

# Minutes of the Faculty Assembly

## University of North Carolina 142nd Session of the Faculty Assembly September 28, 2007

### Minutes of the Faculty Assembly September 28, 2007

Present: Brenda Killingsworth (ECU); Gary Jones (WCU); Judith Wegner (UNC-CH); Chip Arnold (ASU); Sandie Gravett (ASU); Martha Marking (ASU); Susan Staub (ASU); Catherine Rigsby (ECU); Mark Taggart (ECU); Ken Wilson (ECU); S.D. Stith (ECSU); Blanche Radford-Curry (FSU); John Mattox (FSU); Linda Wilson-Jones (FSU); Linda Florence Callahan (NCA&T); Derrek Dunn (NCA&T); Cynthia C. Thompson (NCA&T); Laura Onafowora (NCCU); Timothy Seigler *arrived after 12 noon* (NCCU); George Wilson (NCCU); Jamie Lathan (NCSSM); Dan Teague (NCSSM); Nina Allen (NCSU); Kenneth Esbenshade (NCSU); Janet Hudson (NCSU); Kerry Havner (NCSU); Suzanne Weiner (NCSU); Jim Martin (NCSU); Gwen Ashburn (UNCA); Gary Nallan (UNCA); Richard (Pete) Andrews (UNC-CH); Steven Bachenheimer (UNC-CH); Joe Templeton (UNC-CH); Bonnie Yankaskas (UNC-CH); Rosemary Booth (UNCC); Sonya Hardin (UNCC); Sallie Ives (UNCC); Meg Morgan (UNCC); Gregory Starrett (UNCC); Kenneth Allan (UNCG); Paul Duvall (UNCG); Eileen Kohlenberg (UNCG); Ellen Jones (UNCG); Jeffery Geller (UNCP); Chet Jordan (UNCP); David Zeigler (UNCP); Tammy Hunt (UNCW); Raymond Burt (UNCW); Kathleen Roney (UNCW); Richard Beam (WCU); Sharon Jacques (WCU); Rita Edwards (WSSU); George Heilman (WSSU); Subash Shah (WSSU)

#### I. Orientation

A. *Welcome.* Chair Brenda Killingsworth welcomed the delegates.

B. *Orientation:* Vice Chair Gary Jones presented the orientation materials provided on the Faculty Assembly website. Coverage included an explanation of the University system (its breadth, campus locations, and mission); the Board of Governors (its membership, meeting materials, UNC Policy Manual); UNC Tomorrow (BOG attempt to identify state's and public needs in the years ahead; including scholars counsel, briefing materials, meeting materials, trend reports). He also provided an overview of UNC General Administration (with emphasis on academic affairs division and its role). He also referenced the President's Advisory Committee on Efficiency and Effectiveness (PACE), an effort to increase efficiency in order to reallocate available funds to the academic mission. Jones also provided a set of links on UNC resources and statistical sources (including UNC institutional profiles; statistical abstract; freshmen measures; persistence, retention and graduation rates; enrollment; institutional research; minimum course requirements and financial information). He then provided information on the Faculty Assembly itself (main home page, Blackboard site, committees, governance links to campuses, charter). Finally, he provided a brief overview of other higher education organizations, links to national data and institutional research information, and links to information on a number of contemporary issues (assessment, civic engagement, economic development, sustainability). Links to related information are available at [http://paws.wcu.edu/gjones/unc\\_faculty\\_assembly\\_orientation.htm](http://paws.wcu.edu/gjones/unc_faculty_assembly_orientation.htm)

C. *Questions:* A delegate asked about the Blackboard site (<http://blackboard.unc.edu>). Faculty Assembly Secretary Judith Wegner explained that she will send out information on access and asked that anyone who would like enhanced privileges to contribute additional materials (or anyone who has faculty on their campuses who would like access) should let her know ([judith\\_wegner@unc.edu](mailto:judith_wegner@unc.edu)).

#### II. First Plenary Session

A. *Call to Order.* Chair Brenda Killingsworth called the session to order at 10:00. She said that Professor Yogi Kakad would serve as parliamentarian but he is absent today (Richard Beam from WCU agreed to step in and cover those responsibilities for this meeting). Kakad can be reached at [kakad@uncc.edu](mailto:kakad@uncc.edu)

B. *Minutes.* The minutes of the May 2007 Faculty Assembly meeting were unanimously approved.

C. *Committee and Task Force Assignments.* Chair Killingsworth noted that committee assignments were specified in a handout available on the table in the back, reflecting delegate preferences. She said that we were starting a new tradition of making announcements from the campuses (materials are in the folders). She said that the Assembly will more carefully track resolutions and follow them up until related matters are

brought to fruition.

D. *Focal Areas.* Chair Killingsworth noted the focal areas for the year.

1. *Shared Governance.* She proposed that, working with VP Harold Martin, the FA would develop a three year plan for implementing “best practices” for shared governance (recognizing that every campus would not proceed in the same way). She said that there would also be a three year review cycle. The first area of focus will be review of administrators, which was a major issue last year. She reported that based on comments from the FA task force on administrator review, VP Harold Martin and Jim Sadler (at GA) did a good deal of work on this topic. There are materials in the back with the survey sent out to the campuses, materials on administrative review on the campuses, and a summary across the campuses. We don’t have a separate administrative review task force this year, and this matter will be handled by the FA governance committee this year. She emphasized that VP Martin had been working hard on this topic with the chief academic officers from the campuses (CAOs). Relevant materials are included in an Appendix.

2. *Committee Work and Goals.* Killingsworth also stressed that it was important for committees to set up goals and due dates that can then be shared with CAOs, and tied in with BOG committees, etc. She emphasized that the committees and committee chairs needed to get their goals for the year down on paper.

3. *Work with GA.* Killingsworth said that we continue to try to work effectively with GA (Martin and Bowles). More materials are being sent to her. She recently attended the chief academic officers (CAOs) meeting, and Martin included the administrator review issue and other resolutions passed last spring on the agenda. The delegates need to be clear in communicating to her about what information is needed. She said to let her know so that she can share these questions and comments with GA and others. She can be reached at killingsworthb@ecu.edu

## E. University Code Revision Proposals

1. *Background.* FA Secretary Judith Wegner introduced the subject of recent proposals by GA and the “603/604 Code Committee” chaired by Provost Nielson of NCSU. She explained that she and chair Killingsworth had met with Nielsen in July and that Nielsen met with the FA Executive Committee in August. On behalf of the FAEC she had drafted the proposed resolution and revised text that the FAEC believed more appropriately addressed matters of concern to the Code 603/604 Committee in ways that better addressed faculty concerns. She emphasized that the delegates were being asked to consider a resolution that called for submission of proposed FA Executive Committee (FAEC) language for comment as preferable to the recommendations of the Code 603/604 Committee recommendations, in order to constructively address issues raised by the Code 603/604 Committee in a timely way. Wegner then introduced Provost Nielsen and asked him to provide background on the objectives of the Code 603/604 Code Committee.

2. *Comments by NCSU Provost Nielsen (chair of Code 603/604 Committee).* Nielsen said that he had been asked by VP Martin to attend the FA meeting, and introduced Charles Waldrup (attorney with GA’s legal counsel’s office) who had assisted the Code 603/604 Committee in its work. He said that he appreciated the work of the FAEC and agreed with many of the recommendations, saying that in many respects the FAEC’s recommendations were cleaner and preferable to the Code 603/604 Committee’s proposals.

3. *Review of Code 603/604 Committee Recommendations.* Nielsen reviewed key aspects of the Code 603/604 Committee’s recommendations:

a. *Streamlining the process.* The Committee attempted to streamline the process of discharge by requiring that the initial notice of proposed discharge provide the grounds for discharge or sanction; establishing time constraints on how long the faculty hearings committee would have to consider appeals; and eliminating the Boards of Trustees from the process by providing an appeal directly to the Board of Governors (with the effect of reducing the time for appeal by 71 days).

b. *Evidentiary standard.* Nielsen explained that GA attorneys believed that the appropriate evidentiary is “preponderance of the evidence” for discharge, based on legal standards used in taking away licenses of doctors and lawyers by professional review boards. The FAEC disagrees and believes that the “clear and convincing evidence” standard is more appropriate. This is a continuing area of disagreement.

c. *Grounds for discharge.* Nielsen said that his committee had recommended a fourth basis for discharge (incompetence, neglect of duty, misconduct and “unsatisfactory performance”).

d. *Post-tenure review.* Nielsen explained that in his view it was important to link post-tenure review explicitly to grounds for discharge. He also believed that there were benefits in allowing administrator review rather than peer review. He noted that he agreed with a proposal from the provost at WCU that

would allow faculty post-tenure review committees to determine whether administrative review was appropriate in a particular instance if requested by an individual faculty member

e. "Special Faculty." Nielsen acknowledged that the original proposal had been to allow special faculty to be appointed "at will" (subject to dismissal by administrators without regard to a particular contractual term). He said that he was ready to withdraw that recommendation and instead provide for special faculty to be appointed only for fixed terms.

4. *Discussion.* The delegates engaged in a wide-ranging discussion of the Code 603/604 Committee proposals.

a. Subash Shah (WSSU) observed that he was reluctant to leave questions of performance or evidentiary standards to administrators on campuses that had historically had weak shared governance traditions.

b. Tammy Hunt (UNCW) said that she believed that post-tenure review responsibilities should stay with the faculty, since too many faculty powers were being removed and faculty had better insight on faculty performance standards.

c. Rosemary Booth (UNCC) said she was concerned that the Nielsen draft had referenced discharge on grounds "including but not limited to" performance on post-tenure review. She emphasized the open-ended ambiguity of this standard and also stressed the problems with a standard that required faculty members to improve performance in less than one year.

d. Jim Martin (NCSU faculty chair) said that NCSU faculty are strongly opposed to the proposal by NCSU provost Nielsen and the Code 603/604 Committee. Post tenure review (PTR) should be a faculty development tool. It should not be associated with post-tenure review. The AAUP agrees with this viewpoint, and the separation of faculty development and sanctions were clearly drawn when post-tenure review was initially introduced. Moreover, PTR does not end, it is continuous, and it should be focused on faculty development. Martin referenced a faculty task force at NC State which addresses many of these concerns.

e. Meg Morgan (UNCC) questioned Nielsen's use of the phrase "stop performing" in terms of faculty work and "neglect of duty." She offered an anecdote regarding the purported "unsatisfactory performance" of a colleague in her school about five years ago. She explained that, after careful comparative review and a survey of former students, a faculty member who had been rated as "satisfactory" had performed less well than someone rated as "unsatisfactory." She said she believed this example demonstrated that, at times, administrators ranked faculty members as "unsatisfactory" based on personality conflict and favoritism.

f. Provost Nielsen said that he wondered whether anyone in attendance would support the proposition that there was never a time when a faculty member might be beyond "resuscitation" for weak performance and should therefore be dismissed. DeLacy Stith (ECSU) took issue with this formulation, saying that the question should instead be about faculty development.

g. Steve Bachenheimer (UNCCH) supported Jim Martin's point. Bachenheimer said that it was important to separate PTR from sanctions. PTR should be developmental, and should not be linked to discharge. Any discharge process should not involve co-opting faculty through their work on PTR committees and should place the burden of proof on the administration.

h. Nina Allen (NCSU) said she was concerned about introducing a timeline for faculty hearing committees. She had been a chair of such committees and was concerned that extensions of committee time lines should be vested in faculty committee chairs rather than chancellors.

i. Catherine Rigsby (ECU) said that it was important not to co-opt the PTR process. She believes that there is an adequate process for reviewing proposed faculty dismissals and that there is no need to link that to the PTR process.

j. Kerry Havner (NCSU) said that in his experience NCSU had let quality people go from the department of civil engineering, based on concerns about personality conflicts. Provost Nielsen observed, as a point of personal privilege, that personnel actions were confidential, the full picture was not available in situations such as these, and decisions should not be made by anecdotal reference.

k. Subash Shah (WSSU) said that he was concerned that Nielsen and others might be using a broad brush to generalize about all faculty members and their performance, and that such an approach was inappropriate.

l. Sharon Jacques (WCU) observed that there was a problem in assuming that a university-wide

committee was as familiar with faculty performance as faculty in a particular unit.

m. Raymond Burt (UNCW) pointed out that GA tracks the discrepancies across campuses regarding numbers of faculty deemed "unsatisfactory." It is thus not beyond imagining that GA might expect each campus to have a certain common percentage of 'unsatisfactory' findings, and this might lead to a 'quota.' If PTR is now listed as a reason for dismissal, an expectation that campuses find a certain percentage of faculty as "unsatisfactory" is a danger to the tenure system.

5. *Faculty Executive Committee Resolution and Proposed Alternative Text.* Judith Wegner (UNCCH) then reviewed the terms of the FAEC's proposed resolution and preferred University Code text revisions. She then entertained questions and comments.

a. Nancy Goldsmith (NCSA) asked about the distinctions between special faculty members appointed "at will" and those appointed for "fixed terms." Wegner explained that those appointed at will could be discharged for any reason and at any time, and that is why the FAEC had objected to the Nielsen committee proposal to introduce appointments "at will" for special faculty members.

b. Ken Wilson (ECU) asked about the difference between the "clear and convincing" and "preponderance of the evidence standards." Provost Nielsen had said that he and his committee believed that the same standard (less rigorous showing of "preponderance of the evidence," that is, more than 50/50) should be used for discharge of faculty as would be used for disciplinary sanctions by regulatory boards overseeing doctors and lawyers. Wegner said that, whatever the practice for licensing committees overseeing lawyers and doctors, academic freedom and tenure required a high level of evidence before discharging faculty members.

c. Jim Martin (NCSU) questioned why the FAEC resolution did not address proposed revisions in post-tenure review. Wegner said that the FAEC had removed all direct references to discharge or sanction based on post-tenure review findings from its proposed language and instead incorporated a standard that referenced sustained failure to perform duties and sustained incompetence in performance after having been given a reasonable opportunity to improve. In that way, the FAEC believed that the link to post-tenure review had been separated, but the concerns of the Code 603/604 Committee and others (relating to long-standing problematic performance) had been met. She also stressed that the FAEC text addressed such issues as significant research misconduct and mistreatment of students, which had not been expressly addressed by the Code 603/604 Committee's vague language. She also said that VP Harold Martin had clearly advised that "post-tenure review revisions" were not within the charge of the Code 603/604 Committee and were "off the table" in light of the work done by the FA and proposals to the BOG made last June. Wegner asked Harold Martin to confirm that post-tenure review revisions were indeed "off the table" and Harold Martin agreed.

d. Pete Andrews (UNCCH) asked about language related to sanctions including suspension and reduction in rank. Wegner responded that the language in the FAEC's recommendations was intended to indicate that suspension and reduction in rank should be subject to the same criteria as discharge, and should be available as lesser sanctions in instances in which discharge was not warranted.

e. Sandie Gravett (ASU) said that she believed that the "clear and convincing evidence" standards was appropriate and that the "preponderance of the evidence" standard should be rejected. Steve Bachenheimer (UNCCH) agreed.

f. Jim Martin (NCSU) asked whether the proposed text for the last paragraph of Code section 603 opened the door to ready sanction of faculty. Wegner responded that this language was designed to emphasize that lesser sanctions (suspension or demotion) should be considered in other than the gravest cases. This may be a point that delegates wish to consider further in connection with further campus review of the proposed resolution.

6. *Adoption of FAEC Resolution.* The FA then unanimously agreed to the Resolution on Proposed Challenges in University Code" as proposed by the FAEC, subject to minor editorial revisions.

7. *Appreciation.* VP Harold Martin thanked Larry Nielsen and Charles Waldrup. Martin said he thought that the Code 603/604 Committee was a strong and quality committee. He said the process won't be rushed and he will tell President Bowles that there was need to take the requisite time. Work needs to be done on the campuses. There has been great debate on these policies in the FA and feedback should be directed to the FA. The matter should be brought to closure one way or the other, and delegates should take their roles on the campuses seriously in soliciting viewpoints. He also thanked Judith Wegner, Brenda Killingsworth and the FAEC for their work on this difficult issue.

8. *Next Steps.* Brenda Killingsworth confirmed that this matter would be on the agenda for the November FA

meeting and reiterated that the BOG should be asked to defer action until the FA had addressed this matter once again. Subash Shah asked for a "word" version of relevant documents and Judith Wegner said she would provide this and more materials to the Faculty Senates on the campuses as soon as possible.

## F. Report by Vice President Harold Martin

1. *UNC Tomorrow study and processes to move ahead.* Martin said that the UNC Tomorrow effort continues to raise substantive issues. President Bowles will comment on some of the emerging recommendations from listening forums later in the meeting. In Martin's view, there are a number of key issues:

*Student Enrollment Growth.* How do we deal with the expected additional 80,000 students expected to require college education in the next decade? How we deal with this issue will impact facilities, admissions, partnerships with community colleges and more. The campuses don't have facilities, abilities and maybe the desire to grow to accommodate 80,000 additional students. These developments will also change engagement on the campuses. GA will soon begin an enrollment planning process and hopes to accommodate most of the students on the campuses, in on-line offerings, and perhaps at additional campuses or branch campuses.

*Diversity.* These students will be among the most diverse ever. We therefore need to think about diversity of faculty, administrators, BOTs on the campuses. We need to support the students.

*Degree and Program Approvals.* We have in the past created new degree programs on the campuses, but the BOG and GA have suspended existing processes until after the UNC Tomorrow study is done. They know that there are campuses which have been traditionally been focused on undergraduates, but which now want masters and doctoral programs in key areas. Traditionally, that's been regarded as a change in mission and the BOG was required to approve such proposals. After the UNC Tomorrow study, there may be a change in how new programs are addressed (not necessarily with BOG), so are thinking that through now.

*Needs of the State.* There's also a growing focus by the BOG on identifying new ways to address the needs of NC in the next years. We need to create a conversation around the notion of an "engaged university." We need to bring more clarity to the meaning of "engagement" and "need driven" universities. Chancellors, chief academic officers, and faculty haven't really worked through these issues. WCU has been working on this matter, and have proposed changes in their promotion and tenure policies so that they can recognize activities of faculty that are "extension-like."  
<http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2007/10/02/wcu> Is the BOG going to expect all campuses to work on such changes on their promotion and tenure policies in order to recognize faculty engagement and reward for activities off the campuses? We want the FA to begin thinking about this as well. We don't want the UNC Tomorrow study to conclude that we need to focus on applied rather than basic research. We want to get ahead of this conversation before the end of the UNC Tomorrow study (which will be finished in December, with the BOG responding to recommendations in January). As they have sessions here, he will talk with FA Executive Committee so there is no hidden agenda or loss of communications.

*Other.* This is some of whqt they've heard from listening forums. There are business leaders who want a system campus in Hickory. They're getting a lot of pressure and are trying to do the right thing.

### Comments and Questions from Delegates

a. Steve Bachenheimer (UNCCH): In your comments about increasing by 80k students in the next decade, you laid out options (more satellite campuses, on-line teaching, etc.). All these models require new faculty. At the margin, it may be possible to increase workloads, but it really comes down to new faculty. What is your general thinking about that? What guidance will be given regarding the kind of faculty who will be brought in? Will there be mandates by GA regarding percentages of faculty who are fixed term v. tenure-track? Or is it the responsibility of the individual campuses? Martin responded that enrollment growth will drive number of new faculty positions. GA has not yet given thought to how the campuses would use these positions, but perhaps there is need to consider that matter. Martin said he would suggest that if there is an effort to accommodate part of the expected growth on the campuses, then that drives conversation toward more tenure-track faculty. If there are branch campuses that teach the first-two years in a region, then those faculty members at a branch campus might not be tenure-track and they would probably not be funded to do research. Bachenheimer noted that it might then be appropriate to have more well-developed partnerships with community colleges.

b. Jim Martin (NCSU). Jim Martin said that, with the funding formula as we have it, there's inadequate funding for new hires (e.g. set-up costs, especially in the sciences; and start-up for junior faculty whose expectations may differ from those who will be retiring). Will there be changes in the funding formula? Harold Martin responded that legislators think the existing funding formula is rich. It's

probably not the place to fund start-up costs (and the legislature has not supported allocations for start-up funds). This legislative session has yielded some support for graduate students and a new competitiveness fund, however. Jim Martin commented further that there's still a challenge when it is necessary to compete for funds given the tight time frames for actually completing the pertinent research. Moreover, competing for research funds is different from providing core resources for being a faculty member. Harold Martin said that he appreciated the point. GA is trying to identify the best strategies for including such topics in budgetary requests (for example to create funds for start-ups). They'll be starting on the budget in the next month and would welcome suggestions to GA senior staff and BOG. They will try to make a case for it in the budget.

c. Nina Allen (NCSU): Allen asked how many of the 80,000 additional students will be graduate students, explaining the need for graduate students as partners in teaching. Martin said that there would be some modest increase in graduate students. Allen noted that if it will be necessary to find more faculty to teach the larger number of students, it will be necessary to educate more graduate students to become future faculty. Martin noted that with upcoming faculty retirements that was on people's minds.

d. Greg Starrett (UNCC): Starrett said he'd like an update on the use of the Collegiate Learning Assessment, including GA oversight and use of best practices. Martin said that Alan Mabe (of GA) was preparing a document for discussion later today, and he agreed that he would be available this afternoon. [Note: no materials were provided and this matter was not discussed in the afternoon session.

e. Kenneth Allan (UNCG): Allan commented that he's on the dean's diversity task force on his campus. He asked whether there been any discussion about the meaning of "diversity"? Martin said that there is information on the ethnic and gender diversity of students and faculty. Campuses are being asked about what they're doing to increase diversity of faculty, administrators, and membership on Boards of Trustees. Allan asked again whether there will be a discussion about the meaning of diversity, and Martin said that there will be need to continue that that discussion.

f. Sharon Jacques (WCU) reminded the group about court mandates relating to racial diversity from the 1970's.

2. *Accountability Matrix and Admissions Requirements.* Martin commented on GA's ongoing effort to review the success of students who have been admitted to the campuses, and whether they've been admitted meeting minimum course requirements. An additional year of high school math was required for those entering beginning in 2006, and there are still some students who don't enter with that background (current policy allows these students to be advised of the requirements and they must meet the requirements within 12 months of enrollment). Martin noted that there are far too many students who are being admitted with poor reading, writing and math skills, and that the campus Boards of Trustees have the responsibility for enforcing requirements. There is a task group that GA has convened from across the system that will report to the BOG shortly. The task group has a draft report that will set minimum standards at the system level (these standards would govern with regard to any campus that lacks its own minimum standards and set a floor for all). There will be need for sensitivity and careful work with K-12 educators to address student preparedness and enhanced partnerships with community colleges. President Bowles has pledged to the Governor and legislators that the university will work on alignment between community colleges and universities in order to avoid possible legislative intervention (such as Connecticut has done through legislative mandates about treatment of courses).

## **G. Sustainability**

1. *Introduction.* Gary Jones (WCU) suggested that the reason that sustainability is on the agenda is that, looking 20 years ahead, there are issues regarding water resources, waste management, energy conservation and other matters for which we need to be preparing for now. This issue is relevant to faculty because of potential opportunities for faculty research and service - but also because of potential impact on university curriculum in the coming years. There's been some legislation on this topic (e.g., S668 passed this legislative session), and there's likely to be more. There are upcoming conferences and events relating to the issue of sustainability that faculty might want to be aware of-or perhaps involved with. Jones offered links on sustainability for those who would like additional background: NC Links at [http://paws.wcu.edu/gjones/UNC-Sustainability-NC\\_Links.htm](http://paws.wcu.edu/gjones/UNC-Sustainability-NC_Links.htm) and campus links at <http://paws.wcu.edu/gjones/UNC-Sustainability-Campuses.htm>. Jones then introduced Cindy Shea, Sustainability Director at UNCCH.

2. *Presentation by Cindy Shea.* Shea emphasized that faculty have a key role in educating the next generation of leaders to address sustainability issues. Among other observations, she noted that faculty members have a unique role to educate and empower students on sustainability issues. She urged faculty members to consider creating service-learning projects, capstone courses raising sustainability themes, working with student government and advising student organizations with related interests. She said that at

UNCCH, students led the way in advocating for a student fee used to establish “green” energy practices, and that they are involved in an event (Focus the Nation) that will serve as a national teach-in on January 31, 2008. Lesson plan assistance is also available for faculty. There is also a local campus sustainability day (to be held in October). She urged delegates to consider whether the UNC system might sponsor a statewide conference on sustainability as some other states have done, and suggested that those interested might attend the November 2008 meeting of the Association for Sustainability in Higher Education (to be held in Raleigh). She encouraged delegates to urge their chancellors to sign the College and University Presidents’ Climate Commitment. She noted that state legislation was recently passed to require existing state buildings to become 20% more energy efficient by 2010 and 30% more efficient by 2015, and urged more attention to building design, landscape design, and business practices that save energy and water, reduce materials consumption, and enhance occupants’ health and sense of well-being.

#### **H. Self-Study Task Force Update: Bonnie Yankaskas**

1. *Status Report.* Bonnie Yankaskas (UNCCH) presented on behalf of the FA’s self-study task force that has been reviewing key issues over the past year. Since time was limited, she noted that there will be space provided for commentary on the FA interactive website (<http://blackboard.unc.edu>).
2. *Background.* Yankaskas refreshed the delegates’ recollections about the rationale for the self-study task force (which included a desire of the FA to respond quickly to emerging issues of importance including President Bowles’ requests for timely feedback, the desire of delegates and campus senates for a higher level of engagement and the FA’s desire to make more efficient use of delegates’ time during meetings). The task force reviewed past FA resolutions, looked at other faculty governance organizations practices (officers, duties, terms of office, committees) and discussed a variety of issues including communication, meeting structure and possible use of task forces as a means of fostering discussion. She recognized the members of the task force including Gary Jones (WCU), Susan Weiner (NCSU), Tim Seigler (NCCU), Eileen Kohlenberg (UNCG), and Chair Brenda Killingsworth. Based on the task force’s work today a number of changes have been made including adding task forces, changing meeting schedules, inviting campus senate chairs to hold a standing caucus at FA meetings, increasing the number of meetings each year, and asking delegates to evaluate changes. Early feedback was positive on the use of task forces, although there has been some frustration about too little time allocated to accomplish work of committees and task forces. There’s also a general sense that FA meetings are more engaging and productive. There’s a clear need for timely and effective communication. Feedback from the FA delegate survey this week is also helpful.
3. *Proposed changes.* Yankaskas sketched the key changes likely to be proposed by the task force including changes in the election schedule; changes in officers (adding a new vice chair for communications and electing the chair through as “chair-elect”); changes in the make-up and selection of the FA Executive Committee; changes in committees (and use of liaisons), and use of task forces. These changes are described in greater detail in the power point materials attached as an appendix to these minutes.
4. *Revision of bylaw in order to change election schedule.* Yankaskas asked the delegates to turn their attention most urgently to a proposed change in section VII of the FA bylaws (attached as an appendix to these minutes). She explained that previously the election of officers and committee chairs has taken place at the first spring meeting of the FA (now held in January), and that the proposal would call instead for election on or before May 31 (which is a date after the deadline for receipt of information about campus elections determining delegates to serve in the coming year). She distributed the proposed bylaw revision, noting that 30 days notice in writing is required before a bylaw change. The proposed bylaw revision will be considered at the November FA meeting.
5. *Other changes.* Yankaskas highlighted several other changes that will be discussed in greater detail in subsequent meetings.
  - a. *Officers.* The task force plans to propose the creation of a new officer position (Vice Chair for Communications )with responsibility for communication among delegates, communication between FA and campus faculty, communication between FA and the BOG (along with the chair), oversight and maintenance of the FA website, a FA newsletter, and preparation of an annual FA report. The task force also plans to recommend that the chair be selected as “chair elect” to serve for a one-year term, sit on the executive committee, prepare for service the subsequent year as chair, and foster continuity of leadership.
  - b. *Executive committee.* The task force will recommend that there be four officers (chair, vice chair, secretary and chair elect), six at-large Executive Committee members (elected through a system assuring that different sizes of campuses would be represented, as well as two members selected at large), and HMI representation. The task force hopes that their proposed changes would provide a greater opportunity for more delegates to be in positions of leadership (rather than restricting involvement in the Executive Committee to committee chairs). The Executive Committee’s duties would include reviewing the structure and functions of standing committees and task forces; conducting

ongoing discussions with President to set priorities for issues; advising the chair, among other responsibilities. Ken Wilson (ECU) asked whether any delegate can attend EC meetings if they'd like to, and Yankaskas responded in the affirmative.

Self-study Update (presentation)

### III. Lunch, caucus sessions, and meetings of committees and task forces

The HMI committee and the caucus of faculty senate chairs met during lunch while other delegates engaged in informal discussion. The delegates then broke up for committee and task force meetings, including meetings of the following groups: academic freedom and tenure committee, benefits and welfare committee, budget committee, governance committee, planning and programs committee, technology committee, sustainability/special projects task force, and "engaged university" task force. Committee and task force chairs reported briefly on committee efforts if they believed appropriate, when the Assembly convened for its second plenary session at 2:30 p.m.

### IV. Second Plenary Session

A. *Committee and Task Force Reports:* The following committee and task force reports were presented during the session.

1. *Academic Freedom and Tenure.* Mark Taggart (committee chair, ECU) reported that the committee would focus on the issue of administrator reviews. VP Harold Martin had reported earlier that information had been collected through the chief academic officers on the campuses as to the processes of administrator review. (Materials provided are included as appendix to these minutes). The committee would like to hear from faculty members about their level of participation and would be requested related information from faculty senate presidents in hopes of developing best practices. He hopes that the next steps will include very collaborative discussions with administrators.

2. *Benefits and Welfare.* Steve Bachenheimer (UNCCH), substituting for committee chair Dennis Daley who was absent) reported that the committee initially reviewed three resolutions that had been passed by the Faculty Assembly over last year.

(1) University Insurance Committees. Every campus is mandated by state law to have a university insurance committee. At the request of the FA, GA conducted a survey of the campuses and learned that in many instances such committees are nonexistent or have not met in recent years. GA has spoken with the chief academic officers about the need to have such committees and will follow up to determine that they have done so in the next year or so.

(2) Benefits for Domestic Partners (after tax benefits). GA has urged campuses to make such benefits available. Related background information on current practices was collected and is included in an appendix to this report.

(3) Health Benefits for Domestic Partners. Work on this issue is ongoing. VP Martin gave a preliminary report in the morning FA session concerning possible changes in regulations of the Office of State Personnel to prohibit discrimination based on age or sexual orientation (this matter is still pending with OSP). The committee will continue to monitor this situation.

Bachenheimer also reported on changes in phased retirement policies that have resulted from federal and state law. Beginning in the 2008-2009 academic year phased retirement may be available to those under the state retirement plan (TESRS) at age 62 and under the optional retirement plan (ORP) at 59-1/2 (provided that there has been a minimum of five years of service). The changes from the prior system that did not reference these age cut-offs were made to ensure that the UNC system is in compliance with federal law. Additional information on phased retirement is available at <http://www.northcarolina.edu/content.php/hr/benefits/retirement/phased/phased.htm>

Bachenheimer also provided updates on several other issues. With regard to health insurance, the traditional indemnity plan has been phased out in favor of a PPO (preferred physician system), but changes are likely to be imperceptible since the physician network being used is a very extensive one. Some options have changed with the optional retirement plan. Information on legislative changes in the health benefits available to faculty is available at <http://www.northcarolina.edu/content.php/hr/benefits/UnivWideBenefits.htm>

The committee's goals this year will be (a) to examine the state of day care on all campuses and put together an action plan; and (b) review the optional retirement plan since in key respects it appears

relatively uncompetitive (increasingly, faculty opt for the ORP rather than TESRS; compared to peer institutions the ratio of employee/employer contributions here requires employees to pay slightly more, and vests only after five years compared to higher employer contribution rates and immediate vesting in many other peer universities).

3. *Faculty Development.* Chair Meg Morgan (UNCC) reported on behalf of the committee. They are committed to continuing to work in the period between FA meetings. They will focus this year on post-tenure review to be sure that faculty members know what's happening. They also hope to make recommendations about how better practices on mentoring and tenure can be put in place. In addition they will complete a report for the next meeting regarding collaborative efforts between the university system and the community colleges (relating to the conference on "seamless transitions" co-hosted earlier this summer). They are also interested in the notion of university engagement and the role of faculty development and tenure policies in facilitating engaged work by those faculty members who are so inclined.

4. *Budget.* Chair Sandie Gravett (ASU) reported that they had discussed this year's budget results with VP Rob Nelson (to be summarized later in the meeting). The committee this year hopes to develop a "Budget 101" educational resources for faculty members, including an interactive website that will educate faculty members about budget processes and issues (for example, tuition and fee recommendations will be developed very soon on the campuses and on the budget to be presented to the 2009-2010 long legislative session will be developed during summer 2008). The committee hopes that it will be able to speak with a pro-active voice about faculty needs and possibilities (rather than simply reacting after budget priorities are set).

5. *Engaged University.* Task Force Chair Judith Wegner reported that the task force hopes to develop meaningful opportunities for rank-and-file faculty input into the work of the UNC Tomorrow Commission ([www.nctomorrow.org](http://www.nctomorrow.org)), which is already well along in its work. The task force members anticipate working with interested campus senates to develop "listening" forums geared to faculty members, and would like to create such a forum to elicit FA delegates' thinking at the time of the next FA meeting in November.

6. *Technology.* Sallie Ives, UNCC, is the new committee chair. The committee discussed major issues that campuses are addressing. They hope that this year's TLT Collaborative Conference will hold sessions on key topics and asked delegates to be sure their campus faculty are familiar with this opportunity.

## B. Additional Administrator Reports

### 1. *Vice President for Academic Affairs Harold Martin: Shared Governance.*

*Comments on Shared Governance.* Martin concluded his report (cut short in the morning session due to time constraints). He focused on shared governance. Martin explained that he has had extensive orientation discussions with each of the new chancellors, each of whom this year leads one of the historically minority institutions (HMIs). There will be a second round of orientation in which he will discuss shared governance. Martin indicated that he regarded attention to shared governance as an expectation, not a regulatory mandate. He said that several FA delegates had commented to him that there had been good conversations with new chancellors on their campuses. He invited questions and comments from delegates.

#### Comments and Questions from Delegates

a. Cynthia Thomspson (NCA&T, and HMI committee chair) asked whether there could be a conference on shared governance in the Spring. Martin said that he had had several conversations on this topic last year, but that the FA committees had not resolved how planning was needed in order to get such a project scheduled.

b. Blanche Radford Curry (FSU) asked whether shared governance will become part of the chancellor's evaluations. Martin responded that, in the recruitment of all new chancellors, and that he had taken into account whether candidates had the experience and skill sets needed to be supportive of shared governance. He hopes to develop a template related to this topic to be used as part of the new metric on evaluation/assessment.

2. *President Erskine Bowles.* Chair Killingsworth introduced Bowles and thanked him for opening his home to the delegates for the reception held on the evening of September 27. He said he hoped there

would be other similar opportunities in the future. He reiterated prior statements indicating that faculty are very important and hold the key to the future in their minds.

a. *Budget.* Bowles commented on key elements of the budget, noting at the outset that the economy had been good this year and that the legislature had treated the University system very well. Highlights included:

*September, 2007*

- Full funding for enrollment growth (now included in the continuation budget)
- Full funding for need-based financial aid for NC residents. In the past, students who applied after June didn't get funding since the money had run out. Going forward, there will be enough money and everyone will get it, allowing students in need to be held harmless on tuition and fees increases. The earned scholars program and lottery funds are also important. He stressed that the current financial aid structured was very helpful to students whose families fall below 150% of poverty level, but said that where it's hardest is for those in the middle income bracket (\$50,000-\$100,000). He'll try to keep tuition increases low this year.
- Faculty salaries. Bowles said he was very proud of what happened on faculty salaries. An additional 4% was made available for faculty salaries, plus an additional 1% for moving closer to the goal of 80<sup>th</sup>-ile of peers. As an example, he indicated that UNCCH was much closer to the goal (now on average \$3,000 rather than \$8,000 below the mark). There has really been progress over the past two years.
- Money for pre-admission summer programs. Bowles observed that some schools have been operating on the basis of nearly "open admissions" for all comers, but that in many instances not all students are "ready to learn" at the college level since they have not acquired requisite skills by the time they leave high school. Such students often come in, take remedial courses, and drop out after a year or two with substantial debt. Pilot funding will be made available for one or two campuses to implement rigorous and intensive summer programs perhaps comparable to the one at Coastal Community College (where military personnel gain 2.7 years in 6 weeks, while taking course work focused on reading, communications, and math).
- Money for on-line educational programming. Bowles reported that the system had recently been complemented by the U.S. Navy about on-line educational programs. He understands that there are more than 1000 courses and more than 150 degree programs offered through UNC-On Line. He invited faculty members to come to GA if they have ideas for on-line degree programs and courses. Alan Mabe is the contact point there.
- Graduate student tuition remissions. For the first time since 1986, increased funding was secured for this purpose. It's not enough, but it's a good start and efforts will continue next year.
- Competitive research funding. Funds for this purpose was allocated for the first time.
- Money for new facilities. More than \$1B was allocated.

Bowles stressed how important it had been to have team work among campuses, students, faculty, and administrators, and urged everyone to thank the members of the Legislature for their support. A summary presented to the Board of Governors on legislative developments, including the budget, is attached.

b. *Chancellors' Raises.* Bowles noted that the FA Executive Committee had asked him to respond to concerns from some about the very substantial raises given to many of the chancellors. He said he wouldn't apologize for this, since he thinks he's done the right thing. He's had chancellors offered positions at other places, and couldn't replace them for the salary that he's paying now. He wants to get chancellors to the 80<sup>th</sup>-ile, just as he does faculty.

c. *UNC Tomorrow.*

Bowles commented on the importance of the UNC Tomorrow project. He suggested that the Assembly view a related video at its next meeting, and said he would like to spend time listening to delegates talk about what they see as the state's needs. He went to the campuses to listen and got good input. But he takes to heart the notion that he needs to hear from rank and file faculty. He'd like to check with faculty to hear whether he and the Commission have "got it right." They have a survey and a blog and are getting a lot of input. They also set up scholars' council whose members have gone to Commission meetings and are writing up the reports of what was heard. That will help. He also asked them to keep campuses informed. Chair Killingsworth is also member of the Commission. The Commission has held 6 out of 11 listening sessions in communities around the state and will hold the rest in the next two weeks. Delegates and faculty colleagues throughout the campuses are urged to review the extensive materials available on the UNC Tomorrow website at <http://www.nctomorrow.org> Bowles summarized some of the highpoints that have emerged in the "listening forums" to date:

- Citizens don't necessarily understand "liberal arts," but say that they want the University to

graduate students with good writing, communication, analytical, and similar skills. There is some dissonance about the understanding of the mission of the University. Soft skills and the liberal arts are what people want from graduates. They strongly emphasized the importance of being sure that graduates know how to write. This theme has been voiced at every forum, and have been made with respect to every campus without exception. To a lesser degree, citizens also emphasize the importance of stronger math and science skills.

- Citizens stress the importance of educating and graduating teachers who are prepared in key areas such as math and science, and who ready to deal with environment in the schools.
- Nurses and health care providers are needed.
- There is concern for educating diverse students. A particular concern is the relative dearth of African-American men receiving college educations, and the need to stand up and be sure that the students among the growing Hispanic population receive college educations.
- There's also a desire for campuses to be more available to meet community and regional needs.
- Listening to and hearing concerns are critical steps. Bowles said that he hoped faculty members would put aside their campus hats and offer their insights as citizens.

d. Questions and Comments from Delegates to President Bowles

1. *Domestic Partner Benefits.* Steve Bachenheimer (UNCCH) referenced the FA's resolution of last year about the need for domestic partners benefits. Bowles said his companies have always provided benefits. Vice President Harold Martin indicated that he had asked each campus to reestablish their insurance committees (which is a statutory responsibility) and had asked the Human Resources unit in GA to survey the campuses about their practices. There's no requirement that they provide partner benefits, but GA has asked campuses to adopt best practices as best they can to date. The problem is that campuses differ. UNCCH has committed to "affordable" benefits, but others can't do that. Bachenheimer gave information on the supplemental benefits programs. He asked what the state health plan might do on this front, and inquired whether these issues would be brought to the General Assembly to cover state employees' domestic partners. Martin indicated that the State Personnel Commission recently proposed a policy on non-discrimination as to sexual orientation. That policy was available for comment until the end of September. The Commission will then review hearing testimony and comments and will adopt policy as they judge appropriate. Martin said that he has now asked legal counsel to advise on what can be done if the policy changes.
2. *Competitive Research Fund.* Jim Martin (NCSU chair of faculty) said that he had heard that money for research will be apportioned by competition. However, proposals will be short fused (research work must have impact by March 2008). Bowles said he'd heard about that and thought it was crazy. He has countermanded that approach and will only fund quality initiatives. Jim Martin observed that research is a long-term commitment requiring long-term investment. Bowles observed that he had worked to secure \$50M in continuing money from the legislature for cancer research, so he "gets it." The purpose of this initial competitive research fund was to leverage federal money and address economic transformation. In Bowles' view, it would be better to give the money back than to do something silly.
3. *Educational Emphasis.* Joe Templeton (UNCCH) commented that he had the impression that some of the economic drivers that deserve attention are leading the way about how we think about education. He thinks there's a feeling that GA is favoring the first job training and professional degrees, but not the long-term. Bowles stated that the University "is not a trade school or trying to become the community college system," but said he wants people to leave here with education and skills needed to compete in a knowledge-based economy. Soft skills, writing, communication, math and science, are needed and he will continue to push that. What he will try to do is to be responsive to the marketplace. In his view the University also has a responsibility to have an effect on economic transformation. He's not been talking about professional degrees. Research has shown we have a shortage in social work, accounting, teachers, nurses, and health care professionals and we have responsibility there. He wants to turn out people who can compete. We have to be a good deal smarter than we are now because competition is global.
4. *Sustainability.* Pete Andrews (UNCCH) commented that one of the FA's task forces is addressing issues of sustainability. He asked how GA is treating this subject as a priority rather than depending on mandates from the legislature. Bowles said that the University is working on its own efforts regarding sustainability. What sickens him is how the system has spent more than \$2B on construction when so few of the resulting buildings have features that are environmentally sensitive or geared to energy conservation and sustainability. He said that the system and campuses need to be aware of costs resulting from a failure to address these issues,

and that there should also be more attention to maintenance of existing facilities. Bowles noted that some of the reasons for these failures relate to cost-cutting and believes that any energy-related savings will not be retained at the campus level but rather will revert to the state. He has a challenge in getting campuses to believe that they should do this anyway, wherever the savings go.

5. *Core Program Funding.* Jim Martin (NCSU) noted that the legislative budget this year was very generous but that a ½% cut had still been imposed on various programs. New money is coming in new programs, but many of the core programs are suffering because there have been repeated cuts in recent years. How can money be directed toward long-term viability of the academic core, rather than focusing on new and novel programs? Bowles said that the increase in funding for core programs this year was 14% (so he wouldn't be too worried about the ½% cut). How money allocated is up to chancellors, and GA is trying to get the campuses to direct money to core functions and infrastructure in some cases. The UNC Tomorrow effort will trigger a greater focus on the essentials. He noted his concern that, at ECSU, founded as a normal school, only 18 teachers had graduated this year.
  6. *Enrollment Growth.* Tammy Hunt (UNCW) noted projections for an increase in student enrollment by 80,000 students in the coming decade. She hears that people are inclined toward masters and professional programs. Bowles noted that GA and campuses will try to do a better job in using data and working on enrollment growth. One of the things that may come from the UNC Tomorrow effort is a satellite program in Jacksonville (satellite for of UNCW) since there is high growth in this location and it might be possible to co-locate on the Coastal Carolina campus. He observed that on the UNCW campus, utilization for classrooms is 70% and for labs is 50%. Some campuses which aren't growing are asking for more classrooms (but only have 20% classroom use and 12% lab use). He stressed that as the university grows to meet the demand, some campuses such as UNCC may grow to 40k students and might therefore get more new buildings compared to others. GA will also look at where the demand is coming from, for example in areas of grow such as in health a priority might be set on getting a science building while lower priority areas might not get new buildings. If a campus is not utilizing its facilities, it will probably not get new facilities. A delegate inquired whether the funding formula favors graduate rather than undergraduate programs and Bowles said yes it does. Bowles noted that it is important to look at these issues but explained that it does cost more to educate a graduate student so some differences are warranted.
  7. *Tuition Levels and Financial Aid.* Ken Wilson (ECU) thanked Bowles for his attention to access for low-income students. Bowles said that he would continue these efforts and noted again that for families under 150% of the poverty line, students can go to school and get out without much debt. For those between \$42,000 and \$100,000, there's really a pressure point and we need to think about that category. That's why he's a low tuition reason, and that's why he wants to utilize facilities better and hold costs down. He does want to reduce cost. Whenever the current legislative leadership turns over (and it will at some point down the road), we will have to show that we're fiscally responsible or the university will be in funding problems. If he can buy credibility by absorbing modest cuts and campuses reallocate funds to meet the core, he'll do that.
  8. *Tuition Waivers for Children of Faculty Members.* Subash Shah (WSSU) asked if there is a possibility for children of faculty members to get a tuition waiver. Bowles said that he knew the campus and faculty pay levels, and observed that there are many faculty members who can't afford to send their children to college. Bowles said it's important to address this issue but he lacks the money now and doesn't want to overpromise. It's also an issue that has been raised in the UNC Tomorrow "listening forums."
  9. *Funding for Liberal Arts and Writing Programs.* Janet Hudson (NCSU) commented that it is difficult to get funding for the liberal arts, and particularly for writing programs which are facing intensive demands. How do we teach students to write, if can't fund it? Bowles said that raising such concerns is one of the points of the UNC Tomorrow effort. It's in every single category of work: writing is a primary need. We need to seek funding and reallocate needed resources into writing programs if that's the thing we're hearing. If we're listening, there's a need to respond.
3. *Vice President for Budget and Finance Rob Nelson.* Nelson commented that he'd be brief in light of the hour.
    1. *Tuition and Fees Policy.* Nelson reviewed the tuition and fees plan adopted by the Board of Governors in October 2006 (and attached as an appendix). He noted that tuition goes to support the academic mission and fees typically go to support student services. The 2006 tuition and fees plan establishes a system for tracking historical trends in the general fund and in tuition/fee

levels, and calls for capping tuition/fee increases at a lower level if the General Assembly provides support above historical trends. Tuition and fee proposals will be submitted by the campuses for review by GA in January and adoption by the Board of Governors (BOG) in February 2008. There are criteria in the policy as to the use of resulting campus-based tuition revenues (allocation among need based aid, faculty salaries, and program initiatives), as well as benchmarks for undergraduate resident student tuition/fee levels (no more than 25%-ile of public peers), and undergraduate non-resident student (no more than 75%-ile of peers). Nelson noted that fees cannot increase by more than 6% and said that he expected some stressors on this issue in the coming round of submissions.

2. *Textbooks.* Nelson reminded the delegates that efforts to control the cost of textbooks were also reviewed in connection with proposals for tuition and fee increases. The BOG passed policy on this point as well (attached as appendix xxx). GA has been working to encourage collaboration among the campuses as a means of limiting costs, and has a system developed for calculating costs as part of its yearly review. Faculty members are doing a better job in considering costs and ordering books as early as possible. There are efforts to pilot some rental programs for books in core undergraduate classes where basic coverage doesn't change that much from year-to-year, as well as an effort to pilot a guaranteed buy-back program (assuring students of 75% of what they've paid if they re-sell their books in core classes). Unfortunately the book publishers aren't doing a lot to assist. Several delegates commented on this topic. Steve Bachenheimer (UNCCH) said that the cost of textbooks is clearly a national issue. Some newspapers have suggested that it might be better to focus on the intellectual property involved and license access to text materials rather than seeing the matter as simply one of textbook sales. He wondered whether there was any way that GA might consider these insights. Nelson agreed that this was a fruitful train of thought, particularly since the way materials are delivered is changing rapidly. Nelson noted, too, that there's a textbook committee on each campus and urged such ideas to be submitted to them. Pete Andrews (UNCCH) said that in some courses such a system is already in place since materials are placed on electronic reserve and fees are paid according to use. Ken Wilson (ECU) noted that when he started teaching, he'd taken excerpts from various monographs for use in class and that was allowed, but now expectations are that fees be paid for each excerpt. He therefore thought the license idea was worth considering.

- A. *New Business.* No new business was raised.
- B. The Assembly adjourned at 4:10. The next meeting will take place on November 16, 2007.

#### Appendices

- A. Orientation Presentation
- B. Delegate Survey 2007-2008
- C. Materials related to UNC Code Revision
  1. FA resolution as adopted
  2. Text of FAEC Recommended Revisions of University Code text
  3. Background memo comparing FAEC recommendations and Code 603/604 Committee recommendations
- D. Presentation on Sustainability by Cindy Shea (UNCCH Sustainability Director)
- E. Materials from Faculty Assembly Self-Study Task Force
  1. Powerpoint slide presentation
  2. Proposed Bylaw Amendment on election process (be be voted on at November 2007 FA meeting)
- F. Faculty Assembly Committee and Task Force Assignments for 2007-2008
- G. Information on Administrator Reviews (collected by GA)
- H. Information on Domestic Partner Benefits (collected by GA)
- I. Summary of Legislative Highpoints (including budget) (prepared by GA for BOG)
- J. 2006 BOG Tuition and Fees Plan (adopted in October 2006)
- K. 2007 BOG Textbook Policy (adopted in 2007)

Judith Welch Wegner, UNC-CH, Assembly Secretary (Judith\_wegner@unc.edu)  
October 2, 2007  
posted on UNC Faculty Assembly Web site 10/9/07