

UNC System Staff Assembly October 9, 2008

Chair J.C. Boykin called the meeting to order at 8:38 a.m. He welcomed all. He then passed the gavel to the elected chair for 2008-2010, Kelly Eaves-Boykin. Chair Eaves-Boykin made a special presentation to outgoing Chair Boykin honoring him for his service to the Staff Assembly and the University of North Carolina. She presented him with a framed resolution honoring his service as well as a clock inscribed with his name. The Chair then asked the outgoing Executive Committee to come forward to be recognized for their many hours of service.

The Chair conducted roll call of attending delegates. She noted changes to the agenda including the shift of the chairs' committee meeting to Friday morning. The Chair then asked new delegates to stand and give their name and school.

The Chair directed delegates' attention to the minutes from the May meeting. She called for discussion. It was noted that in the state of the University reports, delegates were asked to submit the rest of their information in writing so that these comments could be entered for the record. On page 5, a delegate noted that Tammy McKenzie's name was incorrectly spelled. A delegate noted that North Carolina School of the Arts should be mentioned on the bottom of page 2. A motion was made and seconded that the minutes be accepted, and the motion was approved with none against and no abstentions.

Chair Eaves-Boykin asked past chair Boykin to serve as parliamentarian. Boykin noted that delegates should raise their hands to be recognized if they wish to speak. He said that it would be the intent of the meeting to follow the agenda as closely as possible, but the agenda was not voted on as the sole business that the Assembly could conduct today. By not voting on the agenda, the Chair will have the authority to arrange the time schedule. The meeting would follow Robert's Rules of Order. The Chair asked members to take a moment to get to know others around the room.

The Chair welcomed UNC System President Erskine Bowles to make the meeting's opening address. Bowles thanked Boykin for his service as an extraordinary asset for him. He said that he had relied on him and his judgment over and over again. He particularly said that Boykin had told him that he was marching down the wrong path in the move to remove the UNC System from the State Personnel Act, leading to the "substantially equivalent" language of Article 16. Bowles said that the UNC System Staff Assembly had made a big difference during these negotiations.

Bowles said that the University System had enjoyed three really good budget years since he began his tenure. Conversely, the System will endure a poor economy in the coming years. He cited falling exports, the weakness of the European economies and the falling confidence of the domestic consumer as reasons for the upcoming lean years. As a result, businesses cannot obtain credit and economic activity is falling.

Governor Easley had called for a .6% cut in state budgets with another 2% reversion, with the possibility of a 3% cut. Bowles followed these measures by directing chancellors to hold back another 2%. Bowles commented that it was better to enact these measures at the beginning, rather than the end, of the budgetary year. Bowles said that infrastructure was the easiest thing for a University administrator to cut in lean years. He said that employees should not bank on big salary increases this year, saying that revenues were likely to be down.

Bowles named his priorities for the University as a whole. The first involved the UNC Tomorrow effort, the purpose of which is to change the way that the University operates. He proposed to shift the University to a demand-driven model by figuring out the needs of the people of North Carolina in the next 20 years and then finding ways to meet those needs. He said that the University had held 39 listening sessions across the state. He said that the first thing was to perfect the academic planning process on each campus, specifically speeding up the review of admissions. Every university cannot be a research university. He said that the University must institute a real long-range plan for its campuses this year coordinated with what has emerged from UNC Tomorrow. Such a long-range plan must set out objectives, timelines, costs, people accountable and mitigating factors otherwise it will become useless. A real long range plan must be developed from the bottom up and must be combined with an accountability plan. He said that the "big boys" on University campuses now have real accountability for their work.

Bowles said that the University had revised its technology transfer operations policy to help attract better professors and more research dollars. He said that the University must produce more and better teachers, recalling that traditionally the state could rely on African-American women who had little opportunity elsewhere. He had established measurements of best practices at various schools of education in the University System. Bowles also said that the University must improve its work in academics areas like health care. He noted the new dental school at East Carolina University and the expansion of UNC-Chapel Hill's medical school into Charlotte and Asheville. He looked forward to expanding the University's nursing programs in coordination with community college health educators.

Secondly, Bowles noted the new leaders of System institutions, stating that ten of seventeen chancellors have been working at their jobs less than three years. He said that administrative challenges include financial aid, contracts and grants, fiscal management, accounting, and the Banner system. He said that plans are to reduce the number of options available to campuses within Banner. He said that he would work to reduce the number of mistakes and to solve problems that he inherited in campus administration.

Thirdly, Bowles noted the 80,000 additional students predicted to enter the University System in the coming years. He said that General Administration had worked to implement alternative growth strategies such as on-line education. On-line education now reaches the equivalent of 15,000 full-time students with a quality of education rated by the Navy as the best in the country.

Bowles sought to strengthen relations with community colleges. He said that the future will see more students spend their first two years at community colleges then transfer onto University campuses for their four-year degree. This option costs families and taxpayers less in the long run. Bowles was exploring the idea of allowing students to spend only what they had paid for community college tuition in their last two years with the University System. He said that campuses should expand their summer school offerings since it seemed crazy to use campuses for only nine months a year.

Bowles said that the University System was exploring placing branch campuses across the state, possibly in Jacksonville, Rocky Mount, Hickory or Henderson. He said that this expansion would be done in cooperation with local community colleges, to avoid spending money on bricks and mortar. Another area to improve educational access

without spending on buildings is to increase the number of early college courses available to high school students.

Turning to politics, Bowles said that he fortunately had a close relationship with both gubernatorial candidates, Pat McCrory and Beverly Perdue. He would continue to work closely with both sides of the Legislature and both parties. Bowles said that the difficulties with the rogue campus at North Carolina Central University had reflect poorly on the entire University System. He said that he must prove that the University is worth investment. Similarly, he called on the Assembly for help in making the case for the University's upcoming budget as important to the economic condition of North Carolina. He said that he looked forward to working with the Staff Assembly and said that he needed and wanted its advice.

Suzanne Williams confirmed that Banner standardization would still mean that the modules for finance are still available. Bowles lamented the \$11 million spent on Sunguard as money he could have elsewhere. A delegate asked what the University typically pays faculty who teach online courses. Bowles said that some are paid by the course whereas others are paid like any other faculty members are paid. He said that it costs more now to teach online than face to face, but developing these assets is important to the future. Bowles commented that a number of adult learners cannot take courses during the daytime and must learn via online methods. Some have said that they have more contact with their professors through online courses than face to face.

A delegate asked if there was a concern that the University campuses would lose customers to online courses. Bowles pointed to the estimated 80,000 additional students due to attend University campuses as a factor forcing the implementation of increased online offerings. He noted that North Carolina is projected to become the seventh largest state up from eleventh in the near future.

Margo Gross asked if Bowles foresaw General Administration becoming more involved in encouraging telecommuting on System campuses. Bowles said that he had studied the telecommuting plans at UNC-Asheville and UNC-Chapel Hill. He realized that one size would not fit all but he believed that telecommuting could make real sense for the University System. He said that if the job gets done, telecommuting creates better working conditions and a better retention rates. He asked the Assembly's help to consider this question.

Tom Johnson noted discussion about requiring students to take nine credit hours each summer. Bowles said that any move must obtain legislative support to pay for the idea. Some states like Maryland have already established summer school requirements for their students. Rosanna Bell noted a private high school's requirement that each of its students take twelve hours of college credit before they graduate. She worried that this would become a statewide trend. Bowles said that he did not know enough to comment as he was not an educator. However, he believed in setting high standards for children. He also noted that families can use programs such as Governor Easley's EARN scholarships, state-based aid, lottery funds, and Pell Grants to find ways to graduate early with a minimum of debt. However, he did not think that every child could take twelve hours of college credit in high school.

Kevin Course asked about the PACE initiative. Bowles said that he had tried to cut costs where he could, but not stupidly. He encouraged chancellors when making the .6% cuts to think about vertical cuts but also look at cutting areas. He had cut Teaching

and Learning through Technology, as one example of getting areas to operate as efficiently as possible.

Harold McKeithan asked if, given the recent stock market problems, Bowles foresaw a freeze on jobs. Bowles said that he could see a freeze on compensation but not yet. Bowles had told chancellors to hold back a 4% reversion to prepare for possible difficult times. He said that this was the toughest economic time that he had seen. A delegate asked Bowles to comment on the Banner and Beacon systems. Bowles said that the System was moving to Banner for payroll and that it would be more expensive to continue both systems. General Administration had gotten the state to agree to do payroll for the University System for a continuing period of time. He doubted whether the University System would complete its conversion by the end of 2009 as originally scheduled.

Wayne Reese asked how the System will insure that it does not place economically disadvantaged students at a loss given the increasing emphasis on SAT scores. Bowles said that he was skeptical of a test in which those who could afford test preparation could do better than those without. Surprisingly, high school grades, no matter if one went to a poor or great high school, were a better indicator of whether one will graduate from college than any other factor. Bowles said that all he could do was to provide equal opportunity to all, including illegal immigrants attending UNC System institutions.

Alan Moran asked if, given the downturn in the economy, there were plans to review the Reduction in Force (RIF) policies to insure that they are fair and impartial. He said that adherence to these policies varies by department. Bowles said that he would review the policies if the Assembly thought it a good idea to do so.

Bowles thanked the Assembly for its work.

Chair Eaves-Boykin noted that all delegates could attend the new delegate orientation. She asked the Assembly to prepare to review the body's mission statement. She explained that the Assembly bylaws require four delegates to serve on the Executive Committee, each from a different System institution and none from the same campus as Assembly officers. The Assembly will meet by video conference on the second Wednesday of each month.

The Chair said that delegates, aside from those who chair their campus organizations, should plan to serve on just one Assembly committee. This change was made to avoid delegates spreading themselves too thin.

Speaking for the Communications committee, Suzanne Williams noted that Assembly Secretary Paula Daughtry had resigned. She invited delegates to serve. Jed Tate spoke on behalf of the Diversity committee. The Governance committee would be chaired by the parliamentarian if that office were voted as part of the bylaws by the Assembly. Delegates noted that former Assembly Vice Chair Joanne McKnight had served with distinction as chair of the Innovations and Initiatives committee. The Legislative Priorities committee invited members to serve. The Chair confirmed that committee chairs serve for only a one year term.

Carolina Francis and Roger ?? served as co-chairs of the Planning and Budget committee said that group would handle expenditures, a particularly needed task given that the Assembly was considering moving to four meetings a year. The Staff Development committee was chaired by Margo Gross. Chuck Brink of the Human

Resources committee said that group would work on legislative authority for Article 16, proposed flexible scheduling for the entire System, and proposals for an increased tuition waiver program.

Chair Eaves-Boykin said that several bylaws changes will be brought to the floor later in the meeting, among them the addition of a procedural manual and a parliamentarian. She emphasized that 35,000 University employees look to the Staff Assembly for its decisions so she urged everyone to work hard on their committees. She was excited about the prospects for the coming year.

The Chair clarified that the parliamentarian would be the past chair or chair-elect, if the position were approved. She also noted that the parliamentarian would not have a vote in Assembly deliberations. J.C. Boykin confirmed that the position would allow the past chair to do more than only perform duties assigned by the current chair. However, the past chair is an ex officio position that has not been elected by a campus any longer and so has no voting rights in the Assembly. Harold McKeithan asked why the position would have the right to chair the Governance committee if it had no voting rights. The Chair confirmed that the parliamentarian's duty is to keep order and documentation from the full Assembly. She said that a person elected to chair-elect would presumably know parliamentary procedure and so could immediately assume the parliamentarian position. Suzanne Williams said that parliamentary procedure would follow Robert's Rules. She said that the role of the committee chair is to facilitate committee business, not to serve as a voting member of the committee.

The Chair confirmed that delegates would indicate their committee of choice before breaking out into separate meetings later in the afternoon. The Assembly would determine the balance of members before allowing the breakout sessions. She recommended that staff organization chairs not chair another Assembly committee, so as to avoid burning out on the Staff Assembly. A delegate confirmed that alternates can serve on Assembly committees but cannot vote unless they are serving in the place of an absent delegate.

At this point, the meeting was recessed for lunch and the new delegate orientation.

Chair Eaves-Boykin called the meeting back into order. She introduced Norma Houston to discuss the UNC Tomorrow initiative that President Bowles had mentioned that morning. Houston proposed to flesh out the priorities that Bowles had discussed earlier. She noted that the UNC Tomorrow commission had been adopted by the Board of Governors in January unanimously. Phase 1 of the effort required campus involvement and real commitment to the goals of the state and the mission of higher education. General Administration staffers have spent the summer reading the over 3,000 pages of reports from System campuses, in an effort to develop summaries that identify areas of collaboration. Interested parties can access www.nctomorrow.org for more information.

Phase 2 of the effort will address specific faculty and staff issues as well as reports from affiliated centers. In the summer, major themes emerged throughout the System. Working groups have grown from five video conferences around key issues such as access, underrepresentation, communications, global readiness, and economic transformation.

Several issues have emerged from President Bowles and the Board of Governors. For example, the Board has approved the revision of academic planning policies, with regulations being written and circulated presently. The Board has adopted a policy to address branch campuses.

The Board is also taking steps in the area of environmental stability. The University System is a major consumer of utilities across the state, representing 75-80% of the State of North Carolina's government's energy bill. General Administration anticipates sending a policy on sustainability to the Board by November of this year.

General Administration is working with Kathy Kennedy Socorra to develop an approach to private fundraising that is more systemically centered around UNC Tomorrow themes. Similarly, budget requests before the Legislature will be tied to specific UNC Tomorrow goals.

A delegate from Western Carolina University asked whether there had been any change in the General Administration report after campuses had sent in their feedback. The delegate recalled that campus had sent in a letter requesting that Native Americans be more represented in the diversity component of the report. Houston said that the report had not changed its wording but was cognizant of Native Americans. She noted that a national study notes a growing gap among the higher education attainment of males of Hispanic, Latino, black, Asian, and Native American background. Houston said that the University System had awarded a national access challenge grant to develop a committee of representatives and scholars to see what can be developed around the issue of student populations, particularly minority males. She said that Native Americans are an important part of the conversation and are included in the challenge grant.

A question arose concerning minority participation in science and technology research. Houston said that a number of programs are spread across the System. She said that the System must identify programs that have achieved measurable success and try to replicate these programs.

Houston said that Phase 2 committees would work on narrower areas not addressed in Phase 1. One main area will be academic planning, particularly studying existing and proposed new degree programs and whether these meet the high need areas of the State. Promotion and tenure policies and mission statements will also be under review. Faculty and staff recruitment and retention, most notably in light of the upcoming baby boomer retirements, are also items of concern. Given the anticipated more than 80,000 additional students arriving on System campuses in the next ten years, Houston cited the need to plan for their presence now. She also said that the need to increase the workforce would allow the campuses to increase the diversity of their workforce.

Phase 2 will ask if a particular campus is engaged in a thoughtful process to address workforce planning now and in the future. Areas of concern will include critical talent identification, needs of an aging workforce, demographic shifts, and succession planning in a multi-generational workforce. Phase 2 will ask what level of professional managerial development is present on System campuses. Who are the future deans, vice chancellors, finance leaders, and others? Phase 2 will work to provide campuses succession planning and analytical tools to meet these goals.

Houston emphasized that these questions were more of a status check than a test to see if these items were in place. A delegate asked if General Administration were also

answering these questions. Houston said that these questions are not being answered at General Administration but these issues do indeed apply to General Administration.

Lamonica Singleton asked what staff organizations can do to connect themselves to the Phase 2 discussions. Houston said that General Administration has not dictated how campuses should structure the Phase 2 processes, but has strongly encouraged them to have staff representatives.

Chair Eaves-Boykin asked what role the Staff Assembly can play in Phase 2, recalling that the Assembly had done a resolution but had not played a big part in Phase 1. Houston said that if the Staff Assembly wants to work on Phase 2 questions through its committees this work would be helpful.

Wayne Reeves observed that the majority of effort and representation was reserved on his campus for faculty issues. He said that staff representatives would need to bring their data forward aggressively to insure their voice was heard. Hap Anderson said that he thought that staff had been recognized on his campus even though history was skewed towards the faculty administrative side.

At this point the Assembly moved on to a discussion of committee preferences. It was confirmed that alternates serving on the committees must foot their own bill for attending Staff Assembly meetings if they were not attending in the place of absent delegates. Chuck Brink said that it was up to the constituent bodies whether to foot the bill for attending alternates. Alternates cannot vote on standing committees but can serve and do work. The committees ended with an average of five delegates serving on each. The Assembly then took a ten minute break.

J.C. Boykin opened discussion of the election of officers. He noted that the Assembly would have the opportunity to elect a chair-elect in alternating odd years in preparation for their two year term as chair. In even years, the past chair is set to serve on the Executive Committee in the place held by either the chair-elect or the past chair. In October 2009 the Assembly would elect another chair-elect to serve on the Executive Committee in the place of the past chair.

In addition, the Assembly will elect a one year term of vice chair, secretary, and four at-large delegates to the Executive Committee. None of the four at-large delegates can serve from the same institution as the chair, vice chair, secretary or past chair/chair-elect. Thus, eight of the seventeen institutions in the UNC System are represented on the Staff Assembly.

The vice chair conducts meetings in absence of the chair and can be designated to represent the chair at any given function or meeting. The vice chair serves as chair of the chairs' committee and assures that each are communicating with leadership of constituent units. One delegate from each institution must be the chair of that institution's staff organization. The other two delegates from each unit are elected in the manner in which the units prefer.

The secretary has responsibility of maintaining and distributing the minutes of Staff Assembly meetings as well as the Staff Assembly Executive Committee minutes. The secretary also serves as Communications Committee chair. Margo Gross confirmed that UNC-Charlotte and NC State University cannot elect any of its delegates to the positions of vice chair, secretary or the Executive Committee since they are represented by Chair Kelly Eaves-Boykin and Past Chair J.C. Boykin, respectively.

There would be two windows for nominations that do not require third party nomination, that afternoon and Friday morning before candidates address the Assembly. Candidates will be elected by written ballot. J.C. Boykin noted that all of the deliberations of the Executive Committee are subject to the open meetings act and all minutes are online. J.C. Boykin said that the Executive Committee meetings will take place by video conference on the second Wednesday of each month from 2-4 p.m.

The floor was opened for nominations for vice chair. Margo Gross nominated Scott Milman from UNC-Greensboro. Stacey nominated Wayne Reeves from East Carolina University. There were no further nominations that afternoon.

The floor was opened for nominations for secretary. Suzanne Williams said that she had served in the position before and had no desire to be placed in nomination for it again. Sherri Batson was nominated for secretary. There were no other nominations.

Nominations for at-large members then took place. Stacey Sears from Appalachian State, Tom Johnson from Western Carolina, Alan Moran from UNC-Chapel Hill, Reddie Coleman from North Carolina Central, Tommy Griffin from UNC-Chapel Hill, and Carolyn Francis from General Administration were nominated for the at-large positions. Wayne Reeves asked that his name be considered for an at-large position if he were not elected vice chair. Harold McKeithan moved that nominations be closed for the day, seconded by Chuck Brink. All present voted in favor, and the nominations were closed.

J.C. Boykin said that candidates for positions do not have to leave the room following their statements and could in fact vote for themselves.

The meeting moved into group discussion. The first item was the Article 16 Task Force and its next steps. Chair Kelley Eaves-Boykin recalled that in May, the Staff Assembly had sent a resolution through President Bowles to the Board of Governors in agreement with the Task Force report. The report was sent to the Legislature for a vote, but instead the Legislature decided not to vote in order to leave time for reelection campaigning. The issue will come up again from the Legislative Priorities committee when the General Assembly convenes in January.

Chair Boykin recalled that the Staff Assembly had met with the Chapel Hill delegates to arrive at suggestions for the Task Force report. She said that if the legislation is passed, the Staff Assembly will be asked its opinion as to how it will work for the staff of the University System. She wanted the Staff Assembly to be proactive to frame its legislation to create a positive fit for staff of UNC. She wanted a viable discussion in spite of the fear and negativity surrounding the change. She said that the Staff Assembly has a big influence on the legislation and that delegates should let President Bowles know what they like and don't like about it. She urged the Assembly to move forward given that the Board of Governors had already approved the proposal. She said that the Staff Assembly needs to serve as a representative for the 35,000 staff employees of the University of North Carolina System.

Chuck Brink suggested that delegates go to the General Administration website to read the final report of the Article 16 Task Force. The document does not address specific needs but rather identifies areas in which flexibility would help. He said that the

legislation would benefit the University System by making it more efficient in retention, hiring, and compensation, among other areas.

A delegate asked what were areas for concern. Chair Boykin said that there was much fear of the unknown about how the legislation would be framed and implemented. She said that no one had laid out how the legislation will be implemented. Wayne Reeves said that UNC Tomorrow's ideas on faculty and staff retention should be informed by the Task Force's report. A delegate noted concerns that each campus should make these decisions on their own rather than General Administration developing policies and procedures. Scott Milman said that the Assembly should go back to campus to ask what the new system would look like. He did not think that each campus would get all that it wants.

Chair Boykin urged the Assembly to frame the details of the legislation once it is possibly approved. Ann Lemmon said that Human Resources personnel are working to survey competitors of each campus as to their compensation and bonus packages in order to frame the parameters of the legislation. She said that the Task Force gave what it thought was important and the information is now rippling downward.

Harold McKeithan asked how the legislation would help SPA employees. He recalled that only the Legislature has the authority to grant bonuses. Lemmon said that the legislation could ask for the ability to put in a bonus program. Now, bonus programs must go from the Board of Governors, to the Office of State Personnel, to the State Personnel Commission. At this point, no one can ask the State Personnel Commission directly for different bonus programs because there is no authority available to have different programs. Article 16 would give the System the authority to ask the State Personnel Commission for that authority, rather than requiring an act of the Legislature each time.

McKeithan asked if giving the authority would mean that University employees lose their SPA rights. Lemmon said that it was very clear that SPA rights, often referred to as property rights such as the right to grieve, are included in Article 1. The proposed legislation is not asking for an exemption from Article 1 but rather seeks an exemption from Article 2, which sets pay and benefits. This exemption would give the University an opportunity to do different things. McKeithan asked if Article 16 left out Article 1. Chuck Brink said that the General Administration website would show that Article 1 and 8 are included in Article 16 as they were reinserted before the resolution.

A delegate asked how the Task Force addressed EPA non-faculty employee rights. Lemmon said that these had nothing to do with the Task Force, as EPA employees receive a separate allocation from the Legislature that is distributed in a lump sum. Milman noted that some EPA employees in a department receive more than the average and others less, depending on how the University chooses to allocate the lump sum money. Some employees are rewarded greatly, while others may receive nothing at all. Lemmon said that the Legislature has in the past set a minimum for EPA employees but the legislative language changes from year to year. Sherri Batson observed that EPA non-faculty have fewer rights than SPA, such as being subject to termination at a moment's notice. Lemmon said that it was not the purpose of the Article 16 Task Force to address EPA non-faculty concerns nor to replicate the EPA bonus program.

The Assembly moved to consideration of the sustainability report. Chair Boykin noted that the report had been sent to delegates to distribute to their staff organizations. A delegate said that her staff organization had solicited comments from a person with a degree in environmental science. She thought that laymen would have less to contribute to this kind of technical matter. Scott Milman thought that all staff have opinions and can contribute in some way to consideration of the report. It was noted that the Staff Assembly had a deadline of October 17 to submit comments.

A delegate noted that NC State University had decided to shut down its campus over winter break to save energy, requiring staff to take their own leave time to accommodate this change. He said that environmental initiatives can have a negative effect on staff.

Chair Boykin offered to compile the report if no one else would do it. She asked other campuses to provide her with comments to include in the final report. It was confirmed that the Staff Assembly would send reports on sustainability to Judy LeFaye of UNC-Asheville for final compilation.

The Assembly moved to delay consideration of the tuition waiver survey results until the following day. This motion was seconded and approved with no opposition.

Harold McKeithan asked what committee would handle distribution of information to employees who lack computer access. The Assembly thought that the Communications and Technology committee should handle this question. Suzanne Williams noted discussion about the need for a newsletter combined with print copies. Reddie Coleman said that North Carolina Central University had had great success with inviting facilities services personnel to attend their staff organization meetings. A delegate suggested setting up computer kiosks for these employees.

The Assembly heard a motion to move the update on the distinguished staff mentors program until the following day. The motion was seconded and approved with none opposing.

The meeting then was adjourned at 5:10 p.m. until the following day.

Respectively submitted,

Matthew Banks, Recording Secretary

October 10, 2008 UNC System Staff Assembly

Chair Kelly Eaves-Boykin called the meeting to order and took roll call. She welcomed Tami McKenzie, Nancy Jones, and Suzanne Williams to do a demonstration of the Blackboard communication system. Beth Allred had developed a video through UNC-Wilmington. Staff Assembly members can access blackboard.uncg.edu with the user name "staffassembly" and password "blackboard". The video demonstration is available at www.uncw.edu/sac then by clicking "Staff Assembly" then "Tutorial."

Chair Eaves-Boykin moved the state of the Universities section of the agenda to later on in the meeting, allowing time for discussion of the tuition waiver survey results and the distinguished staff mentor program. Stacy Sears led a discussion of the tuition waiver program, noting that over 50% of staff have not used the benefit. She thought that the figure that 19% had not used the benefit at all seemed pretty high and in fact alarming. A delegate thought that employees should have the opportunity to pay for the balance of their tuition via payroll deduction. Sears said that the next step is to look at universities outside the state. She said that the Assembly should put together a proposal by February. She said that the Faculty Assembly had expressed interest in the tuition waiver survey as well.

It was noted that the Executive Committee had held a conversation Wednesday night to discuss the best way to pass the survey onto the Human Resources committee. Chuck Brink suggested posting the electronic presentation on Blackboard. Sears said that the main thrust of the research was to get a discounted rate for dependents and spouses to attend any UNC System schools under the policy. She said that the Assembly needed to show the statistical cost of the proposed revisions to the UNC System. Margo said that the first step was to come up with the plan and the second step was to see if there was enough interest in the plan. She confirmed that employees can now receive a waiver for three 3-credit classes. It was also noted that summer school attendance is receipt driven and most schools will not accept tuition waiver use from another campus for summer school attendance. Delegates confirmed that spouses would not receive an additional 9 hours to go with the original employee's 9 hours.

Alan Moran confirmed that this waiver would work for undergraduate and graduate study. Ann Lemmon confirmed that there is not a guaranteed ability to use the tuition waiver in professional programs such as business, law, and medicine. Moran confirmed that the waiver can be used for on-line courses. It was suggested that Kitty McCollum would be a great resource to determine the cost of extending the tuition waiver to spouses and dependents.

Chair Eaves-Boykin brought forth Vice President for Governmental Relations Andy Willis to talk about the legislative priorities for the University. He looked forward to a very successful session. He cited the great support for the University in the Legislature but said that support could change on a dime. He said that the University had submitted a rigorously prioritized budget, citing continuing improvements in public safety, salaries, financial aid and health care after consultation with System chancellors. The Board of Governors should adopt a budget priority list at its November meeting. He said that there should be a continuing fight over new enrollment dollars, with some new talk about capping enrollment which he had never heard before in North Carolina. He said that Florida had had a negative experience with capping enrollment in its higher education system recently.

Willis said that the capital budget campaign had been extremely successful, thanks to the leadership of Representative Bill Owens, with \$1.2 billion in projects dedicated in the next three years. He said that this dedication far outshone that of California and Texas.

Willis said that the new election would see a 10-15% turnover in the House and Senate, as well as a new Governor. Both Perdue and McCrory would represent a significant change in state government. Regarding the current budget situation, Willis said that at least the next two to two and half years would be difficult, harkening back to the difficulties of 2000, 1991, and 1973. He cited the good news that North Carolina is considered among the top 3-4 best run fiscal states. Revenue

projections this year are up by 4%, a little less than inflation. The Governor has talked about state agencies holding back 2-3% to prepare for possible shortfalls. He said that tourism numbers are down drastically in the state, up to \$75-100 million. Willis noted that the Senate would have the first crack at the budget process this term. State agencies have been instructed to prepare for the worst. He noted that North Carolina ranks among the highest for its gas prices. This is the first time in ten years where there have been 3 months of rising unemployment at the 6% level. There also exists a decline in the housing market, but not along the level of foreclosures in Florida, Arizona, California and Texas.

Willis cited a \$242 million loss in the State Health plan this fiscal year, as opposed to a projected \$62 million loss. This jump was one of the reasons for a change in the plan leadership. Willis said that if the Legislature does not act within the first month of being in session, the plan deficit could grow to \$800-900 million in 2-3 months time. He said that the Health plan is not in serious trouble, but it is the Legislature's responsibility to collect funds for this use and it does add to the State's budget woes. He said that the hope is to hold the deficit to between \$300-500 million. There have been cuts to wellness programs and other items within the health plan administration's authority to cut.

A delegate asked on what these figures are based, noting that cuts to the wellness program were not the long-term way to stay solvent. Willis agreed, but said that the plan must find cash to make itself solvent. He said that a number of legislators have raised a question about requiring employees to pay a portion of their premium. He said that employees should pay attention to health benefits this cycle. Willis also noted that retiree health benefits cost the plan a great deal and that the move to require employees to work 20 years instead of 5 should do something about this cost. Willis noted the various worsening economic factors and compared these to 2001 when Governor Easley entered office. He predicted that hiring freezes, travel and purchases would slow down immediately to save money for Easley's successor. Willis thought that the cuts would reach 5% eventually, but praised President Bowles' ability to manage reductions competently. He also thought that if the Legislature approves a 1-2% salary increase, it would cut State Government 1-2% to fund this increase. Willis noted that the State funds 100% of payroll and so is in a better position than states like Georgia, Virginia, or California which have already started laying off their state employees.

Chuck Brink asked Willis what advice he had for the Staff Assembly in making future wage requests. He thought that there is a fiduciary responsibility to ask for what is needed but requests must be realistic. Willis noted that every 1% salary increase represents \$160 million in State funds.

Ann Lemmon commented that it would not hurt to have representatives from the House and Senate speak with the Staff Assembly as it begins to meet four times a year. Wayne Reeves asked if the Legislature would take action on a copayment increase. Willis said that it would be interesting to see if the Legislature would approach the State Health plan problem in a comprehensive fashion or piecemeal. He said that Senator Tony Rand did not like to address problems in a piecemeal fashion. Willis also cited problems with child health insurance and the Medicaid program.

The Assembly then heard statements from the various staff council chairs. Chair Stacy Sears cited the 50% increase in membership at Appalachian State as well as the council's work on town and gown issues and flexible work time questions. The chair from East Carolina University, Paula Ann Daughtry, cited the organization's participation in the million step march and the Pirate Perks program, a discount program for employees. East Carolina has also instituted an anonymous digital dropbox for employee suggestions. The chair from Elizabeth City State University, Joyce Shaw, noted the organization's participation in personnel actions and grievances, as well as the organization's purchase of a \$100 brick on the University's walk of fame.

The chair from Fayetteville State University, Harold McKeithan, cited the good relations with the University's chancellor. The chair from NC A&T University noted the two successful educational sessions this year, hosting between 300-500 employees to hear presentations and discuss issues. NC A&T will host another staff meeting to hear about a reorganization of Human Resources on that

campus. Reddie Coleman of NC Central University cited the good relations with the chancellor of that University. She noted that Central's Staff Senate had hosted diversity and leadership workshops and had worked to build a house with Habitat for Humanity. The Senate had been awarded a budget of \$3,000 this year.

The past chair of the NC School of Science and Math's Staff Council had worked to promote health and wellness this year and had made reports to the School's Board of Trustees. Steve Carlton of NC State University's Staff Senate reported that organization had entered its 14th session. The Staff Senate was exploring ways to update its bylaws and homepage and will hold a retreat in June for new senators.

Judy LaFaye, chair of the UNC-Asheville staff council, noted that group had raised money for a student scholarship. The organization had worked hard on making contributions to the UNC Tomorrow initiative. Tommy Griffin, chair of the UNC-Chapel Hill Employee Forum, cited the group's work on campus literacy programs and increasing pay for the lowest paid workers on campus. The chair from UNC-Charlotte said that group had begun a book scholarship program with revenue from soda machines and contributed to a homeless shelter initiative. The organization had held a staff recognition luncheon at which employees could receive blood pressure checks and other wellness information, in addition to a diversity day event.

Carolyn Francis of UNC General Administration's Employee Forum noted that organization's community service project. The organization is trying to get more participation and activities done and has begun work on a strategic plan to come up with goals and initiatives for the coming years. UNC-Greensboro's outgoing president Scott Milman cited the organization's achievement of obtaining office space for the Staff Senate. Aubrey Swett of UNC-Pembroke said that Staff Council had made quiet progress in getting staff involved in key committees around campus, to have a voice in what will affect the campus in the future. The Council had worked to influence the career banding process and had also raised money for scholarships for eight staff members and their dependents.

Amanda Balwoua of the UNC School of the Arts Staff Council noted that the organization would receive a small budget this year. The Council had written a welcome letter to each new staff member and had also instituted sustainability committees. Finally, the Council had raised \$2500 for breast cancer foundation research this year. UNC-Wilmington's Staff Council had instituted a scholarship program and had held four open forums on staff benefits. The Council had held a safety symposium, a weeklong employee appreciation event, and a service award luncheon. The Council had also redesigned its web page and organized a finance training certificate program. Western Carolina's chair, Jed Tate, cited a new staff award, an emergency fund to help employees facing emergencies, and a staff scholarship. Lamonica Singleton, president of the Winston-Salem State Staff Senate, noted the four meetings with executive team leaders, the combined effort to build a staff member a house, and the declaration of August 29 as Staff Senate Day.

At this time, the Assembly took a recess for lunch. The chairs' committee also met at this time.

Margo Gross cited the long work that had gone into drafting documents for the purpose of creating a distinguished staff mentoring program to enhance professional development. The goal for this effort was to improve understanding, communication, morale, efficiency and productivity. Phase Two of the process will pair interested parties together. The process will now enter a pilot stage in various library offices throughout the University System. Ann Lemmon said that the librarians involved in the project had taken ownership of the idea and were excited to have a say in what was going on. She said that the project is on the agenda for Human Resources facilitators. She also noted that NC State already has a mentors' program, and said that this new program did not mean to compete with existing programs. It was noted that this program started in the innovations committee and would possibly remain there or move elsewhere for management.

Chair Eaves Boykin called for a motion to open the floor for nominations for vice chair. The

motion was made and seconded and approved without discussion. Harold McKeithan was nominated for vice chair to go along with the other nominations of Scott Milman and Wayne Reeves. Chuck Brink moved to close the floor, a motion which was seconded and approved without opposition.

J.C. Boykin then asked each nominee to speak for two minutes as to why they would like to be elected vice chair. Scott Milman cited the service that each person does as they live life as the way they would be remembered as his keynote reason for running. Wayne Reeves noted his day to day experience as chair at East Carolina and on the Staff Assembly Executive Committee as reasons for his candidacy. Harold McKeithan said his support for everyday employees had led him to support payroll deduction for parking and athletics passes.

A delegate asked how each candidate would take care of the office of chair if the current chair were unable to fulfill their duties. McKeithan said that he would step up and take charge. Reeves said that he would follow the agenda set. Milman said that he would also follow the agenda and Robert's Rules. Donna asked how the candidates would keep the chairs' committee as productive as it needs to be. McKeithan said that he would hold meetings every month. Reeves said that he would reach out verbally to members to insure output from members. Milman said that he would try to contribute as much as he could through the blackboard process and other means.

A majority of votes was cast for Wayne Reeves, who was elected chair for the upcoming year.

The next election was for the secretary position. The floor was opened for nominations and seconded without opposition. There was only one candidate nominated, Sherri Batson. The floor was closed for nominations, seconded and approved without opposition. Sherri Batson was elected secretary by acclamation.

The nomination process was opened for executive committee representation. Nominees were Harold McKeithan, Sylvia Williams, Caroline Francis, Stacy Sears, Tom Johnson, Alan Moran, Reddie Coleman, and Tommy Griffin. Due to their having been elected to officer positions, Wayne Reeves and Sherri Batson withdrew from consideration. Alan Moran withdrew and nominated Christy Johnson for the at-large position. Scott Milman from UNC-Greensboro and Hap Giberson from NC A&T were also nominated. There was a motion to close nominations, seconded and approved without opposition.

Reddie Coleman said she had a passion for staff that led her to seek nomination. She noted her work as chair of the NCCU Staff Senate. Caroline Francis said that the Staff Assembly had greatly helped her as a member of the General Administration Forum. She wanted to help all people with solving challenges and issues. Hap Giberson said that his job as delegate was to support the entire University System. Tommy Griffin cited his 36 years and his experience serving on committees on and off campus to run for the Executive Committee. Kristie Johnson from NC A&T noted her passion for hard work as a reason to run. Tom Johnson cited a career in law enforcement and a position in the western part of the state as reason for his candidacy. Scott Milman supported the good and enjoyable work done by the Staff Assembly. Stacy Sears noted she had served as vice chair last year and cited change as her watchword for the future.

Chuck Brink asked if Tommy Griffin would put aside his differences and support the Staff Assembly to develop General Administration authority under Article 16 if he were elected to the Executive Committee. Griffin said that he would follow the leadership of the group.

There was a motion to close nominations and vote. The motion was seconded and approved with none in opposition. Chair Eaves Boykin noted that each delegate would have 4 votes. She later announced the results: Reddie Coleman 12 votes; Caroline Francis 30; Tommy Griffin 22; Kristie Johnson 14; Tom Johnson 36; Scott Milman 25; Stacy Sears 42. Francis, Johnson, Milman and Sears are the four elected representatives to the Executive Committee.

The discussion moved to committee reports. Chuck Brink of the Communications committee reported that group had asked for a copy of the draft study on telecommuting and would look at the policies of technology introduction. The committee would work to establish a unique logotype with the cooperation of graphic arts groups. The committee would like to establish a quarterly newsletter as

well.

Reedie Coleman of the Diversity committee said that group was working to restructure itself to interact online. Joyce Shaw of the Governance committee had been elected vice chair and that committee was looking for a secretary. She noted that one amendment and several recommendations were to be presented to the Staff Assembly for consideration. First, in article 3, section 8, page 2, the committee sought to add a number 5, reading that the past chair or chair elect shall serve as parliamentarian for the Assembly, and also serve as chair for the Governance committee. The motion was made to accept the recommendation by Tommy Griffin and seconded by Harold McKeithan, with all in favor, no opposition and no abstentions. J.C. Boykin thus became chair of the Governance committee.

The committee also recommended that the Assembly adopt an operations manual to give a step-by-step process on the Assembly's work, standing committees, and other guidance procedures. A delegate asked the timeline for producing an operations manual. Shaw said that it was hoped to have it prepared by the spring meeting. A delegate confirmed that the Governance committee would be responsible for its production. There was a motion to adopt the recommendation that was seconded and approved with none in opposition.

The committee recommended adding voting protocols to the bylaws. Wayne Reeves asked if the protocols would be appropriate to the bylaws or the operations manual. Suzanne Williams thought it more appropriate to have the protocols outside the bylaws since the bylaws were more rigid. She made a friendly amendment to integrate the protocols into procedure. Chuck Brink accepted the friendly amendment was accepted.

Shaw recommended that the Assembly add an article to the bylaws detailing how changes to the bylaws will take place to be voted on in the spring. A delegate thought possibly something needs to be done now. Another delegate thought that the existing bylaws had enough information in them to grant the Executive Committee authority to deal with anything that might come up between now and the spring. That delegate said that technically now the Assembly could change anything with a minority vote but bylaws changes normally require either a 2/3 or 3/4 vote, as well as at least 30 days notice.

The motion to develop a procedure for amending the bylaws was seconded and approved without discussion or opposition.

Shaw noted that article 2, section C1 of the bylaws says that regular meetings shall take place twice each fiscal year. The Governance committee recommends that the meetings take place four times per fiscal year to allow more time for committee work and more in line with the Faculty Assembly. Caroline said that the Budget and Planning committee was looking at finances and had a concern about supporting four meetings a year. She noted that part of the bill from the visit to Appalachian State University was not paid until this fiscal year. Shaw said that the meetings would be one two day meeting and three one day meetings.

Chair Eaves-Boykin said that the Governance committee had approached President Bowles about meeting four times a year to carry on committee meetings. A delegate thought it best to put this proposal into the operations manual rather than the bylaws. Scott Milman noted that the Faculty Assembly does not incur costs for meeting space because it meets at General Administration those four times a year. He thought that the Staff Assembly might want to meet in places in which it does not have to cover meeting hall costs if it chooses to meet four times a year. Sherri Batson asked if the Assembly could request money for this purpose from the President. Chair Eaves-Boykin said that the Assembly receives \$25,000. Batson pointed out that the Faculty Senate at UNC-Wilmington sometimes has budgets at the school level for travel.

Wayne Reeves read the recommendation that the Staff Assembly meet four times per fiscal year in accordance with a schedule published and distributed no later than July 1 to Staff Assembly delegates by the secretary. He moved to close discussion. The motion was seconded and approved

without opposition. The motion to accept the recommendation was seconded and approved without opposition. A delegate recommended that the Governance committee clean up wording in item 2 and 3 of the operations manual noting the vice chair's position as chair of the chairs' committee.

The Innovations and Initiatives committee's chair Judy LaFaye reported that the group had found that many staff using tuition waivers could still not afford the accompanying textbooks. The committee would work on this question as well as other ideas that delegates might have.

The Legislative Priorities committee discussed the RIF policy question that Alan Moran brought up to President Bowles. The committee would take another look at the State Health plan as Andy Willis recommended. A delegate suggested that the committee post various documents associated with these questions on blackboard when available.

The Human Resources committee established regular meeting dates for the second Thursday of each month from 2-4 p.m. via teleconference. The committee will look at tuition waiver transfer information and the flexible work schedule initiative. A delegate asked about the pay raise resolutions and appreciated Andy Willis' comment that these made a difference as long as they are reasonable and supportable. Jonlynn Cripe said that the committee will continue to monitor Article 16 as well as equity questions across the various universities, particularly how various staff organizations can obtain administrative support.

The committee asked for comments on a telecommuting and flexible scheduling document to come from various campuses to tie into the UNC Tomorrow initiative. Chuck Brink observed that flexible scheduling at UNC-Chapel Hill had led to an up-tick in moral and productivity. He said that some administrative pressure had to be brought to bear to convince Facilities Services to embrace flexible scheduling. Brink said that no additional manpower was necessary for flexible scheduling. Wayne Reeves asked if every workforce was sufficiently sized or oversized to allow for core hour support and Brink responded that this would be determined from school to school. A delegate asked if there were any provision whereby an employee could acknowledge not to challenge a bad performance rating. Brink said that this was a good question and that there was some feeling against the proposal as being potentially ungrievable, particularly in smaller areas lacking coverage. Connie Boyce asked if the supervisor was required to be on-sight for all shifts. Brink said that overlap was built in whereby one supervisor was one while another was off. This again would need to be worked out unit by unit. Tommy Griffin said that flexible scheduling had reduce absenteeism in his department 25% as well as reducing overtime. Brink said that flexibility at either end of the schedule had led to use of public transportation or carpooling.

A delegate asked what consideration is given to students and faculty and administrators with only one support person whose workday does not end until 5 p.m. Cripe said that the committee recognizes that not all units, particularly small units, can participate in this kind of flexible scheduling. She said that the number one priority is to educate students, which is the reason that flexible scheduling is at the department or manager head's discretion. Chair Eaves-Boykin said that her office had had some success with extended hours leading to one Friday a month off. Another delegate said that the flexible scheduling had caused some hurt feelings towards vice chancellors and departments that would not allow certain areas to participate. This delegate hoped that the idea could be used as a template. Another delegate thought that the possibility of reducing costs could serve to garner more support for the idea.

Delegates were asked to respond to the proposal by December 10. The motion was made and seconded and approved with none in opposition.

The Staff Development committee moved that the group's new name be shortened from the Staff Development and Wellness and Morale committee. The motion was made and seconded and approved with none in opposition. The committee had worked on a revised committee purpose, with a goal to increase tangible benefits and promote health and wellness and other training programs.

The Planning and Budget committee planned to post excel spreadsheets on blackboard and to

create a template form for committees to project their expenses and encumber funds.

The Chair of the Chairs' Committee, Wayne Reeves, did not have a report.

Chair Eaves-Boykin noted that the Chair can appoint a Nominating committee before the fall meeting to seek nominations for various positions.

The Assembly moved to induct the new officers into their positions.

A delegate asked what happened with the tenure of delegates who are committee chairs but whose term expires in June. What happens between June and the next fall meeting. Chair Eaves-Boykin said that she did not know and so said this was the reason to create an operations and procedures manual. Caroline said that the past Governance committee had left it to campuses to decide when to elect new delegates to the Assembly. The Chair proposed that the Governance committee study this question further.

The Chair said that she would send out announcements about guests for the February meeting at a later date. Rebie Coleman observed that there had been many side conversations during the past two days that she found unbelievable. She urged delegates to give speakers respect during their time speaking.

There was a motion to adjourn that was seconded and approved without opposition. The meeting thereby adjourned at 4 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Matt Banks, Recording Secretary