr Martin replied that it was very expensive to put summer school on the state funding model but he saw the wisdom in funding Summer Bridge Programs and others designed to improve academic, technology, time management and communication skills. He referenced the report *The Toolbox Revisited* available at the US Department of Education website and urged everyone to read its recommendations. He said that some campuses had developed excellent programs that might serve as models for others, and expressed his support for a study of the feasibility of a trimester model for at least some campuses.

-The third questioner asked if a study had been done assessing the impact of recent tuition increases on family incomes. Dr. Martin answered that a lot of data had been gathered and early next week General Administration would have charts that present graduation and retention rates versus socioeconomic and ethnic classifications. He promised to have an interactive dialogue with campuses to ensure that they are sensitive to the constituencies they are serving.

-The fourth questioner asked whether there would be special consideration given to campuses that catered to adult learners. Dr Martin reiterated that plans for improving graduation and retention rates would be generated by individual campuses so these and other differences among campuses could be addressed. He indicated that the current focus was limited to undergraduates but he anticipated extending it to graduates in the future.

-Finally, a concern was expressed that these efforts might amount to unfunded mandates. President Bowles immediately responded "it wouldn't be". He indicated that during his years in government service he had found such practices particularly disingenuous and vowed that they would not happen on his watch. Dr. Martin then expressed his belief that bureaucracies could be changed so that student needs can be addressed more effectively. A delegate commented that summer courses in the sophomore and junior years were especially important.

Report by President Erskine Bowles

President Bowles began his report by emphasizing his desire for feedback about how he is doing his job. He considers faculty critiques of his job performance particularly important and expects the Faculty Senates to be involved. He noted that he is not an academic, and indicated how pleased he was to have Vice President Martin on his team. He stated that Dr. Martin was in charge of the academic side of his administration. He thanked us for being the core of the university, what "makes it happen" and assured us that the focus of PACE (President's Advisory Committee on Efficiency and Effectiveness) and other cost saving measures was to redirect funds to academics so that our needs can be better met.

President Bowles reported that a plan to manage tuition increases had been drafted by General Administration and would be made available to the Board of Governors, University administrators, and Chair Killingsworth on Monday. He emphasized that he expects our critique, and indicated that it was part of an overall plan to improve educational quality while keeping higher education affordable, an obligation that he characterized as a moral imperative. He said that tuition increases have varied significantly from year to year and campus to campus, making it difficult for students to plan their academic futures and that this plan was intended to smooth things out.

President Bowles reaffirmed that the General Assembly must be the primary funding source for improving the university and promised to keep the pressure on legislators. He stated that low tuition was no bargain without quality, and vowed that there would be no lowering of standards since "quality is everything". With this in mind, his most important budget priorities would be

- a. To raise faculty compensation to 80% of peer institutions (as reported by AAUP) in two years.
- b. To ensure that every student eligible for needs-based aid gets it, and that these students are held harmless to any tuition or fee increases.

He said that money for these priorities must be secured from the Legislature, other trending sources and savings generated by PACE and other moneysaving initiatives. President Bowles emphasized that reallocation of resources to academics would happen as a result of PACE because administrative sides had become "pretty heavy."

President Bowles then returned to the topic of performance goals. He emphasized that they needed to include timelines, implementation plans, and estimates of the costs involved. He acknowledged that one issue over which we have little control is the quality of incoming students because many are not ready to learn out of high school. He found it particularly problematic that some students take a lot of remedial courses and then drop out only to find themselves in significant debt. He said he considers summer remediation critical, and promised to make the case to the legislature.

Finally, Mr. Bowles thanked the Assembly for helping to support last year's successful legislative initiative to include expansion funds in the continuation budget. This year he will request \$118M in additional funding for all of the priorities presented in the budget proposal. He emphasized the importance he places on achieving his goals with respect to faculty compensation by stating that it was one of his performance measures. In addition to funding need based financial aid, he said that he considers funding to increase retention and graduation rates critically important, and promised that research was in line for "a big chunk" of additional funding. Finally he reported that funds are being sought to increase the number of teachers and nurses produced by the University. He expressed the hope that we would work as one university stressing the same priorities.

President Bowles then opened the floor for questions.

-He was asked if the \$38 M sought for students in need included summer school support. He said it did not. He also commented that he had expected that at least 25% of last year's tuition increases would have been used to increase faculty salaries, and another 25% would be allocated to need-based financial aid. He was shocked to discover that two campuses hadn't applied any funds from these increases to need-based aid and vowed that we would learn who they were in the coming week. Mr Bowles indicated that as President he takes responsibility for letting this happen and promised it would not happen again.

-A second delegate thanked President Bowles for the 6% raise this year and expressed the hope that efforts in this area would continue. Mr Bowles replied that he feels about us the way he feels about K-12 teachers: Our work is a lot more important than many other professions that receive much higher compensation. He has always believed that you value what you pay for, so improving our compensation will continue to be one of his highest priorities.

-Questioner 3 suggested that many of these good ideas would be difficult to sustain without sufficient capacity, a problem at many campuses. Mr Bowles admitted that one mistake he continues to make whenever he enters a new organization is to attempt to immediately raise the standards, and he tends to "pour it on.". He commented that leading from the front can result in system overload, and that capacity is a problem. He promised good follow-up, and said that now that the action plan is in place in every area detailing what is to be done, who will do it and where the money will come from, he will be meeting every week with key leaders to track progress and plan how to keep the initiative going.

-President Bowles was then asked if any additional action would be taken with regard to textbook costs. He replied that he was not convinced that a textbook rental policy didn't make sense and that he couldn't find a flaw in the policy followed by Appalachian State. He also commented on the wide disparity in costs for the same textbooks at different campuses. He said that the PACE initiative would investigate the feasibility of a system-wide rental plan as well as bulk purchases of textbooks by the UNC system.

-A delegate from Fayetteville State University commented that his institution had done away with its rental policy and he considered it important that students value their books and keep them even after graduation. President Bowles replied that he has only one of his textbooks from either graduate or undergraduate school, and he hears repeatedly that students can't afford their books. He thinks it is one of factors that blocks access to the University, and that the decision by FSU was a mistake he would have fought against.

-Another delegate asked what President Bowles thought was the most serious problem affecting faculty. He replied that we suffered from serious misconceptions on the part of the public and the Legislature regarding what we do and how hard we work. He commented that he could not have secured our 6% raises last year without the faculty portraits provided by the Assembly through the leadership and hard work of Cat Warren. He suggested that this was why he considered our participation in events involving members of the legislature and Board of Governors so important. He pointed out that it was reasonably easy to convince people of the value of the skills taught at community colleges but convincing them of the need for critical thinking skills was a harder sell.

-A delegate expressed excitement about the pay raise, but pointed out that our benefits package was also an issue of

concern that had put us at a serious disadvantage when trying to hire new faculty. Mr Bowles responded that he was well aware that our benefits are atrocious, but he felt he could make more progress with salaries because benefits are a harder sell. He indicated that another modest step forward for health care would be coming this year but he didn't expect any action on retirement benefits.

-A delegate asked how it was that he had indicated to the Assembly last year that GA would be seeking a 4% raise and we ended up getting 6%. Mr. Bowles said it had always been his policy to "under promise and over produce".

-President Bowles was asked by another delegate whether he considered it a moral imperative to build and maintain buildings that did not waste energy. He answered that he was aware that mistakes had been made in this area and that he was aware of companies in the private sector who would fund the cost of making a building environmentally friendly in return for part of the savings realized by the improvements. He noted that he has found some opposition to such a plan.

-Finally a delegate commented that low tuitions are good, but if we set them too low and there is no increasing in funding by the Legislature, we might easily get into trouble. Mr Bowles replied that he would keep pressure on the legislature and that tuition increases would be permitted only if they were demonstrated to be the only way the system could improve.

President Bowles concluded his remarks by saying that he looks forward to his report card.

Report by Alan Mabe, Vice President for Academic Planning

Dr. Mabe indicated that he planned to meet with the Assessment Task Force, and expressed the hope that every task force would have at least one representative from General Administration available to it. He said that workshops on improving retention and graduation rates had been conducted for years, but now Chancellors and Provosts were developing five year targets. He acknowledged that one plan would not be appropriate for all campuses. Instead, data for each campus will be examined and each campus will discuss its goals with General Administration.

The twelve priorities identified in the accountability document came from discussions among the Chancellors following the charge from President Bowles. Measurements designed to determine whether we are meeting these priorities are currently being developed, and Dr Mabe emphasized that our input is being sought. He said that the overwhelming majority of data needed for the measurements suggested in the accountability document had already been collected.

Next he outlined the timeline for implementing the accountability measures. Suggestions or additions or corrections to the proposed measures must be submitted by November 1 (suggestions from the Assembly should be sent to Brenda by October 27). These measures will be discussed and finalized during January and February. Then campuses will have the opportunity to consider the data and add additional goals and measures they might find appropriate. Overall objectives and measures will be finalized by the end of Spring. Dr Mabe indicated that he anticipated that a set of objectives and measures would be common to all campuses, but system wide measures do not preclude individual campus measures. He also said that the approach was to identify a limited set of effective measures, in contrast to the approach taken by Texas, which created an overwhelming number them.

Finally, Dr Mabe reviewed the priorities and commented on some of the measures currently under consideration. He said that outstanding faculty and student development were tied for the highest priority and speculated that workload data might provide some information, but he asked what might be more effective measures of outstanding faculty. He said that a five year plan for producing more K-12 teachers was in place and initial data would be available soon, but admitted that the plan did not yet address the goal of improving the quality of the teachers we produce.

Mabe said that research measurements were largely based on the total amount of funding awarded to the Institution and the amount of funding per capita. He acknowledged that different campuses would have different "looks". *Should also consider the number of students involved in research per capita.*

Measurements to monitor student success might include NSSE (National Survey of Student Engagement) survey data and results from the Collegiate Learning Assessment. The focus will not be on specific disciplines, but rather the "value added" as a student progresses from freshman to senior. Mabe said longitudinal studies are being considered that would track individual students throughout their undergraduate careers to determine the relative increase in the students' "skills" year by year. He emphasized that the focus would be critical thinking, not content knowledge.

Leslie Boney has been charged with developing measures in the area of regional and statewide development. In health care, the issue of whether we are providing adequate numbers of health care professionals will be assessed. Mabe acknowledged that Information Technology was a difficult area to assess. Robyn Render will be leading that assessment effort, which would focus on total dollars spent, and the number of computers owned and available to faculty and staff.

Measures to assess internationalization will include determining the number of students who have an out of country experience, and the extent to which international students are influencing the internationalization of the curriculum. In the area of partnerships with community colleges, Dr Mabe reported that community colleges are very concerned with getting more of their students to transfer to a university. Currently many of the students taking college transfer

courses do not. He also reported that the current graduation rate for community college transfers with Associate Degrees is approximately 70%, compared with a 90% rate overall for juniors in good standing.

Measures to assess private fund raising efforts will include the size of campus endowments as a function of the size of the institution, as well as funds raised for endowed professors and scholarships.

Dr. Mabe concluded his remarks by reiterating that General Administration will use the 12 priorities to assess how well we are doing. The measures to be used will be honed over the next month, at which time the Board of Governors will be engaged. He said they had already received significant buy-in from the Board, and he urged members to seek input from their faculties and Faculty Senates, and communicate it to him as soon as possible. He even indicated his willingness to accept personal emails from faculty on these issues. He then opened the floor for questions:

-A delegate commented that research should not be tied exclusively to dollars, but should also consider the number of faculty publications and other such data, because considering only dollars would send a bad message to administrations that money is all that matters. Dr. Mabe agreed and asked if faculty routinely filled out Delaware forms on research output. He emphasized that he needed consistent measures that would allow collection of faculty data, and expressed the hope that faculty would fill out these forms every year.

-A second delegate commented that at his institution, this information is given by every department, and a software system facilitates the collection of these data. He emphasized the need for a system-wide collection system, and reemphasized the need to focus on more than just the dollars generated for research. Dr. Mabe pointed out that the individual campuses set the goals for their institution. The delegate responded with a concern that the campuses might adopt a literal interpretation of the message sent by these goals. Chair Killingsworth interjected that this is exactly the type of message the task forces needed to send to General Administration. It is very important that the Chancellors have this discussion with their Faculty Senates. Dr. Mabe indicated that General Administration had meetings with the Chief Academic Officers about the need to get faculty involved in these discussions.

-A delegate pointed out that there were likely to be great differences in how research is prioritized at different campuses. At UNC Chapel Hill, for example, salary increases are tied to two components, one directly related to the amount of outside funding awarded. It would be a serious error to impose a "one size fits all" model to evaluating research. Vice President Martin responded that he agreed and was asking campuses to define individual targets that are realistic for that campus.

-A delegate asked to what extent these assessment measures were an attempt to do an "end run" around a federally imposed system such as that advocated by Secretary of Education Spelling. Mabe replied that President Bowles does not want a government imposed system. Instead, he favors a voluntary system involving input from each campus. He believes that if we get engaged in this process now, we can forestall federal or state intervention.

-Another delegate wondered if the priority of "quality academic programs" implied that general administration was not supporting Secretary Spelling's call for standardized testing. Mabe replied that the assessment of academic programs was a campus issue, and that general administration had "no interest" in broad standardized testing. Rather, they preferred to focus on how students do after they leave our institutions.

-The next question returned to the subject of evaluating research, particularly in the arts. The concern was that considering dollars only would make it impossible to assess the contributions made in the arts, and that even counting publications would not provide a fair measure of faculty contributions in this area. Mabe replied that the Delaware Collection System contains a section for contributions in the Arts.

-A delegate commented that at UNC Chapel Hill and at NC State, all reports of faculty research output were collected in a centralized database. Vice President Martin said that he expects this feedback from Chief Academic Officers, and he urged faculty to get engaged in the process. He indicated once again that the assessment document was still in draft form and our input was welcome.

Dr. Mabe then made a few remarks concerning on line learning. He commented that campuses are in different places, and there is a lot going on. It is possible to obtain a UNC degree in 52 counties in North Carolina, even though we only have campuses in 14. To provide degree opportunities in the other counties, we will need more on line programs. He said that the UNC system currently offers 95 degrees on line (significantly more than the University of Phoenix, which offers 46), and that the next step was to rationalize the system for ease of use and inter-institution transferability. He noted that some split programs required two registrations and two fees, and said that the committee advocated that the institution offering the course receive the fees. He estimated that it would take nine to twelve months to get a program running, and that a default system needed to be built so that registrars, billing and other campus agencies can easily communicate with one another. The goal is to make the process easier for students so that more will take them.

He noted that President Bowles believes that given the high quality programs we have, offering selected programs to out of state audiences could produce a significant revenue stream. Plans are currently in place to establish "UNC Global" and identify degree programs it would offer. A centralized entity would be needed that dealt with marketing, etc, but individual campuses would decide what programs, if any, they would offer out of state, and campuses would

control the content and receive the bulk of the revenue. Currently Jim Sadler and Robyn Render are working on this. Dr. Mabe then opened the floor for questions about distance learning.

-A delegate asked about the SACS (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools) rule that 25% of the credits for a degree must come from the institution granting the degree. Mabe answered that we would not be offering a piece meal approach. Each campus that has on line degree programs will decide which, if any, to put on line. If there were collaborative programs offered, he felt that SACS would make allowances for them. He anticipated that campuses might collaborate to offer certificate programs, for example, but emphasized that they would have to grow out of the campuses themselves.

-Another delegate asked if funding was available for such things as marketing of programs. Mabe replied that there would be front money for the entity that coordinates the programs, but that a market analysis and a business plan would be developed for each program considered, as well as for the UNC brand.

-A delegate asked if there were statistics available on graduation rates for distance learning programs. Mabe answered that we need to build a mechanism for measuring these, but that data from ECU showed no difference in rates for on line programs using their tracking system. He emphasized that all evidence indicates that great distance learning programs are possible.

-A concern was expressed about the instructors for the courses. Would tenured and tenure track faculty teach these courses? It was reported that some rumors had been circulating that faculty from other countries might be teaching these courses in the "new, flexible university". It was pointed out that at NCSU, tenure track faculty can not teach distance learning courses offered by their institution as part of their normal load, and the departments did not have oversight of the courses that were offered. The fear was expressed that the cart was being put before the horse, and that huge logistical problems weren't being considered. Mabe replied that he did not disagree with the concerns, and that there were currently two models for distance ed in use at schools in the system. The one used by NCSU and others has distance ed as a separate unit, independent of the colleges in the school. AT ECU by contrast, on line learning is integrated into the college. He indicated that he thought ECU was doing it right and NCSU had it wrong. He said we should never let a program go on line without a commitment by the college to support the degree.

-Finally, Dr. Mabe was asked about the restriction that only 18% of students could be from out of state. He replied that this rule only applied to freshman, but the point was well taken if degree programs were to be offered to them. He also said that currently about 12% of students are from out of state system wide.

With that he thanked the Assembly for our attention, and repeated his call for feedback from us.

Chair Killingsworth then outlined the agenda for the rest of the meeting. First, committees would meet again briefly with self study team members and outline the forms they were expected to complete. She emphasized that the self study task force was not out to change anything not recommended by the committees themselves. She indicated the need for timelines, and encouraged the discussion of how the Assembly could become more efficient. She said that the creation of task forces was an attempt to more effectively deal with the issues most pressing to the Assembly. After these brief meetings, the task forces would convene to discuss the specific charge each had been given, and to provide feedback to the GA representative designated to meet with them. The plenary was then adjourned so members could attend their respective meetings.

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. The committees were asked to fill out goals and timelines and email them to the Assembly Secretary. The Task forces were also asked to provide the Secretary with an electronic summary of their meetings.

Gary Jones of the self study task force asked that all delegates fill out an evaluation index card before leaving the meeting.

Next a resolution on Collegiality was proposed by the Governance Committee. After several proposed amendments and considerable debate, consideration of the resolution was postponed until the next regular Assembly meeting. The committee was asked to propose alternative wording, as well as to provide supplementary explanatory materials. Delegates were encouraged to discuss these issues with their respective Faculty Senates.

The Development committee reported their discussion of the issue of recruitment and retention. The committee felt that prioritization should be considered an individual campus issue, but there should be some system-wide criteria. The report was made to the Assembly for consideration of the individual campuses. A question arose about non-tenured faculty. The response was that there is a provision in the assessment document about the number of courses taught by non-tenured faculty.

Next Judith Wegner summarized the results of the surveys administered to delegates and other faculty in the system. The survey had 72 respondents, and a PowerPoint summarizing their responses was reviewed. Wegner also summarized the activities of Assembly members during the summer. These included a visit to the legislature resulting in many positive interactions between delegates and state representatives, and a meeting of Assembly members and UNC administrators with community college faculty and administrators. Some possibilities that arose from the latter meeting were a summer institute composed of UNC and CC faculty, and a combined legislative initiative.

Finally, Chair Killingsworth outlined some of the unprecedented events that had taken place in the past year.

- She characterized the meeting with legislators on June 7 as the first of its kind, and expressed the hope that Assembly delegates would do it again next year. She reminded us that the booklet (available in its complete form on the web) that outlined the daily work of UNC faculty had really helped President Bowles make the case for the significant raises we received.

- She welcomed representatives from the North Carolina School of Science and Math, who will be joining the UNC system as its seventeenth member next year.

- She indicated that she had been going to Board of Governors meetings and had met with the Board Chair Jim Phillips. She said she had been asked that the Assembly offer a workshop on shared governance to Board members in November, and indicated that Mr. Phillips would meet with the Assembly at our January meeting. She noted that for the first time, we were invited to Board of Governors receptions at the President's residence.

- She indicated that she and President Bowles had authored a joint letter to Community Colleges President Lancaster.

- She said she hoped for a cultural change, and urged delegates to get their Faculty Senates more involved. She particularly urged that Senates discuss the proposed accountability measures and provide feedback by October 27.

- She cited the HMI committee's development of the upcoming Shared Governance Conference, and urged that the document on shared governance authored by Dick Veit be updated. She said that because President Bowles now brings up this topic, Chancellors do too. She is asking Senate Chairs to provide information on how administrators at their institutions are evaluated.

- She indicated that the self study task force will help get a big picture of what is going on with the Assembly, and that we have asked for timelines from the general administration so we can anticipate what reports will be coming and can respond accordingly. She urged the delegates to provide feedback on the process.

- President Bowles has provided the tuition plan drafted by general assembly to Chair Killingsworth at the same time it was given to members of the Board of Governors and Chancellors. She expressed the hope that campuses would respond promptly to any requests she sends in response to the report.

- A delegate asked if we would explain the sense of the collegiality resolution to the Board of Governors. It was suggested that another "whereas" could be added to explain the importance of collegiality, and that a link to the AAUP (American Association of University Professors) might be in order.

Chair Killingsworth concluded her remarks by thanking the delegates for hard work today, and asked if there was any new business.

New Business: The following resolution was submitted by the executive committee:

Resolution Honoring Dr. Betsy Brown

WHEREAS Dr. Betsy Brown has served with distinction for five years as Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs; and

WHEREAS during her tenure Dr. Brown drew on wisdom derived from a variety of experiences including her youth in Rowan County, her expertise as an English professor, and Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at Winthrop University; and

WHEREAS Dr. Brown provided exceptional leadership in a variety of arenas of crucial importance to faculty, including advising the Faculty Assembly; and

WHEREAS Dr. Brown designed and executed pan-University leadership development programs that built

bridges among faculty leaders across the University system, and served as the Executive Director of the UNC Leadership Institute; and

WHEREAS Dr. Brown brought needed attention to cutting edge questions including those relating to faculty careers and life stages, the circumstances of fixed-term faculty, work-life balance, pre-tenure faculty, senior faculty, and faculty approaching retirement; and

WHEREAS Dr. Brown has generously served as an important mentor and role model for the faculty members whose paths she has crossed over many years;

WHEREAS Dr. Brown provided critical support to the University Library Advisory Council, and the Advisory Board of the Teaching and learning with Technology Collaborative; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Brown coordinated international activities at the University system level, including work on issues of issues of foreign language access and placement; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Brown will soon be pursuing new opportunities at North Carolina State University where she will continue to address issues of crucial significance to faculty members and public higher education; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Brown will be sorely missed by the Faculty Assembly and her many faculty admirers and friends;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

The Faculty Assembly commends and thanks Dr. Betsy Brown for her important contributions to the quality of public higher in North Carolina, and her visionary efforts on behalf of University faculty in general and the Faculty Assembly in particular.

Dated: September 29, 2006

Brenda Killingsworth, Chair, Faculty Assembly

Jimmy Reeves, Secretary, Faculty Assembly

The resolution passed without dissent.

Chair Killingsworth then asked if there was any other new business, and hearing none, adjourned the meeting at 4:20 PM.

Respectively submitted, James H. Reeves

(c) 2011