

Report on the Meeting of the delegates from the HMIs.

We decided to use the meeting to set the agenda for future meetings. The following issues were seen as critical:

1. Shared governance (or rather the lack thereof). There is a lack of good training for leadership and for chairs.
2. We need to discuss changes in the core curriculum, workload, tenure/promotion, and post-tenure review
3. We need to discuss the raised admission standards, the lack of financial support (financial aid), and Adequate Yearly Progress. There was also a discussion of 12 hours for financial aid as full-time status and the impact of only 9 units of state financial aid.
4. We need to discuss the increase in workload resulting from budget cuts (i.e., balance with service obligations -- why service is often unseen but takes a lot of time).
5. Why are private schools receiving the Legislative Tuition Grant when we have such tough budgetary times?

Next meeting will deal with impact of admission standards on HMIs and the impact of Adequate Yearly Progress changes. HMI reps were asked to find out what percentage of students in the 750-800 SAT range actually graduate from the university to determine the impact of the change. After all, Elizabeth City State University will lose 40% of its students but still graduates 55% of its students. This means that ECSU is doing an exceptional job with students who will no longer be able to attend. After all, if none of these students actually graduate, then ECSU graduates its students at a 92% rate (55/60) which would make it one of the top universities in terms of graduation success in the entire country, rivaling the rate of elite universities.

In addition, since high school GPA is the best predictor of success, perhaps we should guarantee admission without SAT and without other admission requirements for the top 10% of all graduates at each high school, especially since there are high schools in this state where students *cannot* meet the admission standards of the UNC system (foreign language requirement, math requirement, etc.).

Zagros Madjd-Sadjadi, Ph.D.

### **Faculty Assembly meeting - September 16, 2011**

**9:00 Call to order**

#### **President Ross on Higher Ed Today and Our Challenges**

He introduced Dr. Suzanne Ortega – from University of New Mexico. Her background is impressive, from Community College to University- her experience as faculty member and her rising through the ranks to her present position.

He wanted to put context around where we are both as an institution and a society. It is different than it has been and will stay different for the foreseeable future. "These are my opinions" he stressed and then pointed to one fact we cannot ignore : we have experienced the worst economic recession and since March 2009 we have been in recovery – though what kind of recovery?

The economic indicators went down then up and the question is: will we go down again? This is a real possibility due to a number of possible factors:

We are living in a time of great economic uncertainty. Most economists say, we will not experience a strong recovery in the near future. Most people believe that the global economy is stagnant or declining. Even China is experiencing difficulties and structural problems. Unemployment is over 10% in NC, and most economists talk about 7 ½ to 8% as the new norm for the near future. In NC we have been through very tough economic times – including a multi-billion dollar shortfall. We only have the first quarter revenues and they are where we expected, but the future is unknown. We have unresolved Medicaid issues – and costs for hurricane Irene damage. It is said that this is "The New Normal" but he expresses doubt as to whether we have arrived at the new normal yet or if we will return to a growing economy or find ourselves in a continuing decline. In the next 5-10 years we will see a different kind of world than the one prior to 2007. As humans, we tend to think it will go back to the way it was. But he believes that we are in a different time. Thus it is important that we adjust our thinking as individuals and institutions. The cuts we have experienced are not about us alone. It is a societal problem and not a university problem. He says all this depressing news not to depress us but to help us adjust our thinking and remove the barriers preventing us from changing. We will have to do things differently if we are to serve the students as we should. He wishes we knew if we are facing more cuts – but we don't know. We are not likely to see additional state funding – but we hope to have some – such as retention funds – but the truth is, we will have to begin shifting our priorities. I hope we will continue receiving enrollment dollars but he doesn't know if that is the case. This state has been blessed for many years in having one of the best educational systems in the world. It can be the advantage for the state to grow, but not everyone thinks that the university is critical to the state's success. NC is a rapidly changing state. Many new residents of the state do not know the system from experience. It is critical that we pull together to figure out how we meet these challenges. If we can have the edge over other states, then NC will benefit economically. We need to see who the competition is – not California, etc, but Mumbai, Singapore, and others. In that context, we at GA are not looking for the return to the past, but are trying to figure out the appropriate financing model to sustain academic excellence, - so what is the right mix of state revenue and other sources? There is increasing demand for accountability and we have a responsibility to be accountable for the resources we are receiving. He worries, however, about putting too much attention to retention and graduation rates – as these may not be related to anything we do. For example , many students leave for lack of financial aid. Should we be held accountable for factors over which we have no control? In terms of enrollment funding – should we ask for this? We need to tell the legislature what our needs are, and we did request this, and we did receive enrollment funding. Will that continue? Will our growth continue? This is unknown. We are also looking at financial aid resources – one of the greatest challenges we face. It is under pressure in Washington. We asked for \$198 million for the state need-based program. We got \$125 billion – less than we spent last year and what we asked for. Everybody got less and that is why we are seeing a reduction in retention rates. Our

chancellors would say that one problem is retaining our best employees. With no salary increases, this is proving to be difficult and public institutions are at risk. Faculty and staff do deserve fair compensation, but how do we do this? We are also faced with finding ways of being more efficient both at GA and in our campuses. How can we save more in the operational side. We are looking at centralizing payroll and other kinds of shared services which can save resources. The bottom line: we can't keep doing things the same way – either operational or academically. If ever there has been a time we need your help – this is it. I believe we can be a better, stronger institution which serves our students – but it will take a lot of changes. I don't know all the answers – but I hope I can raise some of the questions.

I am appreciative of the Academics First initiative from the Faculty Assembly, and some of these questions have been raised by you, by others, and by me:

Are there policies that currently exist that should be the same across campuses?

How do we articulate faculty workload, when others think that the solution is having faculty teach more?

How do we attract, retain and reward good faculty?

How do we enhance the focus on teaching excellence? We have to do that without under-emphasizing research.

How do we keep a focus on rigor and writing? Today's world is a lot less about relaying content and more about developing competencies and one of those is writing. We need to demand more from students. We might need to raise admission standards as well.

There is a growing pressure on accountability. How do we assess student learning? Or faculty effectiveness?

Can we streamline academic administration?

Can we reward full time faculty?

How can we show workload data which reflects the true picture of all that faculty do?

How do we develop seamless pathways to our institutions?

How do we better serve the increasing number of non-traditional students – returning military, unemployed seeking retraining .

What is our responsibility to work with public and private schools to insure that students are ready for the university?

How do we better use technology? We can do better at online and that will be a major part of our strategy.

How can we develop collaborations and consortia that enable us to expand offerings to our students instead of reducing them. We are going to have to be more of a system.

There are a lot of big issues, and General Administration does not have all the answers -we will need to work together to solve them. The policy makers are asking some of these questions and we need to work together to present solutions.

I thank you for your efforts and leadership and look forward to working with you on the tough questions we are facing.

Questions:

Jimmy Reeves, UNCW: The thing that frustrates me the most is the red tape. For example, I cannot go and purchase a computer at a low cost, since I have to use state dealers and these are more expensive. There is a bureaucratic nightmare when you try to do something entrepreneurial. We want to use our money more intelligently but we can't.

Ross: we collected a list of regulations and restrictions which we sought to have eliminated. We will work toward system-wide e-purchasing. On the personnel side, there doesn't seem to be the willingness to allow flexibility – for example, there was a move to have all promotions of more than 10% require state approval. I would ask you to collect as many of the ideas and examples and give them to us to take to the legislature.

Jim Martin, NCSU: One of my concerns is about the “new normal.” We've gotten ourselves into a reductionist view – that we are looking to become smaller. Look at the past with the formation of the Research Triangle. I think we need to look at visionary big pictures to see how we can expand?

Ross: I do think that our historical approach in developing big visions was to look for new money to do so. We need to look at how we can use our current funds first, then perhaps we could generate new funds. We have a lot of work to do with policy makers who are in a reductionist mode- I worry about the fact that too many policy makers have an all-or nothing attitude : all tax cuts or all reductions.

We cannot reduce quality, but we need new ways of doing things – shared services, new transmission of courses, etc.

Janette Boxell UNC-CH: On the subject of the Rigors of writing. Recently there was a discussion about having NC students taking the ACT and not the SAT and this will significantly affect our admission quality.

Ross: The thinking is to have 10<sup>th</sup> graders take the ACT to see where they stand in math and science to see where remediation is necessary, but there is no resolution yet.

Bruce Mallette: It will be ACT with writing with the target of offering the ACT with writing across the state for all 11<sup>th</sup> graders and perhaps 10<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> as diagnostic . We feel good that ACT with writing is considered. We are checking with admission offices to see what they think about the predictive nature of this test.

Jill Ehnenn ASU: We in education are not the only ones suffering. However, the thing I am concerned about is the “general wisdom” that we need to be careful about saying “no” to legislators who say “no” to us. For example, one legislator thinks that public education is socialism and therefore should not be supported. We cannot change their minds. They do not want critical thinkers. So while we are thinking about strategies, we need to collaborate with parents, alumni, business leaders, community leaders, to show what the elected officials are doing to higher education. We need to rethink our tactics of not making waves, but to reach out to allies.

Ross: First of all, talking about the value of the university is important and we have been doing so. I try to make clear to any community in which I am speaking about what value we bring to that community – how many business come out of the university that are in that community.

One cannot communicate enough – we all have to be willing to talk about the virtues of the university. There are a lot of legislators that do support us, though this particular legislature has not been responsive to protests. We have tried to be very factual about the damage being done, and we are trying to show how we are critical to the future of the state. Should I be more of a firebrand about it? I think that would do more damage. Last year we worked with business leaders in both parties to send letters in support of the university. As the consequences begin to touch the lives of the students, we will also find new awareness among constituents.

**10:00 Lyons Gray, Senior Advisor to the President**  
**The Legislative Landscape and the Challenges Ahead**

Until March 15<sup>th</sup> I was retired in Winston Salem, and President Ross called me to help with the legislature. I served 14 years in the General Assembly (Republican) and in 2002 I did not seek reelection since there was less collaboration between the parties. I spent 2005-2009 in Washington as chief financial officer of the EPA. The first bill I supported was to ban car batteries from landfills – since they contain lead.

How do we deal with the legislature? Of the 40 new members, none of them were directly thinking about the value of the university to the state. This session was more about numbers and not policy. They needed to make multibillion cuts. It was numbers-driven. It leaves us fighting for the dollars. Additionally there is \$300 million problem with Medicaid – that hasn’t been dealt with. Sales tax numbers are not healthy. For 18 years, the state senate loved the university system. Not now. We had avid defenders, but now we don’t. We have to make our own case. Why are we important? Why should they care? Now we in GA are going to people in their district. We ask – do you know your state senator, representative? Can you talk to them about the important role of the university.

We seek your input [lyonsgray@northcarolina.edu](mailto:lyonsgray@northcarolina.edu) – we welcome arguments for supporting the university. What message will be effective? If we talk about research, education of students, etc – they

are not interested.

“How many hours are faculty teaching?” This is what they ask.

People expect instant payoff. Every 10 years after the census, the legislature must redraw the lines of the districts. In the past three cycles, the plans were challenged legally by the minority party. This year, if they succeed in getting this plan approved, then the Republicans will be in power for 10 years.

This morning I met with the Speaker Pro Tem, and I said: what is it about the university system that you need to know to protect the system.

He responded: “Nobody knows what you are doing” – and so I need a one-page response: who are we? What are we about, and why is it important? We need your help.

Catherine Rigsby ECU: a couple of years ago we contributed a one-page response about what a faculty member does. Would that be helpful? We can do this about departments as well, would that be helpful? At ECU we are required to produce documents from each department saying why we are useful.

Lyons: There is an underlying cynicism about what we do. How do we overcome that? Probably it is all about relationships. Sometimes it takes a champion for the idea in the back room when the decision is being made. Relationships very important and we need to develop these.

Jim Martin NCSU: Faculty members are discouraged from getting involved in politics. The perception is that we may not talk to the legislature. Help us revise policy to let us know what we are able to do politically. Tell us how we can build relationships with the legislature.

Lyons: I congratulate you for putting your name forward for election to public office.

Jim: UNC Policy would require us to resign if we ran for the legislature, which is part-time.

Lyons: Thinking people need to offer themselves for public service.

Zagros Madjd-Sadjadi WSSU: There is a tuition grant for students enrolling in private universities which was created because UNC schools could not handle the capacity. How can we have this tuition grant? Why can't this be rolled into a state-wide financial aid and not just targeted for private universities?

Lyons: Good point.

Ken Wilson ECU: Can you talk about those who have the cynical attitude – how do we reach those who are approachable.

Lyon: I was a neophyte when I arrived at the legislature. Some persons were more willing to discuss these issues – how do we find them? If you are of good will and care about your issue, that will come across in discussions with legislators. Those that wanted to scream at me, I couldn't deal with them.

#### **10:45 Academics First**

Bruce Mallette, Senior Associate Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs

Sandie Gravett, Chair UNC Faculty Assembly

Sandie: Last year we addressed a number of ideas which we termed Academics First. This has been taken to the BOG's educational planning session:

Our initial three goals:

we knew where the budget was going, and we knew that there were ways to contribute to a more effective way of doing things. We had three goals in mind in our Academics First initiative:

- 1-Academic progress and degree obtainment
- 2-Seamlessness
- 3-Maximize our limited and declining resources

Bruce will outline our successes on the financial aid issue and then we will look at the policy side.

Bruce: Before our list our successes I want to reflect on the earlier comments:

You heard candid remarks from the president. Lyons Gray is assisting us in crafting a message. It can't be intellectualized. That ties us to Academics First.

Think of a family with 16 kids and each one goes to a different UNC campus. How will the families react to the wide variety of policies across campuses? For example FAFSA responses were due at different times – and now, the financial aid directors will work toward having all campuses list the same priority filing date, March 1st. We can now send the same message to the public.

The second item was the fact that the UNC Need-Based Aid program disappeared this year and that was huge. Previously we had a cap on how long a student can have need-based aid. The cap disappeared when a student challenged it on the basis of differential caps. Starting 2012-13 a state-wide cap is now 9 semesters. We have a year to plan for this and to implement it.

Third, satisfactory academic progress (SAP) will be monitoring every term. Each campus must have a SAP policy. We now recommend that this is done every semester. 10 campuses have gone to every term assessment. All 16 campuses look at "F's" in every semester. So now there is consistency across the state. It is important to have a similar set of academic principals across the system.

Fourth, Normal time of graduation – among the campuses there is a variation of 160 to 189 credits. This designation is how much time we will give students federal aid. The agreement now is 180 credits as the limit to receive federal aid.

Should campuses have institutional aid caps? Further discussions will ensue.

Questions:

Zagros Madjd-Sadjadi WSSU: Why use credit hours – is it fair to students?

Bruce: The state need-based aid only is legislated at 9. The federal aid is at 180. It is important to educate the public about the matrix of rules.

Betty Brown UNCP: Where does the surcharge occur?

Bruce: It is legislatively mandated but some credit hours are not counted: summer, high school earned credits, but what about community colleges? It is more complex, but instead of bringing in all credits, there needs to be accommodation to count only those applicable to the degree. Discussions are taking place on this issue.

There is a values discussion going on among financial aid directors about how to distribute declining resources. We are working toward a system-wide answer.

Fifth: federal regulations state that we must not give federal aid to those who have already earned a degree. We are working to ensure compliance. The point at which you complete the requirements for a degree is when the federal aid ends.

These 5 items are all related to financial aid and related to federal aid.

Sandie: The registrars and financial aid directors were very happy that the Faculty Assembly put this on the agenda.

Bruce: Both of those communities see how these processes take time and that attention is given to serious students.

Sandie: There are tougher pieces – the academic policy pieces. We asked the Faculty Assembly Executive Committee to identify a list of items to focus on.

- 1) Setting a satisfactory academic progress level at 2.0. Our campuses are all over the map on the GPA level. For example, one campus said if you were in your first 33 hours you had to be at 1.3 and then with increased hours the minimum GPA would go up. Some campuses are moving to 2.0 as a standard for academic progress. Do we as a system want to say that 2.0 will be the measure for academic progress. The ethical point- some students keep incurring debt when they will not ultimately achieve their goal. We need the campuses to intercede early to help students.

Linda Florence Callahan NC A&T: At what point is the 2.0 required

Sandie – at the first semester – a 2.0 is required. Interventions and probation can be applied.

Bruce; this doesn't mean that the door is slammed. Intervention occurs immediately

Sandra Rogers NCCU: This year we did lose a significant number of students due to the 1.9 requirement. We have determined that 2.0 will be required starting 2012.

Jill Ehnenn ASU: what is the process by which this or similar issues will go forward?

Sandie: The FA will discuss issues to see if this is the direction we would want to go.

Sandra: This is a direction we must go, since we are using tax payers money, but we need to do it in such a way that does not hurt students in the pipeline.

Jimmy Reeves UNCW: At UNCW we have been pushing a system which will allow students to input what their plans and this would allow the responses within the system to let students know what they need to do.

We need this at the system level.

Floyd James: A&T: Proceed cautiously and remember that some schools have a greater percentage of students who would be disadvantaged

Unidentified : we need to also take into consideration the K-12

Bruce: The high school GPA minimums are being established. President Ross has stated that he is not in favor of reducing admission requirements. It is not just about having a tool for projecting success – but for projecting feasibility and the available resources (class availability, etc) needed for them to reach their goals.

Unidentified : You might be reducing the pool of eligible applicants

Hans Kellner NCSU: Is it a case that the chances of recovering from a bad semester in your first year, as opposed to a bad year in the senior year? We need that type of information.

Bruce: we are looking for a common review and common way for registrars in predicting successful graduation based on performance. What do we know?

Sandie: The impetus is not to punish students but to kick in early intervention.

Bruce: And make it early and consistent. There is a need to continue this dialogue with those working in this area.

George Wilson NCCU: We do have excellent students as well. We get a variety of students. Many are first in the family to go to college. Not every student belongs in college. Where is the responsibility for the students. We need to put part some of the responsibility back on the students.

Andrew Morehead ECU – I am also concerned about students who take financial aid and who are struggling and who are taking 18 credits – some stay in to stay in class and fail in order to keep financial aid. There should not be a financial punishment for dropping a class.

Sandie: We are looking at academic load policies – and the drop dates. At some schools we are losing up to 15K credit hours between drop deadlines and snapshot. Also the Repeat Rule policies are on the list. We need to find ways to think these policies through.

Zagros Madjd-Sadjadi WSSU: There are problems with having students in honors classes who are not honors students .

Jeanette Boxill UNC: Have we thought of using the NCAA model in cases such as basing GPAs on certain courses, etc.

Bruce: From an admissions standpoint, every campus can look at a differentiated scale.

Catheryn Rigsby ECU: An SAT standard for all campuses- We need a process for input from all campuses. ECU passed a new policy but it is not 2.0 for the first semester. We can't just state an across the system and across the board a 2.0 system. It would be premature for us as the Faculty Assembly to make this decision today. We need to send this back to the campuses and perhaps a committee here to study this issue.

Sandie: No policy decision is being made today. The question is – is this the direction we want to go? Is it important enough to pursue.

Dave Ribar UNCG: could we have flexibility in the system – not 2.0 but tie it to the number of credit hours?

Jim Martin NCSU: There is a real problem when the academic standards are different than the financial aid standards – or there will be students who qualify academically but lose financial aid.

Bruce: A good point. There is no policy decision on the table, but the question is – is this an area of interest, and are there commonalities we might do together.

Mark Sprague ECU: Just because we decide to discuss and investigate this issue, it doesn't mean that we will come to the conclusion that all need 2.0

Jill Ehnenn ASU: When we set the number and the time period that the policy would be in effect, we need to have a statement in it that each institution will have an intervention.

Unidentified: Separate the philosophical from the financial – At what point would a faculty member be uncomfortable with having a student in the class with 1.6

Sandie: we can make November a working session on these issues based on information pushed out to you for consideration. We can then develop a process for considering these issues.

Ken Wilson ECU: Can we ask GA for data on what student graduation rates are based?

Bruce: we are trying to distill data from what we have.

Zagros Madjd-Sadjadi WSSU: If we are talking about SATs - some states are looking at the top 10% of students from high schools.

Bruce: That is a Board of Governors' issue.

Unidentified: At what point do we allow a lower percentage of retention by allowing more students the opportunity to succeed.

12:00 Group Discussions

**Group I - Report from Board Room (Front)** – Mark Sprague and Bruce Mallette, Facilitators

We need to understand the legislators, their influences, and their platforms to better frame our arguments.

Be transparent. Get information about productivity out to the public in a consistent format. Keep things at an aggregate (departmental) level.

Give us the flexibility to deal with cuts.

Continue to ask what information the legislators need to understand the university.

Back up our arguments with data. Bring in Delaware creators to discuss its value.

We have to put a better face on the University. We need to personify UNC at all levels. The message must be consistent.

**Group II: Report from Board Room (Back) – Kimbrey Rhinehardt, Raymond Burt, Zagros Madjd-Sadjadi**

A possible description of faculty workload is to use the comparison of the preacher- do they only work for an hour on Sunday, or a television or radio host only working the airtime or a lawyer only paid for the hours in court.

Perhaps we could use a formula to show prep time (3 hours for every 1 class hour ) in addition to service and research. The job is all-consuming – directing research, applying for grants, etc. Some think that we just reuse the same lecture notes every year, but that is absolutely false: “we can’t teach last year’s science, this year” Every discipline has new trends in methodology and faculty need to stay current in research and lectures.

Course preparations need continual revisions – in response to new information, in making the material relevant to the new generations or to the every-changing world.

What is the value of education? One that is overlooked in this vocationally minded age - Developing skills to examine your own life – or to understand the foundations of your society – to understand history. This debate about the value of education is based on those who are seeking something that colleges do not do - job training.

The world’s problems are complex and we people who are capable of working through the complexity.

**Difference from Community Colleges** – why is research necessary? Community college faculty teach 5 classes – why can’t you do that?

Comprehensive universities – do they need research? Comprehensive universities bring research to the undergraduates and introduces students to how one acquires new information, and to how one communicates findings. Students can learn the process of research. Students have the opportunity to engage in research. Smaller schools are able to have undergraduates involved in research. There is a reason why research is connected to comprehensive schools.

Student needs are different and they need different entries into education. There is a whole gamut of educational opportunities. Diversity in the missions of the universities serves the broader public.

**Tenure: Why is tenure important.** Without tenure, we need to be paid more. Grants can go with the faculty and without tenure, a researcher can decide to move to the highest bidder and take large grants and patents with them. Tenure is one of the few reward systems for faculty. Post tenure review is not in the awareness of the public. Obtaining tenure is rigorous and it doesn't mean the retention of a position for bad performers.

What about adjuncts? Isn't it cheaper and more efficient? The tenure system puts into place certain benchmarks and thus doesn't need heavy evaluation every year. Tenure track faculty apply for grants and external funding.

**How to communicate to legislators.** If they are aware of organizations, then they know that innovation, creativity and research is a part of every company. Faculty workload issue: a lot of time is spent in institutional-building activities. Advising students – serving on committees - innovation.

We are doing what every corporation does.

**Value of public education? Why have it?** It is for people's children. Charging higher tuition is a tax not only on the wealthy, but on all seeking an education. Another argument: a graduate of a college makes about \$1million more in a lifetime than those that don't.

A society that is more educated is more economically viable. Businesses moving into the state look at the educational resources.

California and Michigan systems were world-class but have been destroyed by rising tuitions.

The connection between costs and quality – in professional schools, for example. There was a debate: why can't Texas create a \$10,000 bachelor degree? You get what you pay for.

### **Motivation of faculty – changing lives**

The unspoken determining factor of our having to defend higher education is the motivation to keep people ignorant. – but – what are the values that universities are propagating ?

We are not disseminators of knowledge but creators of knowledge.

**We need to delineate the difference between education and credentialing.**

**We need to find valuers of the university – such as the military and business leaders to speak to the legislature on our behalf.**

How do we differentiate ourselves from the quality of the education we provide as opposed to community colleges or for-profit universities. Community colleges are excellent for vocational training. For-profit universities also focus on vocational fields. There are currently serious

questions about the value of for-profit universities. The leader in the field is the University of Phoenix, but their 6 year graduation rate is about 19%.

You train for certainty but you educate for uncertainty.

Zagros: "Short term pain means long term pain in terms of education"

## **Group V - Report from Conference Room C – Eddie Souffrant and Sarah Russell**

### **1) On the value of higher education:**

- It is scary that we have to defend something that has always been of such enduring and foundational value to Americans – notably many of our parents generation saw the importance of giving their children a college education as an investment in the future – particularly those from working class backgrounds and immigrant families who wanted their children to be the first generation to go to college.
- It has demonstrated long-term investment value for both individuals and communities
- Innovation suffers – when universities are cut, the “innovation index” goes down – there is evidence of this.
- Loss of talented STEM professionals in places where universities suffer
- Value of higher ed symbolized by the military slogan: “training is for certainty, education is for uncertainty.”
- In having to answer this question, we want to know more specifically, who are our critics? What are the constituent elements of their criticisms? This would help us respond to them?
- Suggestion: Can we encourage those who are familiar with the views of the legislators to hand-pick some good representatives of the faculty (people who could connect well with legislators) in the UNC system to meet one on one for discussion of their concerns? Or encourage legislators to teach a course for a semester on one of the campuses? The idea would be to break down some of the barriers between these groups.

### **2) What is faculty responsibility?**

- Value of increased interdisciplinarity – need to get rid of the “silos” on campus
- Although many faculty have spent their careers developing articulate, intellectual discourse, they need “back translate” - be better at speaking in the vernacular – to avoid being seen as “an elite corps of intellectual snobs”

### **3) Importance of Tenure**

- Again, the problem of diminished innovation in systems where tenure has been eliminated.
- Value of having time/space to for long-range development of ideas – the freedom to pursue things that could either be dead-ends or turn out to be incredibly important.

- Faculty with tenure have the long view – and long term commitment to their institutions – and can provide an effective, non-fearful critique of the system.
- People who criticize tenure may underestimate the time and expertise that is required to achieve it, and its value in protecting deep levels of expertise in a field.

## **2:00 Updates – Sandie Gravett**

### Faculty Workload Study

This committee does start with the knowledge that this is a workload committee and not a teaching load committee. We are not just answering to the legislature, but as a means to know more in the allocation of resources. The first meeting of the group will be shortly before the inauguration. Summer 2012 is the timeline for the final report, though this may be adjusted.

Questions:

How can campuses give input?

Will this be like the University of Texas that shows how many students

The Pope Center report about faculty workloads – fixing facts around the desired conclusion

### Unnecessary Program Duplication

At the September meeting Chancellor Woodward gave a report. Unnecessary Program Duplication is not currently a major problem at UNC. We do have a biennial process – 264 low productivity programs and 60 were eliminated – so we do a good job of eliminating  
There are still issues with program approval backing up.

Educational Planning subcommittee will look at this process so that needed programs can be established. The review process for new programs needs to be reviewed.

Board Process for establishment of consortia needs to be reviewed.

Current program productivity review works well, but this needs to be an internal campus procedure.

The purposes of online education (in the broadest terms) has to be clearly determined and the university policy level structures developed to support these purposes.

**2:30 Discussion issues:** Grievance training video, standards of faculty governance, & a possible UNC Faculty Assembly structural changes for the upcoming year.

Raymond Burt UNCW led a discussion about the need to produce a resource for faculty senates about the Code and grievance procedures.

Catherine Rigsby ECU led a discussion on faculty governance .

Points of the discussion: What is needed in shared governance advice?

Recommend that there be a workshop which can be recorded and streamed.

One issue, how to turn committees into an effective arm of the senate.

One possibility – outreach to newly tenured faculty. At UNCW a celebration of tenure is being introduced and in this venue the issue of faculty governance can be introduced.

Chancellor searches: Western conducted a search. The search was closed – no one other than the search committee could see the candidates: there must be a better way to gauge support for the candidates, better ability to research background

We were told that this is a GA policy.

What are the policies from other states? Search firms may be the source for the closed searches.

Next meeting topics: Raised admission standards, and lack of financial aid support.

### **Changes to Charter and Bylaws – presented by Sandie Gravett**

To contextualize this proposal:

The executive committee saw that we have challenges and opportunities in the coming years.

In 2007 we adopted the weighted membership scale. So this means that there is a disadvantage to having a large body which limits genuine, engaged discussion.

It is difficult to engage in policy formulation. Delegate attendance was a problem. Costs of gathering this group is significant. We have been encouraged to think about video conferences as an alternative.

Opportunities: Pres. Ross is supportive of shared governance, and invites input.

Vice President Ortega also is interested in shared governance. The issues facing us are great – and we need a body that is ready, able to deal with these committees. The Executive Committee put together a proposal this summer.

The Faculty Assembly was designed to function as a conduit, but it was also designed to advise the General Administration.

The proposal envisions two delegate per campus. A rotational model with 3 year terms.

A smaller body is more capable to respond to the issues.

Question for today: for the next meeting, given these challenges and opportunities what can we do to make ourselves better than we are?

Discussion:

Ken Wilson ECU: I will advocate for an earlier model. We need standing committees. The innovation of the task forces was good, but we lost the standing committees. Standing committees help foster contact with GA personnel. It is possible to influence the policy before it is formulated.

Gabriel Lugo UNCW: I do not understand the statement about a disproportionate representation – if we want to reduce the size we should do so proportionately.

Jill Ehnenn ECU : I am against the proposal of having senate chairs only attend one meeting – it would create two separate bodies. Senate chairs have access to information not available to others and it is important for them to participate in the Faculty Assembly.

Zagros Madjd-Sadjadi WSSU: I support the proposed changes. It doesn't reduce inclusion. On some issues, additional faculty could be included in committees .

As for the numbers – the onus of being here is lessened with larger groups. There is only one chancellor or CAO in representing campuses of all sizes.

Chairs: we do need two non-chairs representing the university

I hope that we can come up with a workable, fiscally sound proposal.

Steven Buchenheimer UNC-CH: I have a concern about going to a lower house model to an upper house model. Large delegations can have diverse issues and not be a block vote. We miss some views if we reduce representation to two. Being better resourced doesn't impugn our reactions.

We can solve the reporting of who the delegates are.

Jim Martin NCSU: Having active committees is the only way to be involved in policy. I reinforce what Ken says. If this body is too expensive, then we have a problem. The issue that a larger campus has undue influence, is not evident in our Faculty Assembly history.

Susan Staub ASU: Has it ever been considered to have the campuses pay for their own travel? Or to cover costs to some degree?

Jimmy Reeves UNCW: Committees are great but we need a creative way to have the committees meet outside of the Faculty Assembly meetings.

Hans Kellner NCSU: It was inappropriate to discuss this change with Ross and Ortega before discussing this with us.

Sandie: It was a way to let them know what was on our agenda, it was not a policy discussion.

Lloyd Kramer UNC-CH: Communication between GA and our campuses is a key function. I have personally gained from the Faculty Assembly, and there will be less visibility by reducing the membership. To shrink us is to hurt our own mission.

Michael Wakeford UNCSA: I would support the current situation- to reduce to 2 each would be a bad idea. It is good to put more of us in front of the reins of power is good.

There will be some push to "render us all the same" but it will be good to have a politics of interest in "lower house."

Andrew Morehead ECU : We appreciate the exposure to multiple faculty. I haven't seen a split between big schools and small schools. I also endorse standing committees.

Sandie: It appears that the sense of the body is that we want to revisit the creation of the committee structure and that we are satisfied with our current election process. One more thing: it is important to discuss who we are and what we are about. This proposal was not intended to offend. We wanted the will of the body.

Catherine Rigsby ECU: We will need to get the names of delegates in a timely manner, and to that end, we change the election date. We need to know what our budget is. The logistical difficulties that the executive committee pointed out are important.

Sandie: We have moved the date back, but the campuses don't hold their elections that early.

Mark Sprague ECU: We need a better process for forming agendas. Sandie has done a good job, but this body should have input into agenda formation.

Sandie: Will be back in touch with you for requests for your service. We need shared work on issues.

More working sessions on policy issues in November. Senate chairs – we will be in touch with you concerning better communication.

**3:30 Adjournment**