9:00 Faculty Assembly Convenes
   Welcome and Meeting Overview (Catherine Rigsby)

9:10 Tom Ross, President (30 minute)
   Updates and comments from President Ross
   • Need faculty input regarding quality, inputs, outcomes, strengths, and weaknesses of current models to assess student learning.
   • Need input on understanding e-learning: what is happening already, what we can do to support/enhance e-learning into the future
   • Help others understand the importance of integrating technology into the classroom – we need more emphasis and policy leaders need to understand that. Technology will grow in importance in both distance and traditional instruction – this is not just about online instruction.
   • Acknowledged a very tight timeline. Early 2013 is still the timeline (Feb board meeting) to be ready for the budgeting process.
   • Do we want to continue on our current path or do we want to become more aspirational – think about economic/social correlates with education.
   • Reported on a healthy discussion with employers on what they need: broad liberal arts but also depth of learning (internships, research projects). Heavy emphasis on “soft skills”

Questions & Answer with President Ross
1. Is there enough quantitative data to capture university impact? Yes there is and we have example. Will they be used?
   • What is the data surrounding impact of education on social effects? We need that data, please share it with committee members.

2. When we talk about revenue versus cost are we including the cost to society of not educating people, such as the correlations of drop-outs with crime and medical costs?
   • Need to try and capture that

3. What is the role for each individual campus (beyond gathering data)? Is there room for a campus-by-campus response?
   • We are open and welcome it if campuses want to tackle it.
4. More restrictions on how we can use money (e.g. distance ed money funds local grad student program but can’t do this because of the rules; all tech fees go to trust fund, but trust fund restricts how the money can be spent.) prevents us from being entrepreneurial.
   - Send me the examples because we are going to work on restrictions with legislators

5. Shared governance – we need more specificity than that given in the Code. How does it get enacted?
   - Believe in shared governance – I will follow it myself.

6. “Shared” becomes top-down; strategic planning needs to balance corporate and community needs – my community sees a polarization, they can’t even agree on definitions. Community need should reflect importance of community impact above serving corporations
   - It is there, but keep sharing
   - Concern about shared governance when faculty who question controversial decisions become targets of retaliation. Faculty won’t always get their way. If this is a problem then the faculty need to sit down with the Chancellor.

7. Regarding the loss of Bill Friday there was a proposal to place an empty chair under his portrait to remind us that he is still in the room.
   - I echo your sentiments and said the same thing to the committee.

9:40 The Faculty Assembly is an advisory committee, and we are not bound by the Open Meetings law. However, today we had two visitors: Jay Schalin, from the Pope Center (http://www.popecenter.org/about/author.html?id=316), and Robert Lee, VP of Academic Affairs of the UNC Association of Student Governments (http://www.uncasg.org/). The other observers in the room were all invited GA staff members (many of whom attend almost all of our meetings, e.g., Bruce Mallette, Karrie Dixon, and Kate Henz).

Kimrey Rhinehardt, Vice President for Federal Relations (20 minute)
Update on the work of the UNC Strategic Directions Committee (the “working group”),
   - I gather the data and report them, please share not as input but as collaboration
   - This is a tipping point in the process but it does not need to mean a radical departure from what we do now, but we need to adjust to student changes
   - Strong commitment to Liberal Education
   - University as a community anchor
   - Need to identify and invest in pipelines
• Bio-tech and other advanced technologies  
• Strengthen talent pipeline

Q&A with Delegates
1. Concern that differences in universities need to be considered within broad goals and plans.
   - That’s where mission comes in.

2. How do we define entrepreneurship? Needs to be bigger than business start-up. Accountability detracts from ability to work (too busy documenting).
   - Need to take care of that here with this body  
   - Entrepreneurship – the person writing that is here and will address it

3. Need to look at access as a measure of entrepreneurship. Need to address student preparation for higher ed so we don’t have to turn them down.
   - Forward question to Leslie Boney

10:00 Leslie Boney, Vice President for International, Community, and Economic Engagement (20 minutes)

• We are in a two year cycle requiring metrics of value
• Many campuses have done economic impact reports
• Need to compare campuses to each other and total output for the system
• Trial metrics will be used for Jan-March quarter to analyze if it works (effort, meaning, accuracy)
• Revise and begin next fiscal year
• Metrics may “nudge” campuses towards the metrics

Q&A with Delegates
1. Metrics weighted on production (how many?) not on outcome.
   - Don’t have the ability or resources to get at outcomes, recognize that they proposed metrics are inadequate.

2. Metric of “real life” creates dichotomy of academic and community experiences. Learning is a part of real life.
   - The phrase ‘real life’ can be changed.

3. Universities should set the agenda – core areas (education, etc…) should not be subservient to “entrepreneurship.”
   - I don’t see it as a divisive term. Many people need this (e.g. art majors). Need to be nimble – tumult in gov., profit, and non-profit areas.
   - Can examine the term if it is toxic

10:20 Break

10:30 Panel Discussion: Measuring Academic Quality (Attachment 3) (1.5 hours)
Mike Carter (Associate Dean of The Graduate School, NCSU)
• Identify areas where we should improve academic quality
• Post-grad surveys; not everything we value is measureable but we need to focus on what is possible and meaningful to measure.
• Quality should be focused at program level.
• SACS reports don’t work in terms of academic quality; quality is defined by academic programs and outcomes are defined differently.
• Difference between “soft skills” and employment specific “soft skills” also lack of evidence of transferability.
• Can’t compare programs between universities.

Bernice Johnson (Associate Provost/Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, NCCU)
• Institutions need individual parameters – need to take it seriously – how-what-outcome.
• Will be in a mode of continuous improvement.
• Ultimately, quality is determined by what students do after they leave our programs.
• Shared governance is integral to developing quality programs.
• “Flipping the classroom” (Bergmann, 2012) where content is online, soft skill development is in the classroom.
• Student engagement seminars.
• If it lasts over time that indicates quality.
• Need to survey grads, employees, and survey dropouts.
• SACS: we have enough data across our campuses, we need to use some of it.
• SACS allows for faculty, student, and community input.
• CAP, CLA,
• Faculty Learning communities can improve teaching, including soft skills, and success rate.
• Example of teaching soft skills in university setting: etiquette seminar – practice how to eat a meal during interview process.

Dan Cohen-Vogel (Senior Director of Institutional Research)
• Business focus on soft skills, not worried about knowledge. Need communication, collaboration, writing, analytical thinking.
• Capacity to respond to a changing world: innovate, serve clients.
• Economies of scale – how can we support programs or provide supports outside the department?
• Perception that SACS is too idiosyncratic to be useful to broadly look at measuring learning.
• Value of internships.
• Don’t have a choice, SOMEONE will determine the metrics, the question at this point is who. How do we measure to what end?*
• Recommend starting with broader measures that can cut across disciplines
• Need to balance in-program and post-program quality measures.
Moderator – Andrew Morehead (Chair, Student Success Subcommittee of the APS Committee)

- How do we look at soft skills as a university responsibility not a course or program responsibility?

Lunch and Chairs Meeting
12:00-12:30  Lunch (Board Room or in your committee meeting room, as you desire)
12:00-1:00  Chairs Meeting (Conference Room A) (Chairs to join in-progress committee meetings as soon as possible)

Afternoon Session
12:30  Committee Meetings (1.75 to 2 hours)
   a. Academic Standards and Policies Committee – Articulation Subcommittee (Board Room)
   b. Academic Standards and Policies Committee – International Programs Subcommittee (Board Room)
   c. Academic Standards and Policies Committee – Student Success Subcommittee (Board Room)
   d. Budget Committee (Chancellor’s Room) Upstairs Conference Room
   e. Faculty Welfare and External Communications (Conference Room C)
   f. Governance Committee (Conference Room A)

2:30  Plenary Session (Board Room) (1.5 hours)
   a. Approval of the September 2012 Meeting Minutes (to be posted on the FA website)
   b. Chair’s Report (Catherine Rigsby) (10 minutes) (Strategic Planning, appointments to GA committees, responses to resolutions; upcoming meeting plans)
      a. Steve Leonard distance ed rep
      b. Dale Knickerbocker -
      c. Strategic Planning – first meeting Monday; documents are/will be available to faculty senate chairs
      d. They are looking at a common Gen Ed minimal requirement across the system
   c. Committee Reports and discussion (50 minutes: 7 committees, 5 minute oral reports plus discussion)
      a. Chairs: timing – need more time together. Many campus issues raised
         i. Shared governance
         ii. Serious grievance/hearing issues
         iii. Program prioritization reviews are often not as intended
         iv. Search issues
         v. Ombuds – should we move on this? NC State is in process.
         vi. Retaliation for speaking out
         vii. Restructuring
      b. HMI: effects of policies being put in place on campuses.
i. 700.1.1 (minimum academic requirements); premises of standards lack empirical support; Thousands of students at HMIs would be denied contrasted with hundreds at non-HMI institutions. Can’t stop the train, but looking for Chancellors to have flexibility such as summer bridge programs, however students can’t afford extra cost. Strategic plan lacks discussion on minority access. Two statements:
   ii. And/or GPA being included as being more predictive than SAT
   iii. Chancellor’s need flexibility (beyond 1%) if they can show with empirical evidence

c. Governance committee – work at the institutional level,
   i. Included in documents (institutional) operational of policies of shared governance;
   ii. Training of grievance hearings; want to produce a user-friendly document to help guide people in the process.
   iii. Committee wants to be better educated on this issue. Emphasize attendance at shared governance session on December 1.

d. Budget Committee: Hopeful of a budget that might not be as bad
   i. Request to Chancellors of budgeting priorities
   ii. To what degree are faculty involved in budget process?
   iii. Allocation of faculty lines – is it becoming more strategic? Does that change the curriculum?

e. Metrics:
   i. Affirm academic quality in an opening statement,
   ii. Acceptance of value rubrics,
   iii. Academic content,
   iv. Metrics chosen to reflect institutional values,
   v. Multiple broad-based measures hard/soft skills (core competencies), surveys, SACS data, continuous improvement, peer review,
   vi. Responsibility cuts across program boundaries for developing core competencies.

f. Articulation: split into two groups
   i. Distance group:
      1. Alluded to UVA “technologically backwards” issue
      2. GA wants to know what technology faculty are using
   ii. Minimum core of studies:
      1. There is no “one size fits all” requirement however there is much shared vision.
      2. We need to look for commonalities, discuss them, and communicate them to the public.
      3. Need to recognize differences and make it easy for counselors and transfer students to see what they have/need.

d. Other Business
a. Invite legislators to campus to meet and work with faculty, staff and students
b. Distance Ed meeting will be talking about more accountable for DE funds
c. Resolution honoring Bill Friday
e. Meeting review

Next meeting is Nov 30, not Nov 16!

4:15 (estimated time) Adjourn
LIST of ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1. Materials related to the Faculty Advisory Council (Ross letter, Council roster and Council functions)

Attachment 2. Economic Impact Metrics (for discussion)

Attachment 3. Guiding Questions for Panel Discussion on Measuring Academic Quality

\[i\] Many representatives were not in favor of the term “soft skills.” The term continued to be used throughout the day and will probably be used in future discussions and draft document copies, however the term “Core Competencies” had significant support as a term to replace soft skills as we move forward.

\[ii\] The term “entrepreneurial” was a prevalent buzzword of the day. It is a bit unclear to me exactly what the President and the Strategic Directions Committee mean by it. People representing the committee did allude specifically to programs with degrees and certificates with the word entrepreneurial in them and this seemed to be distinct from the idea of entrepreneurial spirit.

\[iii\] Shared governance and faculty input were big topics of discussion. Based on questions, conversations, and motions, faculty throughout the system are frustrated with a hierarchical model of governance that they feel not only limits substantive faculty input but, in many cases, provides only a façade of faculty input. Nobody said it exactly this way, but this is my interpretation based on piecing together multiple references to faculty governance, voice, and shared decision making.

\[iv\] Rather than trying to capture each question and each panel member’s response to the specific question, I bulleted the comments each panel member made during the session.

\[v\] This message was echoed throughout the day. The UNC system and each institution will be measured on impact, quality, and degree attainment, all imbedded into something that determines “efficiency.” This will happen and the challenge of faculty and institutions is to try and determine what those measures will be as opposed to letting someone else do it.