

**FACULTY ASSEMBLY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE 2012-2013 GOALS AND PRIORITIES**  
**(A report on the July 23-24 Executive Committee Retreat)**

**SUMMARY**

The Faculty Assembly Executive Committee (FAEC) would like the Faculty Assembly (FA) to work on the following **three major focus areas** during the 2012-2013 academic year:

- *Student Success* (moving toward quality-focused performance metrics)
- *All Things Articulation* (includes community college courses and programs, DE courses and programs, early college high school courses, AP courses, courses taught to military cohorts, considerations of a “common core,” etc.)
- *International Programs* (the problem of “drive-by” courses;, special/duplicative programs, programs for foreign students, indifference to the political behavior of certain nations, etc.).

Each of these areas is on the GA “goals and priorities” lists. And, because each of these focus areas is directly related to academics they are of concern to the faculty. The Faculty Assembly will address these areas by utilizing its committee/task force structure, seeking input from key players at GA, from students, and from colleagues throughout the system. As is detailed below, each of these major issues will be addressed by a team consisting of an FAEC leader and a small team of FA delegates and GA staff who are willing to work together to gather data, develop recommendations, and prepare a final report for the full Assembly, GA, and the BoG.

In addition to these three major issues, the FAEC agreed that the following issues must also be monitored and recommendations concerning policies and procedures around each of these issues should be developed (by the various Faculty Assembly committees):

- Grievance procedures on our campuses (continuation of the in-progress project)
- The extent of faculty governance during “crisis situations” (developing best-practice recommendations concerning the appropriate role of faculty in situations that require short-time-frame decisions that could have long-term academic consequences)
- Workers’ rights (EPA and SPA; e.g., SB 575)
- Identifying faculty expertise on the campuses that can be called upon to work on GA and BoG committees and taskforces
- Identify nonacademic barriers to student success
- The new strategic plan, mission creep, and our campus identities
- Track success of the new Academics First policies; monitor for unintended consequences
- Track changes in student and faculty health insurance costs
- Track changes in faculty benefits (e.g., reductions in employer contributions to retirement plans)
- Stay up-to-date on system-level security policies and how those policies translate to our campuses
- Track demands and expectations for professional welfare of faculty (research identity, faculty development, grants supports, etc.)

The four committees that will be active during the 2012-2013 academic year (and beyond?) are the *Academic Policies and Standards Committee*, the *Budget Committee*; the *Faculty Welfare and External Communications Committee*; and the *Governance Committee*. In addition to these 4 committees, the FAEC hopes that the *HMI Group* and the *Senate Chairs Group* will also make significant contributions to the Faculty Assembly. The rest of this report outlines the work of each of these committees, describing the FAEC’s concepts for how each can contribute to work in the 3 major focus areas and the other issues of on-going concern to the faculty.

## 2012-2013 COMMITTEE WORK-AGENDAS

### ***Academic Standards and Policies Committee***

The Academic Standards and Policies (ASP) Committee will serve as the umbrella committee for work on the three major focus areas for 2012-2013. To facilitate the work, the committee will be divided into three subgroups, each taking on projects in one of the three focus areas. Each group will have a FAEC member as chair and one or more other FAEC members as members. The Faculty Assembly Chair (Rigsby) will serve as the liaison between the subgroups

### **Student Success (Performance Metrics) Subgroup**

Chair: Andrew Morehead ([moreheada@ecu.edu](mailto:moreheada@ecu.edu))

Suggested primary GA resource people: Bruce Mallette (Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs), Karrie Dixon (Associate Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs), Kate Henz (Senior Director of Academic Policy & Funding Analyses)

Additional suggested GA resource people: the campus registrars (NSU and ECU registrars may be particularly helpful with data finding), Cameron Caswell (President, Association of Student Governments)

Rationale/background for focus area: The *Freshman to Sophomore Retention* metric is underlain by the idea that our enrollment processes are excellent in selecting incoming freshmen who can succeed at college. This is simply not the case. Enrollment (anywhere) is not perfect. Many qualified and enrolled students are not prepared for college (for a variety of reasons, both academic and otherwise). The Freshman to Sophomore Retention metric can create perverse institutional incentives to pass through to their second year students who are not well prepared to succeed. Unprepared students who are passed through to their sophomore year are not just set up for failure but are also likely to accumulate significantly more college debt in comparison to those who realize soon (in the freshman year) that they are not prepared for college.

The FAEC suggests that the Freshman to Sophomore Retention metric should be replaced with a more meaningful and more academically realistic metric. Our initial suggestion is to use a metric based on persistence after the freshman year, perhaps *Third to Fifth Semester (or 30- to 60-hour) semester persistence*.

### Action Items/Data Needs:

- Current, historical, and national data around this issue (including debt data).
- Develop a fallback plan for students who do not succeed in year 1 (advising toward community college, remediation, or work; a mechanism to drop back in after some defined period out of the university; etc.).
- Consider how graduation rates for students who make it through the 5<sup>th</sup> semester compare to graduation rates for transfer students and for students who make it through the freshman year.
- Partner with students to develop consensus around any faculty recommendations.

### **All Things Articulation Subgroup**

Chair: Sarah Russell ([russell@ncssm.edu](mailto:russell@ncssm.edu)), assisted by Jim Martin

Suggested primary GA resource people: Bruce Mallette (Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs), Karrie Dixon (Associate Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs), Alisha Chapman (Vice President for Academic and University Programs), Maggie O'Hara (Director of E-Learning)

Additional suggested GA resource people: Kate Henz (Senior Director of Academic Policy & Funding Analyses), Kimrey Rhinehart (Vice President for Federal Relations), John Leydon (Vice President for

Information Resources and Chief Information Officer), Cameron Caswell (President, Association of Student Governments)

Rationale/background for focus area: Instead of focusing on one specific type of articulation (*e.g.*, a common core curriculum for all UNC-system students or Community College articulation agreements) this subgroup will first look more generally at issues surrounding articulation of both courses and programs within our system and beyond. Although the group will likely come up with specific recommendations about articulation issues related to distance education, UNC online, community college articulation, and more, it will start its work by developing a key set of indicators for successful articulation policies and agreements.

The FAEC suggests that we need to confront the “mythology of equivalency.” We do not have a good ability to recognize learning outside our walls. We need to have confidence in the quality of courses and programs that we agree to articulate (not just CC courses or DE courses, but also early college high school courses, AP courses, etc.). Confidence usually equals quality, but articulation does not really measure quality. In the end, successful articulation equals successful “meshing” of the articulated skill sets (not only, or even mostly, content knowledge) with the courses and programs that follow. We need a way to think about and measure this meshing of skill sets that gets us beyond any us vs them mentality and beyond looking only at content knowledge. With articulation we need to be looking at more than content knowledge, we need to be looking at skill sets and at how courses and sequences of course mesh with what the student will encounter at the university.

Action Items/Data Needs:

- We really need longitudinal assessment data for this one. But, we can make a start with less robust data sets.
- Gather information from each campus on their processes for articulation – addressing some basic questions, including:
  - **For Community and Early Colleges:** 1) who evaluates the articulated courses for acceptance for credit at each institution and what is their process? 2) With which outside programs are there articulation agreements? 3) Are there specific concerns about the articulated courses or course sequences?
  - **For Distance Education on each campus:** 1) How many of the same courses are taught online and in the classroom? 2) what is the difference between the online course and the classroom course? (faculty, assignments, enrollment etc)
  - **For AP Courses:** 1) What AP courses are accepted for credit - as electives, or within a major? 2) what concerns exist regarding their integration into the university degree programs?
- Revisit the Academic Core white paper that the Assembly produced a few years ago.
- Possibly arrange a joint session with Community College leadership/faculty.

International Programs Subgroup

Chair: Margery Coulson-Clark ([mmcoulson-clark@mail.ecsu.edu](mailto:mmcoulson-clark@mail.ecsu.edu)), assisted by Eddy Souffrant and Hans Kellner

Suggested primary GA resource people: Leslie Boney (Vice President for International, Community, and Economic Engagement)

Additional suggested GA resource people: Cameron Caswell (President, Association of Student Governments)

Rationale/background for focus area: Perfect universities would have strong international programs where students would participate in a substantial academic international experience. This experience would include cultural and language immersion, research and intellectual exchanges and not simply “a trip abroad.” UNC

students must be engaged in a significant international experience if they are to engage and lead a globalized world. The International Program Subgroup will explore ways to enhance the international experience of our faculty and students. They will begin by seeking answers to questions about academic, undergraduate experiences and programs, with the hope of producing a white paper that will provide rationale and recommendation for increased academically strong international programs.

Action Items/Data Needs:

Consider the following questions:

- What is the purpose of university level international programs (economic development? International/global knowledge? profit? something else?)?
- When considering course credits, what international activities and courses are equivalent?
- What best practices are available? Is language acquisition or immersion a significant requirement?
- Should international programs offices be able to start their own programs?
- How is the US government involved in international programs in general? Is there awareness of the imbalance of knowledge exchange and how that impacts university programs?
- What is the role of the foreign government in determining program goals, etc. (and teachers and curriculum)? Consider, for example, the Confucius Institute.
- What other disciplines/research/technical details and questions are important to developing sound international program policy?
- Are the unintended consequences of our international programs? If there are, how can we develop policies to avoid them?

***Budget Committee***

Chair: Catherine Rigsby ([rigsbyc@ecu.edu](mailto:rigsbyc@ecu.edu))

Suggested primary GA resource people: Charlie Perusse (Vice President for Finance) and Kate Henz (Senior Director of Academic Policy & Funding Analyses)

Additional suggested GA resource people: Dan Cohen-Vogel (Senior Director of Institutional Research), Jonathan Pruitt (Associate Vice President for Finance)

This committee's primary charge for the 2012-2013 academic year is gathering data (academically oriented data sets) that will aid the work of the three ASP Committee subgroups. In addition, the committee needs to keep current with (and help the FA keep informed about) financial aid issues, tuition and fees structures and processes, and academic budgeting priorities and procedures of setting those priorities.

***Faculty Welfare and External Communications Committee***

Chairs: Chet Dilday ([cdilday@uncc.edu](mailto:cdilday@uncc.edu)) and Eddy Souffrant ([esouffra@uncc.edu](mailto:esouffra@uncc.edu))

Suggested primary GA resource people: Joni Worthington (Vice President for Communications), William Fleming (Vice President of Human Resources)

Additional suggested GA resource people: Bruce Mallette (Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs), Kimrey Rhinehart (Vice President for Federal Relation), Leslie Cates (Director of State Government Relations), Chris Brown (Vice President for Research and Graduate Education), Chuck Brink (Staff Assembly President)

This committee's primary focus will be on developing guidelines describing strategies for effective communication between faculty and our various constituents (legislators, the voting public, parents, board

members, etc.). It will also be responsible for keeping track of all changes associated with faculty welfare in general.

Action Items/Data Needs:

- Gather information about how faculty at individual institutions formally interacts with their constituencies (perhaps starting with information from the Senate Chairs Group).
- Consider getting formal training in communicating with board members and legislators (Suzanne Ortega mentioned this possibility last year ...).
- How do we turn efficiency talk into real efficiency, accountability talk into real accountability?
- Monitor workers' rights issues on our campuses (EPA and SPA; e.g., SB 575)
- The new strategic plan, mission creep, and our campus identities
- Track changes in student and faculty health insurance costs
- Track changes in faculty benefits (e.g., reductions in employer contributions to retirement plans)

***Governance Committee***

Chair: David Green ([dgreen@ncu.edu](mailto:dgreen@ncu.edu)), assisted by Raymond Burt

Suggested primary GA resource people: Laura Fjeld (Vice President and General Counsel), Suzanne Ortega (Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs)

Additional suggested GA resource people:

The Governance Committee will have two main tasks for the 2012-2013 academic year:

- Continue work on the grievance training/education/best practice materials that can be used by all of our campuses. Consider the use of case studies. Reevaluate the use of videos for the dissemination of this information.
- In concert with the Senate Chairs group, explore the extent of faculty governance in crisis situations on our campuses. Are there best-practice processes that involve faculty in short timeframe decision making?

***Historically Minority Institutions Committee***

Chair: Chet Dilday ([cdilday@uncfsu.edu](mailto:cdilday@uncfsu.edu))

Suggested primary GA resource people: Karrie Dixon (Associate Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs)

Additional suggested GA resource people:

This group will continue to meet to discuss issues that are unique to our Historically Minority Institutions (HMIs) and their constituents. But, in addition to discussion, the FAEC asks that the group gather data that will inform the Assembly's work. Specifically, during the 2012-2013 academic year, the FAEC asks that the HMI Committee undertake the following tasks:

- Track the implementation of the new Academic First policies on the HMI campuses, looking for both successes and unintended consequences of that implementation.
- Identify non-academic barriers to student success, the groups of students who face these barriers, and any successes in overcoming these barriers (and how they were dealt with).

## ***Senate Chairs Group***

Chair: Hans Kellner ([hdkellne@ncsu.edu](mailto:hdkellne@ncsu.edu))

Suggested primary GA resource people:

Additional suggested GA resource people:

This Senate Chairs group will continue to meet to discuss governance issues on their campuses. In addition to discussion, the FAEC asks that the group gather information and develop recommendations for best practices that help the FA as a whole and the governance structures in the system and on each of our campuses. Specifically, during the 2012-2013 academic year, the FAEC asks that the HMI group undertake the following tasks:

- Identify and catalog faculty expertise on the campuses that can be called upon to work on GA and BoG committees and taskforces. Develop a set of keywords that will make finding these faculty members easy for those who need their input. Suggested keywords include enrollment processes, student success agenda, demographics, DE, international, STEM, student services, grievance, core curriculum, community college, and many more.
- Track program closures (discontinuations) on all campuses.
- Explore the extent of faculty governance in crisis situations on our campuses. Are there best-practice processes that involve faculty in short timeframe decision making?

### **Committee Meetings and Committee Reporting**

Each committee and working group will meet during our formal FA meetings. In addition, committees are expected to do work and to conduct meetings (via conference calls, Skype, face-to-face meetings, or any other mechanism deemed appropriate by the members) BETWEEN the regular FA meetings and to gather data and prepare reports and recommendations in a timely manner so that interim reports are available to the FA and so that their final reports are ready for FA consideration as early as possible in the academic year. Because some topics are more time sensitive than others, some reports will be needed before the end of the Fall semester. Others will be needed before the March meeting of the Assembly. Each committee will be given a spot on the agenda at each formal FA meeting. At that time, a brief verbal report (and a more detailed written report, if available) will keep the FA and GA informed as to the group's progress and will allow FA delegates to give the committees feedback on their work. These reports are essential to the effective work of the Assembly.