

**Meeting of the UNC Faculty Assembly
January 18, 2008**

Attendance:

Morning Session

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 9:30 by Chair Brenda Killingsworth. She welcomed Jim Phillips, Chair of the Board of Governors, who was back for a second time to address the Assembly.

Comments by Jim Phillips.

Phillips said he wanted to bring the Faculty Assembly back up to speed on UNC Tomorrow. He said that he appreciated communications from Killingsworth and Wegner. He also welcomed the Faculty Assembly resolution passed in November expressing a desire and commitment to being involved.

Phillips said he hopes that delegates understand the extent to which there has been faculty involvement so far. When he appeared before the Assembly previously, he talked about what would be done. There's been a great deal of time spent. The UNC Tomorrow Commission visited campuses to learn what has been going on already, held public listening forums at 11 locales, and held 11 additional faculty listening forums that were very helpful and well-attended.

Phillips said that if UNC Tomorrow has taught him nothing else, he's been moved by seeing 3000 citizens come out to be involved, and faculty members who took time to attend and contribute to the Commission's work. It's powerful to see that everyone really turns to the University to address their problems, and administrators and faculty members really care and contribute.

On the issue of faculty involvement, Phillips said that the first thing he and the Board of Governors (BOG) did was not to hire a consultant but instead to use the expertise of the faculty. That has been a remarkable effort and a wonderful decision for many reasons. For example, it saved them a lot of money. The depth and breadth of input and knowledge was far better than they could have gotten from hiring a consultant. The commitment to the process was at a different level than could get from a hired gun. Perhaps the most important thing is that, having done this once, they will do it again, finding ways for the University and the state as a whole to address thorny problems in the future. They need to replicate this model because of the quality of the work. Phillips said that he wanted the Assembly delegates to know that the UNC Tomorrow report is the voice of the faculty: not only was Chair Killingsworth on the UNC Tomorrow Commission, but the 15 members of the Scholars Council contributed to all facets of the report. The Scholars Council was literally and figuratively part of the commission. Members of the Scholars Council sat with the Commission and significantly affected the process and outcome.

Phillips reminded the Assembly delegates that it is not enough to just have a report, however. He's spent time with key people at General Administration (GA) in working through how to implement the report's recommendations both at GA and on the campuses. It will be the top priority for the BOG through 2008. They will ask the campuses questions about how the campuses will implement the recommendations, and will address that with GA as well. They will work toward thinking about collaboration first, not last, and consider how GA and campuses can work together more effectively. For example, if there's need for a degree program, the question will be how we can meld our resources across the campuses to meet the needs of the state.

Phillips said he implores the Assembly, provosts and chancellors and others to stay engaged. He asked that faculty members submit ideas and points of view that we have, ideas on what will work or not work as we hear about it. If he's spent as much time as he has, if we don't follow up, he'll be disappointed. By the end of 2008, he wants not just a paper report.

Phillips noted that one question he got last time was: "when you're talking so much about jobs of the future, we wonder 'how about the liberal arts?'" The first recommendation in the report is that UNC should prepare students for the 21st century. The key tools are the ability to read, analyze, think, write, and work as a team. He remembered at the Raleigh forum, someone from IBM said they need "T-shaped" people who are deep but also broad. He has twins who are freshmen in college and are likely to be history or English majors.

Phillips concluded by saying that what he wanted to leave the Assembly with was an appreciation that the BOG and those in GA care a lot about what faculty members think. It's not just lip service. The faculty makes the university, and the BOG knows that and appreciates it. If faculty members aren't on board, nothing will succeed.

Members of the Assembly offer questions and comments.

Linda Callahan (NCAT) said that Phillips had said there would be "another UNC Tomorrow." When will that be? Phillips responded by saying that what they're talking about will become engrained in campus planning processes. The report will be the model going forward. He'll probably be off the Board by then.

Gary Jones (WCU) said that some people have commented about upcoming joint meetings between the BOG, the State Board of Education and Community Colleges. He asked what Phillips' outlook was for this discussion. Phillips said that, once a year, the three boards meet. Historically those meetings have largely been a waste of time. UNC will be hosting this time, and will use a process model more akin to the listening forum models used for UNC Tomorrow. He hopes that approach will result in better understanding the problems from others' viewpoints. He wondered when he started as BOG chair whether there should be a merger of all of education for a K-20 system. He finally concluded that that wouldn't work (that approach didn't work in Florida, where things became disarrayed, a referendum was held, and a system similar to UNC's was recreated). Where they're focusing their efforts now is for the people at the top have meaningful relationships with each other. They're working on communication with the respective boards as well.

Jim Martin (NCSU) noted that Phillips had emphasized thinking about the system viewpoint, but what Martin hears is that there's a risk that every campus will be trying to do everything. Is there anything being sent to the campuses saying "what won't you do, and what might be done better by another campus in the system"? Phillips said that that's a very good point. The way they've thought about it so far is to have GA sort that out, but he hopes that Allen Mabe and Harold Martin will take note of that concerned.

Harold Martin said that they'd spent time yesterday working further on the guidelines to the campuses and they won't expect every campus to do everything. They will ask campuses what they do and could do better, but also what other things might they/should they be doing to respond to the report and its substantive recommendations. They will have substantive discussions with Chancellors next Tuesday. They will also have to do a gap analysis (what's being proposed, what collaborations with UNC campuses and community colleges). As they assess what is being proposed, GA will need to determine which campuses have the best potential for delivering what's needed, including using on-line strategies, branch campuses, and so forth.

Jim Phillips said that it's important to ask the questions Harold noted to the campuses. To amplify what Harold said, in Phillips' views, one of the fundamental changes for program planning, going forward, will not be "what new program do we as a campus want to offer" but instead, "how do we best offer this program, and how to do in collaboration with other campuses. They need to use the system's resources in tackling a topic (rather than in silos).

Subash Shah (WSU) noted that Phillips had referenced an "honest, candid" approach and asked how it would be possible to know whether the approach was mechanistic. Phillips said that he wasn't sure of the reference.

Ken Wilson (ECU) said that in helping the schools, there are problems interfacing with schools. If faculty knew there were opportunities then might be able to deploy students to raise the level in various ways. Phillips said "you're on."

Linda Calahan (NCA&T) said that now we're this far down the road with the report, how should Assembly delegates tell their faculty colleagues to stay involved in the process? Phillips said that President Bowles and Vice President Harold Martin may have good ideas. For example, UNC-CH held a faculty workshop to discuss the UNC Tomorrow recommendations. He thinks that for most campuses, there will be an invitation to faculty to participate on this basis. He appreciated the involvement of faculty on the front end, and it's even more important to have them involved on the back end. Unless there's buy-in from faculty, won't work. They would want to know if there were not such opportunities on the campuses.

Comments by President Erskine Bowles

Bowles first introduced Laura Bernstein Luger, the new general counsel. He said he'd tried to find someone like Leslie Winner. Luger has had significant experience through her work as a member of two major law firms in the state (Womble Carlisle and Moore Van Allen). She's highly respected and has done lots of homework to get ready.

Bowles spoke at some length about efforts to implement the UNC Tomorrow Report's recommendations. They have struggled through the "what" (and worked hard at deciding), and now have to move to "how." If everything is a priority, nothing is a priority. Bowles has just read the first draft of the guidelines on "how." We'll do it together. The faculty Scholars Council was the best thing they did. He'll never hire another consultant. They did great research and set the framework for understanding real problems and real opportunities. They wrote the recommendations. He doesn't agree with everything in the report, but it is a framework for moving forward.

A major focus must be on improving K-12. Faculty members see the need everyday with students coming from the state's K-12 schools. We're not up to par with international competitors. In North Carolina, nobody takes responsibility (rather everyone blames each others). The University campuses train the teachers and principals and need to look at what we're doing critically and decide whether we're doing it right. The team at GA has been working on this for the last two years and he thinks we'll be proud. They need faculty advice and help. If we don't fix K-12, everything else is for naught. He's bringing the education cabinet together to work more effectively in an upcoming meeting with representation of top policy/political leaders and State Board of Education, NC Community Colleges, and UNC. They're going to exchange reports on what they're doing, and then have discussions in small groups. He hopes this approach will allow them to pull together real goals, objectives, and timelines. It will be a personal failure for him if we don't make progress on this front. He thinks the world has changed since his mother was a teacher. In his mother's generation, the top 1/3 of the class went into teaching, but today it's the bottom 1/3 of the class. The marketplace where the teachers were going has

changed and is now a war zone. Doing the same thing as in the past won't work. He needs faculty ideas and involvement. For every 100 8th graders, 58 graduate high school, 38 go to college, 18 graduate college. The old jobs are gone and they're never coming back. If we don't educate our population, we're really in trouble.

Comments from Members of the Assembly followed.

Greg Starrett (UNCC) said that as an educator and employee he's excited, but as an educational researcher he fears that we've been overselling higher education compared to plumbers and so forth. He noted that there had been an excellent high school program in horticulture, but then a new principal introduced college prep program for kids who likely won't go to college (setting them up to fail, and not fitting their aspirations). Bowles noted that his father had run for governor in 1972 and had run on a platform of career education. He thought his father was right and Starrett was right. Bowles said that if the people on the factory floor can't use fancy equipment (requiring math, analytical skills, etc.), then jobs will be lost. Bowles said he is concerned that kids going through K-12 aren't getting those basic skills. To go into horticultural science, students need science, and the US is at the bottom internationally. We need to take responsibility.

Nancy Goldsmith (NCSA) asked what is being done to improve K-12 teacher salaries. Bowles said that we're paying too little (including for faculty at UNC). He thinks it's important to compare teacher salaries to other professions (not just to other states' teacher salaries). They've tried an experiment in Greensboro to raise private money to increase salaries, require professional development, allocation for mentoring (1 faculty member from UNCG or NCAT per 8 teachers in the 70 person teacher cohort). This year they've gotten many more teacher applicants and students are performing better in low-performing schools. Some people told him that they'd steal the teachers from nearby to go to Greensboro, but the answer is that there should be that kind of support in other places in the state. They're using this as a pilot before rolling out more widely to show this point.

Subash Shah (WSU) noted that one of the things you haven't touched is the fact that we don't control incentives (for example weak students get hired into part-time jobs). Students are looking for the good life (in the US they don't need education for this, but in other countries that's different). Bowles said that the US will be getting a wake-up call. Unless people have a good basic education, they won't be able to do jobs.

Linda Callahan (NCA&T) noted that the mention of math and Guilford County made her think of her daughter's experience (having a substitute teacher for a month). Bowles asked Mabe about the proportion of classes in math without certified teachers (he thought about 30% but that was old data)

Raymond Burt (UNCW) said he wanted to bring up UNCW's efforts with an early college high school. He was involved in the early planning. There was some support but also considerable resistance from faculty, students, and administrators. They're now in the second year of the program, and students next year will be entering college classes. Last year this program was in the top five in the state for exam scores, and minority students did particularly well. Burt said he also thinks we need to cooperate more with community colleges. Burt said he doesn't know how things will progress down the line. Bowles said that we have to be prepared to try things, some of which may not work. He had designed program for low-performing principals using PEP and Kenan-Flagler. It was a failure but was worth trying.

Scott McRae (NCSU) said he'd been listening to radio presentations on No Child Left Behind. In some of the low-performing schools, the emphasis is only on the test. We need to bypass the tests. Bowles said it's even worse than that because North Carolina's standards for tests are so low that people think that

we're doing well compared to other states when that's not the case. McRae said that we're clearly not preparing students well for college.

Bowles said to please talk with colleagues and send comments.

Comments by Senior Vice President Harold Martin

Martin initially commented on new policy relating to minimum admissions requirements. They've spent considerable time on this question. In order to improve student success, the BOG wanted to set minimum admission requirements. Admissions standards have been delegated to campus Boards of Trustees. The work of the BOG was to set minimum standards on which campuses could build. The minimum requirements were approved by BOG at January meeting, including a minimum SAT of 750 and a minimum GPA of 2.0. By 2013, there will be a move to a minimum SAT of 800 and a minimum GPA of 2.5. Campuses and GA will use a comprehensive dissemination plan to inform parents, students, and others about the new requirement. He hopes to share the communications plan shortly. High school students and parents are aware. All of the campuses that would be affected have raised their admissions standards to comply as of fall 2008. They will also continue to work on access.

Martin also spoke about ongoing work on issues involving the Community Colleges, the comprehensive articulation agreement, and the transferability of credits. Martin said they'd addressed the sticky issues and said that henceforth UNC will work with NCCC so in the future will transmit understandings together. There are other initiatives in the pipeline, and they will keep us informed.

Martin then spoke about the work of University Code Review Committee regarding changes to the University Code. He said that he appreciated the work of the Faculty Assembly on these issues. He had met with University counsels, Faculty Assembly Chair Brenda Killingsworth, Assembly Secretary Judith Wegner, and NCSU Provost Larry Nielson (who chaired the Code Review Committee). The recommendations were reviewed by the BOG personnel and governance committees last week. The only issue that arose with the Personnel and Tenure committee related to cutting the campus Boards of Trustees out of the review process for faculty appeals. The BOG wanted the campus Boards of Trustees to remain in the review process and GA is preparing a revision to be included in the presentation to the BOG at its February meeting. He's submitted the revision to Killingsworth and Wegner and asks for affirmation in order to put before the BOG in February. Once the BOG approves Code revisions, GA will put the Code provisions together with the post-tenure review regulations and send these to the campuses for action. He noted that the post-tenure review policy was reshaped through the work of the Faculty Assembly last spring and that reviews of faculty primarily by administrators rather than peers will not be included.

Members of the Assembly commented and asked questions.

Nina Allen (NCSU) asked about the rationale for reintroducing the Boards of Trustees. Harold Martin said the BOG wanted to be sure that there had been full opportunity for review on the campus before moving appeals up the line to the BOG.

Jim Martin (NCSU) said he wasn't sure why the post-tenure review was being brought back into the discussion about the Code. Jim Martin said that there had been a lot of language put into the text linking discharge and PTR. He wants to be sure that won't be raised again. Harold Martin said that the only reason for sending the policies to the campuses in tandem was to avoid fragmenting needed revisions. Jim Martin said that there should be a statement about PTR being for faculty development.

Catherine Rigsby (ECU) said she was a little concerned about the request to campuses to form committees and review policies. There are on most campuses existing committees dealing with matters

such as this (e.g. university governance committees). How will the request to campuses be framed? It makes a big difference because if it invites creation of administrative committees, it could undercut establish governance. Harold Martin said he would be sensitive to this concern. He thinks that for some campuses, there may not be committees, but he will stress faculty involvement. Jim Martin asked that the instructions be sent to faculty senate chairs concurrently.

Steve Bachenheimer (UNCCH) asked for more contextual information regarding changes in minimum admissions standards. How do these changes affect those who might be applying or enrolling? Harold Martin said that they have significant data. He referred to the enrollment report for fall 2007 which was presented to the BOG. It provides ethnic, SAT, and other data showing trends. GA created a summary of students admitted to UNC across a spectrum using a 10 year window, and considered those admitted with SAT and GPA below a particular level. They looked at student retention and graduation for four, five, and six-year windows. They saw that they had a reasonable population of students below 700 SAT and GPA below 2.0 which surprised everyone. As they looked at where a minimum threshold should be, they tried to balance access, probability for success, and diminished capacity of campuses for campuses to set admission requirements and meet enrollment goals. Considering all these factors, they saw that the campuses that would be affected most were the historically minority institutions (HMIs). Martin said that the campuses also need to focus on assuring success. GA hopes to continue to strengthen ties with the Community College System (NCCC) where many such students may start. They also need to work with K-12, and track developments over time.

Bachenheimer asked what response had been received from the State Board of Education. How will the high schools respond? Harold Martin said that improving K-12 is a top priority for UNC Tomorrow effort. The State Board of Education and the Department of Public Instruction had minimal negative reaction to the changed requirements.

Bobby Kanoy (GA) said that GA compared the standards against the class that entered in 2006. The new standards would have kept out 38 students out of 30,000 enrolled. Chancellors have a 1% waiver for the number they admit, and that will yield about the same number of students.

Ken Wilson (ECU) said that, using the data, it would be best to look at the data more fully (not just GPA and SAT) to see what it takes to succeed.

Comments by Interim Vice President for Human Resources Kitty McCollum and Dennis Daley (NCSU) on the Task Force on Human Resources

Dennis Daley said that the Legislature charged UNC to report by March to its Education Oversight Committee. This is the only opportunity to comment given the time frame for the process. The Human Resources (HR) Task Force was composed of large number of staff members, faculty, HR directors, senior administrative officers, and people from Office of State Personnel. What is being proposed is draft legislation that asks for creating a substantially equivalent system for the University (rather than continuing to deal with staff employees as part of the system operated by the Office of State Personnel). By creating a substantially equivalent system, SPA employees would have the same level of protections that they presently have (SPA employees feel comfortable with that assurance). The other part of the draft legislation lists all the things UNC would be allowed to do if such a system is created. At this point, the Office of State Personnel sets rules and makes legislative recommendations that are geared to the bulk of state employees in types of jobs. That approach doesn't fit UNC particularly well. There would be options for the campuses to address key issues (defining positions, matching salary levels, recruitment, creating managerial flexibility). The proposal would allow campuses to move faster and work more effectively with markets in which we actually operate. Daley said that they would have a resolution this afternoon.

Kitty McCollum said that what the proposal means is that the University System would *not* be taken out of the state personnel system, and would still be under the Office of State Personnel. The University would, however, be given an option for substantial equivalence (subject to review).

Brenda Killingsworth (ECU) asked about the discussion of possible latitude to shift raises for faculty and into employee benefits. McCollum said that once there's a substantially equivalent system, there would be some flexibility to consider recommendations of that sort.

Comments by Scott Jenkins, Associate VP for Research and Analysis

Jenkins discussed GA's pilot program in using the Collegial Learning Assessment (CLA). They're working with the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) <http://www.nasulgc.org/> on voluntary assessment. This approach doesn't take the place of SACS (Southern Association of Colleges and Universities, the regional accrediting entity covering North Carolina) or campus assessments. A workgroup is also looking at NSSE (National Survey of Student Engagement) as a possible component for an overall assessment strategy. There were several campuses that were asked and agreed to undertake a pilot effort with the CLA. There are two CLA options: longitudinal and cross sectional. What GA decided to do for the other campuses was to do a cross-sectional analysis, using 100 freshmen per campus. The assessment is done on-line with several sessions and times to take the assessment. In the spring, there will be 100 seniors expected to participate. UNCW and NCCU also started longitudinal studies (which will involve following sample of 100 in each year). By the end of the summer, GA will put together a committee this summer with a Faculty Assembly representation to review the results. GA has tried to standardize the approaches. Some of the longitudinal data will come in as well. They will determine whether to continue to use the CLA or other tests. SACS also has worked with campuses on quality enhancement plans.

Greg Starrett (UNCC) asked about the focus in analyzing the results. Jenkins said that there is a real split among directors of assessment from the campuses as to whether or not to use the CLA. GA expects to see how CLA responses correlate with SAT scores. They also want to see if students will actually take the CLA (some institutions had difficulty in recruiting students, since they didn't want to go through Institutional Review Board protocols and try to force students in classes to take the instrument). Alan Mabe said that the test claims that it's able to show value added from first to final year. Is it possible to make any claims of this sort? If not, then there's no point in doing this. Greg Starrett said that his problem with CLA is the crudity of the data sent to the campuses. Does CLA provide data to GA? He's seen data and it doesn't really allow different campuses to understand much about what particular actions on the campus (if any) affect improvement if any is shown. It may be a good start to consider how easy or difficult it is to recruit students (it is very difficult to recruit students and administer the instrument on some campuses). Jenkins said that GA spoke to CLA and were going to bring them in if there are things on which GA needs answers. It's very campus-specific data. CLA doesn't explain why particular levels and scores are shown. GA also wants to look at possible cross-population/cross-campus data. It is a very big investment. One of the people on the committee had been involved with the University of Texas system's assessment efforts, which have been fraught with problems. Alan Mabe said that Bonnie Yankaskas's brother-in-law was one of the principal people in CLA and would be coming in fall. Alan Mabe added that GA funded campuses to cover costs of CLA (\$400,000 has been spent on this effort so far, since GA has tried not to make it an unfunded mandate).

Comments by Vice President for Academic Planning and University-School Programs Alan Mabe

Mabe first commented on UNC Online (<http://online.northcarolina.edu>). The website reflects an aggregation of all campus programs (there are now 160 programs and certificate/licensure programs), not GA programs. Users can access listings by campus, program, course, and so forth. They will be adding another link emphasizing teaching (particularly for those interested in lateral entry). GA is working with UNCG in toward development of on-line college courses for high school students. The Governor is providing the funding for this effort and it will be an important one. North Carolina School of Science and Mathematics (NCSSM) is now part of the UNC system. They are beginning to offer on-line offerings in advanced science and math, and will continue to emphasize such developments on-site.

Mabe said that there is now an “On-Line Quality Council” that had its first meeting this fall (it includes a representative from each campus, appointed by provosts, to provide for quality assurance. Professor Jimmy Reeves (UNCW) was appointed as a representative of the Faculty Assembly on which he served last year. What the campuses are doing is amazing. This group wants to put together documentation at the system level. Mabe noted that we need to assure the public that they would be getting the same quality in these classes as they would on the campuses.

Mabe said that GA has been marketing UNC Online. In February they will be moving forward with billboards featuring UNC Online (and teacher education in particular). They’re still working on branding the program. Areas targeted for billboards are more in more rural areas (given cost and need)

The General Assembly has supported on-line campus initiatives. GA used those funds last year to set up the website. A request for proposals (RFP) will go out to campuses shortly allowing them to propose new programs, parts of programs, and licensure offerings to be put on-line. About \$1.5 million will be available for such efforts. GA has noticed in the past that some campuses tried to low-ball faculty payment for course development. They will be particularly attentive that there’s enough funding to support faculty in course development.

Mabe also discussed inter-institutional course enrollment. By August, GA will have set up on-line campus-to-campus enrollment. Every campus will still have its own standards on what courses can be taken. There will be flow of information electronically through registrars’ offices. Everything will be conveyed to the other campuses about key data, financial aid, etc. If a student drops the course, then financial aid will be adjusted. UNCG is the test site for this effort.

Members of the Assembly offered comments.

Cynthia Thompson (NCA&T) asked about access and cost for high school students. Mabe said courses are free for high school students, with reimbursement from the Department of Public Instruction (state covers both tuition and other support). Thompson asked how the structure worked (contract between DPI and individual high schools/colleges). Mabe said that UNCG may continue to be the agent in working with high schools. The Governor got things going in December 2006, and now there’ll be expansion. Jim Sadler will be setting up meeting.

Ken Esbenshade (NCSU) asked whether the on-line registration system will be available for summer school registration. Mabe said that they’re building the system for on-line courses, but are trying to build it with the capacity to manage inter-institutional registration. Once it’s up, campuses can use it as they choose.

Mabe then presented extensive information on K-12 Initiatives, with content included in *the attached set of power point slides* presented to the BOG in January. In addition to the UNC Tomorrow recommendations, there are a host of efforts underway including efforts such as the following: pre-College pipeline programs, general and discipline-specific; Pre-college knowledge and means to get to

college (www.CFNC.org); Early college high schools; Online college courses for high school students (expects in future blurring of high school and college) (taking college courses for free); Alignment of high school and college curriculum; Recruitment of teacher education majors and alternative completers (each campus now has a plan for teacher recruitment); Special focus on high-need areas (math, science, middle grades, special education); Recruitment of principals; Degrees and completions awarded; Degrees in non-teacher education areas (counseling, school nurses, social workers); Continuing support for new teachers and principals; In-service professional development for teachers and principals; Special programs for low-performing schools; Graduate degrees for teachers and principals; Data project with Duke and DPI; Setting targets for production of more teachers in high-need areas; Better preparation of teachers (restructured licensing by state and campuses having to restructure); Work with deans of education to provide better support for beginning teachers in order to improve retention patterns; “Two plus Two” project with community colleges (developed by faculty; courses available for any campus to use, starting with math and moving on to science next); UNC Online; Special project with UNC/Guilford County schools (pay math teachers at a salary that’s competitive, provide mentors, pay for professional development and computers); Grants to encourage science majors to get certified to teach (for first five years of teaching, get added \$5000 per year and international experience); New Schools project: (developing four demonstration high schools; high schools in NC benchmarked to match best practices in the country; four university campuses to be paired with the four schools); Inventory of all math/science initiatives in the state (and linking to inventory by industries); Partner with NCSSM; Center for School Leadership (support and internship with degrees from the campuses); NC Quest (math/science/campus/schools partnerships); NCSIP (special education); Center for Advancement of Teaching; Access (can I really go to college, can I afford to?); Bridges career advising system (through College Foundation of NC); GearUp (enrichment in poor school districts) among others.

GA is considering additional ideas and invites faculty suggestions on such topics as: expanded targets for teacher enrollment; statewide advertising; support for first three years of employment; models for retention (NCSU faculty member Reimer suggests that if local schools don’t do certain things, they won’t be able to retain teachers, but if they work together and tie to campuses they could decrease teacher turnover from 21% to 9%); revision of state teacher-education scholarship loans; circulating an inventory on science and math; on-line programs; pipeline efforts focusing on the middle-school curriculum; collection and dissemination of evidence-based “best practices”; reducing fragmentation and systematizing all K-12; content-mentoring strategies (particularly for math); development of assessment instruments for math (junior level and lower); developing joint plan with community colleges to move more people into teaching; placing all lateral entry courses on-line; work with the State Board of Education to develop a teacher recertification process; expansion of networks focused on middle-school students.

Members of the Assembly commented. Nancy Goldsmith (NCSA) asked that GA remember the arts. The arts they have a bearing on other areas and relate to creativity. There’s a need for creativity in high schools and colleges. Mabe responded that at every listening forum people spoke about the importance of the arts.

Linda Callahan (NCAT) noted the efforts to strengthen teachers’ Spanish language abilities. There is a real need for Spanish teachers for English-speaking students. Her daughter was closed out of Spanish classes in middle school every year. Mabe said that he would welcome some of the campuses to make on-line language teaching their niche. GA will be trying to broker more to encourage campuses to address gaps.

Dennis Daley (NCSU) noted that there’s not a rush by NC communities to raise teacher salaries and retain teachers. How ethical is it for faculty to encourage people to go into teaching? Mabe said that the NC teachers association doesn’t favor what UNC did in Greensboro. We have an obligation to advocate to

others. We can't make it happen, but can show evidence of what works (e.g. in Greensboro). For some middle-school math teaching opportunities in Greensboro, they had 500 applicants. The BOG has gone around on this, but they think that with UNC Tomorrow we have advocacy responsibilities.

Nina Allen (NCSU) asked what we can do as a system to improve the discipline problems in the schools. She's had students who had been teachers come back to NCSU for advanced degrees because they are frustrated with discipline problems. Mabe said that's a tough problem. The way it's coming out is that the education schools are failing because they're not training people to deal with these discipline problems. Allen said it's not just training, but it's dealing with it. Mabe said he hopes faculty members will think about these challenges and push ideas and information forward to those who can make a difference.

Lunch. The Assembly broke for lunch. During lunch the Historically Minority Institutions Committee met, as did the faculty senate chairs.

Committee and Task Force Meetings. The Assembly then dispersed for committee and task force meetings.

Afternoon Plenary Session

Brenda Killingsworth called the meeting to order at 2:30.

Minutes. Ken Wilson (ECU) moved that the minutes of the November meeting be approved subject to remedying typos and other perfecting corrections. John Cope (ECU) seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

Resolution Honoring Sue Carpenter. Judith Wegner (UNCCH), Assembly Secretary, presented the resolution honoring Sue Carpenter on behalf of the Executive Committee. It was passed unanimously. Sue received a standing ovation.

Bylaw Revisions.

Bonnie Yankaskas presented the proposed bylaw revisions on behalf of the Self-Study Task Force. She said that most of this information had been presented at the last meeting. She noted that the self-study task force had prepared and submitted a report that had been distributed to members of the Assembly. She introduced members of the Task Force (Bonnie Yankaskas, Gary Jones, Tim Siegler, Eileen Kohlenberg, Suzanne Weiner) and expressed appreciation for their work. The Assembly then discussed each of the proposed sections.

Section II: Members of the Assembly. Judith Wegner asked which campuses had currently been using only 1 year terms. Yogi Kakad said UNCC did and Judith asked about NCCU. She asked campus delegates to check on the status of their campus terms and determine whether they would change their terms. The section passed unanimously.

Section III. Officers. Yankaskas explained the changes in the terms for the chair and vice chair positions and noted that a new position (vice chair for communications) had been added. Richard Beam (WCU) asked about the term of the chair-elect and chair. Yankaskas said that once elected as Assembly Chair the individual is no longer regarded as a campus delegate (and the campus can elect someone to fill the new chair's original seat). Yankaskas said that this year the Assembly will elect a chair for a two-year term and a year from now will elect a chair-elect to serve for one year as chair-elect before moving automatically into a two-year term as chair. Pete Andrews (UNCCH) asked about the role of vice chair.

Yankaskas said the vice chair could run for chair-elect. Andrews asked whether it be difficult for the vice chair to serve if on a two-year term? Killingsworth said that currently the system has worked to allow vice chairs to go back and get re-elected. Yogi Kakad (UNCC, Parliamentarian) noted that section II.C deals with the chair, not the vice-chair. Yankaskas said that the chair-elect is not a voting member on the Executive Committee and is not assigned formal duties. The section passed unanimously.

Section IV. Agenda Committee. Yankaskas noted that the proposal adds an additional position to the Faculty Assembly Executive Committee (the position would be elected by committee chairs so that they would have a voice on the agenda committee, and would be selected by them in the fall). It also adds the vice chair for communication to the agenda committee. The section passed unanimously.

Section V. Meetings. Yankaskas said that meetings would be at GA unless a reason not to. There is also provision for an orientation meeting. There is also a reference to meetings of senate chairs. The provision passed unanimously.

Section VI: No changes were proposed so no action was taken.

Section VII: Elections. This section was voted on and approved at the November 2008 meeting.

Section VIII: Executive Committee. Yankaskas explained that there would be elections to the Executive Committee based on sizes of campus delegations. Judith Wegner (UNCCCH) asked whether there would be two members of the EC elected at large (as had been included in the proposal presented in November) She said she thought it would be desirable to have two additional members elected at large in order to assure a broad range of views and good attendance. After a review of the prior version, Yankaskas said that part (b) of this section should state that the Executive Committee is to be composed of six elected members: one member from each of the categories of campuses (for a total of four), and two at large from the entire assembly (one of whom will be from an HMI if not otherwise elected from the campus clusters). Eileen Kohlenberg (a member of the self-study task force) said that chairs of committees could also attend EC meetings if they chose. Steve Bachenheimer (UNC-CH) said that the text might be revised to say that "Each of the four will be elected annually by their own group of campus delegates, before the last meeting of the academic year." He said that would allow dropping the balance of section E. Section C then becomes D. Richard Beam said section G refers to a duty of an officer and might better belong in section IXA. Yankaskas said that this section has been there before and makes sense as related to the EC operation. As edited, the section passed unanimously.

Section IX: Duties of Officers. Yankaskas said that duties were more fully described than in the existing bylaws. She said that the VC for Communications would feed content into the website. In addition there would be a newsletter that would go to the campuses. This section was passed unanimously.

Section X: Nominating Committee. Yankaskas said that the nomination committee will be elected at the first spring meeting. This section passed unanimously.

Section XI. Standing Committees. Yankaskas explained that the committees were reorganized and sorted into "academic committees" and "support committees." Faculty development and welfare were combined into one committee. A research committee was added. This section passed unanimously.

Section XII. Task Forces. Yankaskas explained that this section had been added to reflect current practices. Nancy Goldsmith (NCSA) asked whether there was a process for turning task forces into committees (such as sustainability). Yankaskas said that it's not in the bylaws but the bylaws could be amended. Yankaskas said that there should also be a way to drop committees or combine them. The vice chair's job will include evaluating committees, a new function. The section was passed unanimously.

Section XIII. Operations. Yankaskas explained that the chair will appoint a parliamentarian (from the delegates or from prior delegates). The section passed unanimously.

Section XIV. Reports. Yankaskas said that the self-study task force had not concentrated on how technology should be addressed. Pete Andrews (UNCCH) suggested removing the word “standard” from the next to last line in part A. Yankaskas accepted this suggestion as a friendly amendment. She also noted that the Assembly’s secretary will be expected to prepare a final report at the end of the year. This section was passed unanimously.

Sections XV and XVI (attendance and amendments). No changes were proposed to these sections.

Yankaskas suggested that everyone read the task force’s report to see how implementation would work. She also suggested that the Executive Committee review the situation in a year to see how the changes were working.

Nominating Committee. Chair Killingsworth said she’d been talking with people about serving on the nominating committee. She has asked people from a variety of types of campuses to consider service. She will charge the committee to come up with two or more names for each position. The Assembly represents more than 12,000 faculty members. The chair position involves a considerable time commitment, since the chair attends meetings of chief academic officers and the BOG, meets with Harold Martin and Erskine Bowles, and participates in various campus functions. Most organizations develop leadership quality statements, and she’s going to ask the nominating committee to develop such a statement (so it will be doing a little more than nominating people). She’ll also ask the Assembly to approve these qualities. The nominating committee will then identify two or more people for each position. The following people were nominated to serve on the nominating committee: Eileen Kohlenberg (UNCG), Linda Wilson-Jones (FSU), Meg Morgan (UNCC), Steve Bachenheimer (UNCH), Nina Allen (NCSSU), Mark Taggart (ECU), Tim Seigler (NCCU). Ken Wilson (ECU) moved to suspend the rules and allow seven members to serve on the nominating committee rather than the five provided for in the bylaws. A two-thirds vote was required to suspend the rules and the motion passed unanimously. The seven members proposed for service on the nominating committee were then unanimously elected.

UNC Tomorrow.

Judith Wegner (UNC-CH), chair of the Assembly’s UNC Tomorrow Task Force invited discussion about the processes underway for campus discussions. She described the UNC-CH model and said that she would distribute related information to all delegates. Pete Andrews (UNC-CH) said that the current approach seems to reflect a top-down process, and there’s need for a bottom-up process. Andrews said that there are three levels to be considered: individual campuses, how campuses learn from each other (sharing of best practices); some kinds of things that the system level there is need for leveraging system-wide procedures, and so forth. He heard this morning that procedures are being set by GA now. He wonders how faculty will have input into priority setting here.

A resolution was proposed on by Martha Marking (ASU), Gary Jones (WCU) and Jim Martin (NCSSU) based on the discussion of UNC Tomorrow by faculty senate chairs at lunch. Jim Martin explained that the resolution calls on chancellors to provide explicit information regarding faculty involvement, asks that deadlines be appropriate, feedback procedures be established, and a system wide forum to be held involving chancellors, faculty, and faculty senate representatives to talk about a system-based response. The resolution suggests focused discussion of key questions listed.

Pete Andrews (UNC-CH) noted that what seems to be missing is any kind of parallel process relating to what will happen at the system level. Wegner commented that much about the proposed process appears to be in flux. Kathy Crowe (UNCG) noted that in the chairs meeting it appeared dates for campuses responses were still up in the air. Killingsworth said that she understood that campus submissions were to be submitted would be in time to get into the BOG May meeting.

Jim Martin (NCSU) said that it was problematic to request “a response” rather than continuing work over 5-10 years. Killingsworth said GA is aware of that need and is also considering the longer term. Killingsworth said the Assembly got on the mark before the Chancellors. Steve Bachenheimer (UNCCH) said he’d like to get comments on the last paragraph listing items to which campuses should respond. He wondered who will be driving the discussion on the campuses. Killingsworth said that there will be campus-based response teams. Jim Martin agreed to that as a friendly amendment. Richard Beam (WCU) said that in the second resolving clause should be modified for clarity to read “a representative group of faculty senators and faculty assembly delegates from each campus” meet to discuss.” The resolution passed as modified, unanimously.

Wegner gave an additional update regarding the discussions of the Assembly’s UNC Tomorrow Task Force, focusing in particular on K-12 issues. Dan Teague (NCSMS) said NCSMS is working on plans and will be working to develop proposals that could be shared in terms of systematic approaches. They’re very interested in that.

Wegner also reported on discussions about GA’s approach to faculty engagement, incentives and rewards. Jim Martin (NCSU) said that despite an effort to redefine “six realms” for tenure at NCSU, it’s not real on the ground. It’s still back to research, teaching, and service (last and least). There’s nothing to keep a department from ignoring it. The question is how key criteria are actually treated as a matter of application. Faculty generally most things to be handled at the department level, but there may be times when departments are not paying attention to the bigger idea. Do we live out our beautiful policies?

Richard Beam (WCU) said WCU has been going through adopting the Boyer model. He thinks we need a cultural shift. Ken Wilson (ECU) said there’s need to hold the chancellors accountable for action on these issues as part of their evaluations. Beam said that the UNC Tomorrow report assumes that there will be changes in policies. Perhaps we need to pass a resolution on this point. Subash Shah (WSSU) said that administrators need to be reoriented too. Unless they are reoriented, they will carry out decisions based on their habits and what they’re used to. It’s not enough to just order people.

Chair’s Report. Brenda Killingsworth handed out some data on enrollment projections and suggested that delegates review this information (on-line with the BOG’s pre-meeting materials for January 2008 at www.northcarolina.edu). She also distributed print copies of the UNC Tomorrow report. She noted that she had met with Vice President Harold Martin some time ago to ask him to authorize support for chair of the Assembly and this year for vice chair (but not secretary or vice chair for communications). Candidates for these positions should know that it will probably campuses (not GA) who will be asked to provide such support. She as chair gets ½ teaching relief (so is teaching one course on line). She got 16+% of her salary at the start of her first summer, and in second summer when she overlapped first and second years, she got 33% (two summer sessions). At the end of her term, she’ll get one summer stipend. Then she’ll get a semester sabbatical (she’s asked for half time fall and half time spring). This year the vice chair got a quarter reassigned time (one course off); and one summer session stipend (but not at ECU level). She has a pledge from Harold Martin that he will speak with chancellors about providing support for new top officers.

Committee reports

Budget: Chair Sandie Gravett (ASU) said that the budget 101 website should be up and accessible by April (it will provide information for faculty on the UNC system's budgetary process). Chancellors are putting together preliminary budget priorities now, such as salaries, graduate students, temporary dollars to recurring money and so forth. There is also information on capital projects (to focus on things that had received planning money previously). She noted as to tuition levels that six campuses didn't raise tuition, several could not (they were capped this year); while others raised tuition by less than 3%. All this information will be on the web next week.

Benefits and welfare. Chair Dennis Dailey (NCSU) presented a resolution, as discussed in the morning session. Ken Wilson (ECU) asked the reason for the proposal. Dailey responded that, once there is a comparable system, there would be opportunities for addressing campus needs with more flexibility. The resolution passed unanimously. Wegner asked who needs to get to get copies of the resolution and Dailey said he's advise.

Faculty development. They began to look at the report and will have further thoughts.

Governance. Chair Mark Taggart (ECU) said they were preparing a rough draft of their shared governance handbook and will bring some administrators in.

Programs and Planning Committee said they had no report.

Historically Minority Institutions Committee said they had no report.

Sustainability Task Force. Pete Andrews (UNCCH) said that John Noor met with the task force. It's been a horrible missed opportunity to have used bond money for building without attention to sustainability. Bowles will be seeking (from the legislature) the opportunity to keep funds based on energy savings. Andrews noted that sustainability is important in UNC Tomorrow. He asked for a report from GA at the May meeting of the Assembly regarding LEED certification and related sustainability. Gary Jones (WCU) spoke about the UNCCH sustainability report. NCSU also has a report on this. Ken Wilson (ECU) asked whether there's any linkage between the building proposals that will go into the budget and sustainability requirements. Jones said that he believes that there is no requirement of LEED certification, but rather LEED equivalent certified. Sandie Gravett(ASU) said that these issues are being left to the campuses.

Vice Chair's Comments. Gary Jones (WCU, Vice Chair) advised the delegates that he has asked that some of the orientation material that he presented in September be placed on the Assembly website (under Faculty Assembly meetings). He's planning to add materials relating to engagement, including information on Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's (CFAT) elective classification on community engagement. There was a workshop this week sponsored by GA attended by people from the campuses. (UNCCH and NCSU are already so classified). There may be better than half of the 17 institutions that will go forward with an application to CFAT this spring. Jones said he also plans to reference aspects of UNC Tomorrow that might be of special interest to faculty.

Next Meeting. Chair Killingsworth noted that the next meeting of the Assembly is scheduled for April 4.

Respectfully submitted: Judith Welch Wegner, Faculty Assembly Secretary

Attachments: Resolution Honoring Sue Carpenter; Resolution on UNC Tomorrow; Resolution on HR Task Force; Revised Bylaws\