**Minutes**

**UNC Faculty Assembly Meeting, September 21, 2012**

**Spangler Building, General Administration, Chapel Hill, NC**

9:00 Faculty Assembly Convenes

9:00 The assembly was welcomed by Catherine Rigsby (ECU), and she introduced President Tom Ross and Chairman of the Board of Governors (BOG) Peter Hans to address the strategic planning process currently underway by the BOG.

Peter Hans gave a brief introduction to himself, discussing his15 years of academic governance experience between the Community College system (6 years) and the BOG (9 years). He is currently working on a Masters degree thesis and joked about being nervous about being surrounded by this many faculty. He welcomed the Delegates and thanks for effort and appreciates the group’s work on Academics First.

President Ross has put together five key strategies that need addressing over the next five years:

* Look at what is the need in NC for degree attainment
	+ What degrees do we need over the next 5-10 years
	+ Currently around 25% in NC with degrees
	+ Goal is likely 35% by 2018, so many more degrees needed
	+ Additional AA degrees (goal likely about 60% total degrees with AA included)
	+ How to take one million with some credit but no degree to finish
	+ Work to increase retention and graduation rates
* Enhancing Academic Quality
	+ Have to keep an eye on academic quality
	+ Utilize technology and assessment
	+ Academics First
* Efficiency
	+ Sharing services like residency determination and financial aid processing
* Mission to Serve People of NC
	+ Economic Development
	+ Community Service
	+ Health Care
* How are we going to finance higher education?
	+ Student load debt is a major issue
	+ Need to continue keeping tuition as low as possible
	+ Assessment of program quality and reviews
	+ Operational efficiency
		- Health care and utilities

To advance on these strategic directions we need to discuss several issues, including what are the metrics by which we are to be judged? The advisory group will be particularly useful in understanding the needs in the employment sector?

He will be calling on Faculty for many of the other questions as we move forward. There are many challenges ahead and he looks forward to working with us.

Chairman Hans:

The system is required to undergo strategic planning every five years and he worked on UNC Tomorrow and thought it was a very useful and inclusive process, although quite labor intensive.

* Objective here, in his mind, is a bit different, and that is to renew support from business and political structure in the state for the system. Since the prior process, there has been a severe economic recession.
	+ Budget issues have required reprioritization, which is positive in some ways, but has taken a toll
	+ Political establishment had previous leaders like Marc Basnight and Tony Rand that backed education as backbone of state development but they are no longer in place.
	+ Will be continued downward pressure on both state and federal funds
	+ State budget will hopefully be stable but will be dealing with increasing demands like growth in K-12 and community colleges
	+ To renew the commitment he and Ross have invited some of those new leaders to be involved in the process
	+ Hope and expectation that we will be rewarded

He believes education is about more than developing job skills; it’s about the total experience. Being exposed to visual and performing arts, humanities, social sciences, and becoming a better citizen. That is not a question on this committee. Lots of the talk will be around workforce needs, but he thinks that is a good thing coming back to the renewed connection.

Process starts with President Ross and goes from there to a working group: Chancellors, GA Staff, one BOG member. This is the group that sets the agenda, develops documents, invites speakers, etc. and goes from there to broader steering committee (30 or so members with broad representation of Chancellors, BOG members, business and political leaders) and should be completed by January 2012.

President Ross:

* He believes that while the budget is more stable than it was two years ago, but there are still significant issues
* We still owe 2 billion dollars in unemployment payments to Fed
* 4-5 billion dollars in delayed maintenance for the university
* Medicaid (already running a hole this year)
* Not going to be an immediate bounce back

Likely 60% of legislature will be first or second termers, and many of them will not have been through the budget process more than once. We will need to educate these people about what the system means and how it works. There will also be a new governor as well.

Q-Hans Kellner-NCSU: Been through Strategic plan at University and wants to know what the results will look like in terms of detail. We have large number of varied institutions with many different goals and needs. How broad will conclusions of plan be, or will it be action steps that may cause difficulties at some campuses?

A-Tom Ross: Likely some of both, but there are some areas like degree attainment where there will be some fairly specific goals so that the BOG can go to the General Assembly and ask for funds to support those goals. There are others that will have specifics like efficiency, some of the shared services and similar recommendations to save money, mostly on the business side of the campus. Doesn’t anticipate any specific goals on the academic sides, but may ask people to look hard at some things.

Q-Brian Sims-NCA&T: Spoke about the need to involve the business and political community. Have they gotten any pushback from faculty members about the perceived dangers of the close relationship between political and business community with this process and not the academic sector?

A- Peter Hans: There have been some concerns expressed about the shortage of faculty input, but the hope is that we can deal directly with some concerns of those political or business people in a strategic way that benefits the university.

Q-Steven Bachenheimer-UNC: People who are carrying out these plans are faculty and he fails to see how in this document how faculty concerns and needs will be addressed. No salary increases, faculty turnover, concerns about the type and quality of new faculty to be hired. Views on replacement faculty, who they will be, tenure vs. non-tenure, how we will meet this huge coming need for degrees?

A- Tom Ross: We need the investment of business and political community in meeting the strategic goals, but we should be making decisions locally on how we meet those goals. Discussions are occurring about how our benefits and compensation are competitive with other states. There will be some discussion about tenure and some education of a few of the Board Members that tenure is also necessary for competitiveness. Funds must be allocated for retention and recruiting good new faculty. Part of this discussion is an education of the BOG and steering committee.

Q-Chet Dilday-FSU: While not as inclusive as UNC tomorrow because of time frame, but can we do more. There is an assumption that we can educate the business and political community, but can we change minds about some of the biases? Even if the economy gets better, can we develop a plan for when the economy inevitably goes down? We need to reach out to the people of the state. We are depending on the 1% to do the right thing? Many of these folks were elected on the promise of lower taxes. Building a vast machine to support the military and business entrepreneurs, but what about the 47% who need a social safety network?

A-Tom Ross: History of UNC has been bipartisan and both parties have pulled together for the system. Chairman Hans and I (Ross) came from different backgrounds but we both pull together to improve the system. Some of the lightning rods on the strategic planning group have been big supporters of the university, and they are deeply committed to the university regardless of their politics. You have to work within the environment you are given, which may change radically in November, but may not. We have an ongoing effort to build public message using every avenue to tell them what the system does for them. Social media, a map that shows everything the university does on a county-by-county basis.

Q-Sarah Russell-NCSSM: In what ways can the communities on the various campuses support these decisions by bringing information and materials to the planning group considering the short time frame? What kinds of requests for data and what can we do to help with the process.

A-Tom Ross: By faculty to gather information on technological utilization in the classroom, how much distance education and innovative teaching methods like flipping the classroom. There has to be a lot going on in campuses utilizing technology to assess and enrich students’ experiences. Lots of pressure and focused attention by the advisory group on doing this better and faster. Have to figure out how much retooling of the faculty to carry out this process.

A- Peter Hans: Each meeting of the working and advisory groups is open to the public and they want to hear from you. Catherine Risgby is on the advisory committee. Dr. Kim Johnson (UNC) is coming next week to talk about how the state’s demographics have changed and how to make education accessible and affordable. Wants to hear from faculty, staff and students.

Q- Catherine Risgby: Will the meeting dates and other materials going to be available on the website?

A-Tom Ross: Yes, Kimrey Rhinehardt is leading this effort.

10:02 Suzanne Ortega, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

Most immediate priorities in her opinion:

* Review of CAO meeting agenda for next week
	+ Discussion of Academics First
	+ Increase in satisfactory academic progress standards
	+ Census day as uniform add/drop date
	+ Early warning system policy
		- All campuses should develop a system
		- Timely Feedback before middle of the term
* Assessment of Economic Development and Community Engagement
	+ Uniform faculty accomplishment system that crosswalks across campus/system
	+ How does a campus collect information to assess their level of community engagement
	+ Had heard that some faculty don’t want an accomplishment system
		- But if we are truly to reward faculty and campuses, we need to collect this information
		- Do we want to develop our own system?

Q-Jimmy Reeves-UNCW: Each campus is making it up as they go along, and he is in favor of a unified system so long as the faculty are involved in the development of the system. He is convinced a lot of the data that is reported is flawed.

A- Suzanne Ortega: Agreed, the real question is can we find a system that is robust enough and precise enough to generate meaningful data? Is the platform amenable and useful for data mining and report generation?

Q-Jim Martin-NCSU: This whole discussion truly hinges on the “if” you discussed. If we are truly going to reward, if we had confidence that it would work, if there will be merit pay. The problem is that we have heard for twenty years that we will have accountability, but we have seen that more accountability seems to be that we spend more time documenting and doing less. Can you give us a sense if there is any commitment to answering these “ifs”?

A-Suzanne Ortega: Some is accountability; some of it is public relations in outreach to the citizenry. The real problem is that if this is something we value, then we need a way to measure it and reward it.

Q-George Wilson-NCCU: Aren’t we comparing apples and oranges? May punish smaller universities and HMI’s. He has concerns about how the data is used to make comparisons.

A-Suzanne Ortega: Fully understand. We have made a concerted effort to do system wide reports and then do each campus separately to see the patterns of performance and change over time.

A-Leslie Boney-VP: We have tried in makeup of committees to be inclusive of different types of universities. Tried to pick variables that each institution can use to assess and work on. Unfortunately there is not a national consensus on how to measure these things.

Notis Pagiavlas-WSSU: Part of committee, have to sacrifice uniqueness for specificity so there is that push-pull aspect to the process. Still very difficult to quantitate so both quantitive measurements and anecdotal as well. Challenge faculty to consider how to prove we are worth something to outsiders.

10:35 Roundtable Discussions (brief intro, then 30 minutes per session)

1. Articulation Issues (FAEC Facilitators: Sarah Russell and Jim Martin) (GA participants: Suzanne Ortega, Bruce Mallette, Alisa Chapman, Maggie O’Hara)
2. International Programs (FAEC Facilitators: Margery Coulson-Clark and Hans Kellner) (GA participants: Leslie Boney)
3. Student Success and the Performance Funding Model (FAEC Facilitator: Andrew Morehead) (GA participants: Kerri Dixon, Kate Henz, Dan Vogel)

12:00 Lunch (Board Room)

1:00 Chair Rigsby discussed the decision by the FAEC during their retreat to reform four of the previous committees, with several new subcommittees in some of those.

We have set the adjournment time so that we have more time for committee work, so plan to attend until at least 4:00-4:30 so we maintain a quorum and can do business. She reminded the Assembly delegates to send alternate if you cannot attend, and give them the materials relevant to your committee assignment.

Also, Chair Rigsby reminded the assembly that they should go back to their campus and share information with the faculty senates.

Introduction of Committee Chairs and brief discussion of charges.

1. Academic Standards and Policies Committee – Articulation Subcommittee (Sarah Russell and Jim Martin)
2. Academic Standards and Policies Committee – International Programs Subcommittee (Margery Coulson-Clark and Hans Kellner)
3. Academic Standards and Policies Committee – Student Success Subcommittee (Andrew Morehead)

Dealing with implications of the new funding formulas and how we assure academic quality.

1. Budget Committee (Catherine Rigsby)
2. Faculty Welfare and External Communications (Chet Dilday and Eddie Souffrant)

Looking at guidelines for effectively communicating faculty concerns to our constitutencies (Parents, Students, BOG, GA, etc). Introduced Scott Braswell-new media specialist who will be redesigning UNC website. Want to make sure our communications with our legislature is a positive.

1. Governance Committee (David Green and Raymond Burt)

Working on hearing and grievance policies on campuses, making sure in line with UNC code. Work on thinking about how faculty governance is working on our campuses, particularly in times of crisis.

1. HMI Caucus

Track how Academics First is affecting their campuses. Think about now academic barriers to student success, as AF deals primarily with minimum standards.

1. Senate Chairs

Form listing of faculty expertise on campus to form database. Will also track program closures on campuses.

Committees met in advance of the Plenary Session.

2:45 Plenary Session (Board Room)

Rigsby: Announcements

 The link to submit agenda items, will come out two weeks before meeting.

 Reminder to read strategic plan materials on website.

 Introduction of Maggie O’Hare as new Director of E-Learning.

 Introduction of the new Chief of Staff – Kevin Fitzgerald.

 Bruce Mallette is retiring.

Voted approval of the March 2012 Meeting Minutes

(http://www.northcarolina.edu/fa\_meetings/index.php?pg=vb&node\_id=s13006)

Committee Reports and discussion

Student Success-Andrew Morehead

 Lively discussion

 Consensus that we should be doing this, but not agreement on how

 Assess soft skills vs. hard skills

 Can we use SACS data to access academic quality?

Committee agrees that Early Warning document forwarded to the committee was a good idea with its general guidelines requiring that early warnings be given in a timely manner without being overly specific about timing.

Articulation Issues-Sarah Russell

 Community College Transfer Issue-Generally Core Courses well handled

Discussion of how well students are advised, expectations, understandings, etc.

 Action Items-How does each campus handled transfers and who advises

 Is this a single office, etc.

 Future-Where online courses, international, etc are going?

International-Margery Coulson-Clark

 How can we use economies of scale to streamline process?

 How is rigor assessed?

 Identify students who are ambassadors abroad?

 Ensure our students are engaged in competitive programs

 Not brought up today-still part of the discussion?

Faculty Welfare and External Communications-Chet Dilday

 Interactive webpage has been built by Scott Braswell and his staff

 Intranet being built

 Reach NC – Website ReachNC.org

 Considering Benefits in a broader sense

 Retirement contribution matching ratios

Governance-David Green

Separate individual appeals of employment actions from campus wide processes

 Request President Ross affirm his support of shared governance

 Resolution on Shared Governance passed (text below).

Committee requests that each campus have an ombuds office.

 Extensive debate, discussion of study before proceeding.

Motion to table by Eddie Souffrant, voted yes.

 Committee will work with Raymond Burt on best practices

HMI-Chet Dilday

Move that Governance draft resolution on Assessing Shared Governance by the administration on each campus. Passed by the Assembly and accepted by Governance committee.

Discussion of utility of SAT and numbers of admit by exceptions being too low in Academics First.

Would like the GA to publish a listing of what they have asked campuses for input.

 Catherine Rigsby will work on that issue.

Budget Committee-Catherine Rigsby

 Met with Leslie Cates and discussed legislative budget agenda.

Action Item: Revisit Academic Core White Paper and look at that from the perspective of the most recent budget cuts

Voted approval of the proposed changes to UNC Policy Manual Sections 400.1.5 and 700.1.1

 Resolution moved by Catherine Risgby, Second Sarah Russell

 Approved (text below)

Resolution on Faculty input into the BOG strategic planning process was moved by Andrew Morehead. Passed after many friendly amendments (full text below).

4:10 Adjourn

**UNC Strategic Plan Input**

Submitted by the UNC Faculty Assembly

September 21, 2012

WHEREAS

The UNC System is initiating strategic planning process for 2013-18 to set current and future priorities, resource planning and allocation, program planning, review and refinement of academic missions reflecting the University’s deep commitment to help North Carolina respond to changing state needs and economic challenges, and

WHEREAS the Faculty of the UNC system have responsibility for developing, delivering, and assessing the curriculum, and

WHEREAS the Faculty develop, pursue, and publish original research expanding the knowledge foundation on which our future depends, and

WHEREAS the Faculty advise, mentor, and engage students in the activities that lead directly to their future occupations and improve their quality of life, and

WHEREAS all these components contribute immensely to both current job creation and our citizens’ preparedness for the future, and

WHEREAS the Charter of the Faculty Assembly provides “The Assembly shall, through appropriate channels, advise the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina, the General Assembly, and other governmental agencies and officers on matters of University-wide importance, and

The Assembly shall advise and communicate with the President of the University of North Carolina with regard to the interests of the faculties and other matters of university-wide importance.”

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty be informed of strategic planning activities and a mechanism be created to solicit input at the campus level throughout the process so as to achieve effective outcomes and the strong faculty buy-in, and

RESOLVED that in order to define and support measures that advance the quality of the University system representatives of the Faculty Assembly be informed during the strategic planning process, and that the President of the University, in collaboration with the Chair of the Faculty Assembly, create a faculty group to interact and collaborate with the Business/Political community advisory committee for the University’s strategic planning.

**Affirmation of Shared Governance**

Submitted by the UNC Faculty Assembly

September 21, 2012

RESOLVED that President Ross affirm his support for the principles of shared governance adopted by the faculty assembly in April 2005 and that his affirmation be conveyed to the Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer at each campus.

2012-01

**Resolution on Policy Changes Related to Academics First**

Approved by the UNC Faculty Assembly

September 21, 2012

**Whereas:**

* The “Academics First work group” was tasked with advancing the work initiated by the UNC Faculty Assembly
* The goal of “Academics First” is to enhance access, excellence, and timely undergraduate degree completion
* Changes to minimum admission requirement language (BOG Policy 700.1.1 and BOG Regulation 700.1.1.(R)) was intended to promote access while maintaining success
* A system wide minimum standard for Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP) and Good Academic Standing supports “Academics First”
* A system wide commitment to a minimum standard on core academic processes, such as drop/add, course repeat, grade replacement and withdrawal supports “Academics First”

**Therefore be it resolved that:**

The Faculty Assembly supports both the June 2012 Report of the Academics First Working Group, and the proposed changes to UNC Policy Manual Sections 400.1.5 (Improving Retention and Graduation Rates) and 700.1.1 and the related regulations (400.1.5(R) and 700.1.1(R)).

September 21, 2012

**Faculty Assembly – Articulation Subgroup**

Notes

**From Roundtable Discussions:**

Concerns voiced:

* Non equivalency of some comm. College sciences relative to four year schools and yet accepted for full credit anyway
* Ongoing concern that many courses – particularly in STEM fields – are not as rigorous at CC level despite the articulation agreements
* Concerns about new learning objectives tied to SACS-CASI reviews that seek other learning competencies beyond content – how will these be evaluated and articulated?
* Lots of CCs students transferring without AA or AS degree finished/ seem unprepared for pursuing a major and perhaps ill-advised in their choice of lower courses
* Where do online courses fit in?
* Hours in residence to earn a degree from specific university? Is this consistent?
* Need for more universal standards for lower level gen ed courses? Is there a clear common core?
* Early College students are often very bright but seem developmentally unprepared for college work and life – expectations for EC students sometimes differ from CC transfers – also as minors and non-drivers they need different accommodations
* Lots of UNC students also transfer back to CCs – what are the needs and issues for this group?
* Need to better address who CC students are – more often they are traditional age students, some are strong academically, just saving money by going to CC, while some are actually weak students who could not gain admittance to university – different kind of support needed for the two groups.
* Should we look for more coherent alignment – following New York or California system as a model?

**Student Success-Afternoon Session**

**Chair: Andrew Morehead**

**Roster:**

Karen Hornsby (NCA&T)

Korah Wiley (NCSSM)

Laurie Patterson (UNC-W)

Kelly Charles (FSU)

Frederick Buskey (WCU)

Deborah Eaker-Rich (UNC)

Anita Blowers (UNC-C)

Sandra Rogers (NCCU)

James Holloway (ECU)

Jeff Bolles (UNC-P)

Kerri Dixon (GA)

Dan Vogel (GA)

**Notes:**

 What are the primary faculty concerns with the current set of performance criteria?

All productivity criteria

Who is the future audience for this?

What is our value added and how do we measure it for specific audiences?

The public access to teaching evaluations and departmental data.

 Which of the current “counting” criteria give the best measurement of student success?

No consensus achieved

 What are alternative quality criteria that will measure student success?

Can we access SACS data and utilize it in such a measure?

 Which of the above alternatives may be reasonably captured?

No consensus achieved

 Are there politically viable alternatives to the performance funding model we should

explore?

None identified

Early Warning policy:

Committee agrees that Early Warning document forwarded to the committee was a good idea with its general guidelines requiring that early warnings be given in a timely manner without being overly specific about timing.

**Articulation Committee Meeting - Afternoon**

Present:

Sarah Russell, NCSSM

Jim Martin, NCState

Radiah Minor, NC A &T

Maggie O’Hara, UNCGA

Kulwinder Kaur-Walker, ECSU
George P. Wilson, NCCU

Lothar Dohse, UNCA
Ray Fielding, UNCC
Robert Kulesher, ECU
Jimmy Reeves, UNCW

Steve Leonard, UNC-CH

Addressed the many versions of articulation worth evaluating

* transfer from CCs
* from 4 years
* from international
* Early College
* DE

- focused on conventional (mostly) CC transfer articulation in this discussion.

The Structure largely works. There was general agreement that process on most campuses is effective: Admissions/registrar/transfer office evaluates all general ed lower level courses (based on pre-set articulation agreements) and then sends upper-level courses to individual departments for evaluation. Some concern that on a few occasions, admissions or registrar evaluated an upper-level course inaccurately, but that seemed to be a rare circumstance.

**General Issues…**

* who is evaluating transcript.
* Probably not so much a course articulation issue as it is a preparedness for articulation, or communication of what is needed for articulating into a degree program.
* Largest problem is students transferring in with a set of courses as opposed to transferring in with completed a program e.g. an AS degree.
* Meshing articulation with “cluster credit” Writing intensive, global learning, critical thinking …need interdisciplinary cluster (e.g. environmental chemistry part of a cluster of set of say three courses). How will cluster credit be evaluated? Will it sacrifice content credit?
* note that equivalency can be undermined by quality of dept/instructor at specific schools
* related concern that while content may be the same for lower level gen ed requirements, rigor and pace of the course at CC is not up to par with university version – Professors must teach to the level of their students, and that may mean a slower, more supportive class environment at CC level – need more longitudinal studies to verify that possibility.

Related issue - lower level gen ed from CCs accepted automatically, while same courses from schools within the 4 year UNC system seem to be less accepted.

Agreed that most campuses (Chapel Hill – less so) have some experience with CC transfers being less successful than students who begin their degrees at the school.

Questions: Do transfer students get sufficient information about which courses will transfer and what they need to be well prepared to come into university at junior level, declare and pursue a major? Do they have info on the value of finishing associates degree first? do they get sufficient info about choosing a major and choosing courses to support it ahead of time?

First Action Item – For UNC system campus:

1. Locate and evaluate online/web page support for incoming transfer students
2. find dept/office responsible for transfer articulation, intake, support, and ask them if the issues we have identified align with the concerns they have or are seeing in current transfers
3. Compile and send this information to Sarah Russell

Faculty Governance Committee meeting on September 21, 2012

Present: Dale Pollock, UNCSA, Ralph Scott, ECU, Gabriel Lugo, UNCW, Mary Jean Ronan Herzog, WCU, Brian Sims, NCAT, Susan Cannata, UNCP, Dimitri Argyropoulos, NCSU, Stella Anderson, APPSTATE, Susan C. Staub, APPSTATE , Jan Boxill, UNC, David A. Green, NCCU, Chair

We clarified that there was a distinction between a faculty member challenging an employment decision as oppose to a faculty member challenging share governance, where administrators are making decisions without faculty input.

There was a consensus that each campus has different procedures regarding a faculty member challenging an employment decision and often not in compliance with UNC-GA codes.

There was a consensus that it is unclear whether GA, and specifically, President Ross, supported the principles of faculty governance approved by the faculty assembly in April 2005. There was further discussion as to whether there was a later document on faculty governance approved in 2009.

After lengthy discussion, a motion was made to “request that President Ross to affirm his support for the principles of shared governance adopted by the faculty assembly in April 2005.” The motion was seconded and the motion carried*. [The motion carried before the full faculty assembly.]*

After lengthy discussion, a motion was made that “GA require each campus to have an omnibus office for faculty.” The motion was seconded and the motion carried. *“[The motion was tabled by the full faculty assembly. There was a request to get additional information and place this issue on the agenda before the full faculty assembly during the October meeting.]*

The committee recommended that each faculty senate at each of the campuses endorse its support for the principles of shared governance adopted in 2005. [During discussing before the full faculty assembly, it was decided not request an endorsement.]

We agreed to continue to work with Raymond Burt on establishing “best procedures” for grievance hearings addressing faculty challenging employment actions. We will also assure appropriate training.

Submitted: by David A. Green, Chair, Governance Committee