**UNC Faculty Assembly Meeting**

**January 18, 2013**

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

*9:05 am Faculty Assembly Convenes*

Catherine Rigsby called the assembly to order, and gave a brief overview of the day. Some of the delegates may be joining us by video conference due to weather. This is our only opportunity to comment on the strategic plan before it goes to the Board of Governors.

We have four guests today, two from Chapel Hill (Cheryl Kleinman and Maria de Guzman) and two students (Kevin Kimble who has been part of the strategic planning group and Robert Lee from the Associated Student Government).

*9:10-9:40 Tom Ross, President of the UNC system*, provided an update on the Strategic Plan and what the next steps should be.

We have heard from a lot of people already. This is the only chance you will have to provide formal input before the plan goes to the Board in February. The goal is to get final document to our board for their consideration by the end of January.

This is a long range plan, which the Board of Governors is required to do every five years. It builds on UNC Tomorrow, which was a much broader and more inclusive process than the usual way this has been done in the past (typically the GA prepares a plan and presents it to the BOG).

The Board wanted to get a plan ready for new Governor and Legislature (many of whom are also new to the process). They felt it to be important to present priorities and investment needs. Revenue is likely to continue to slowly grow (somewhere in the 2-4% rate). Not the ideal world, and staff and Board have worked hard to prepare a plan, hopefully leaving breathing space for creative work in implementation. We have heard lots of criticism about the process, the wording in the document, that it is too GA centered. There is a clear role for the faculty, through shared governance, to participate in the curriculum implementation. Really, we hope the process will have a helpful outcome for the University.

Q&A with Delegates

Georgie Donovan (ASU): There are several inconsistencies in the plan. One of the major ones revolves around goals 2 and 4 with general education in discussions of commonalities in GE requirements and transferability.

Ross: Don’t see anything that requires a common set of courses across all campuses. There are some on the board who would like to see that, but the GA view is that we move toward competency-based learning objectives and outcomes. Students should have as much ability to move from campus to campus in as seamless a way as possible.

Knickerbocker (ECU): On page 37, some of the wording is very disturbing to some of us. I just want to make sure BOG understands that control of the curriculum resides with the faculty (and is required by SACS). This can’t be done top down, other than setting a broad set of guidelines.

Ross: We get that, and while there might be some confusion on the Board, GA gets it and that’s where the implementation becomes important.

Melissa Burchard  (UNCA): The language should be very careful and more specific about the role of faculty in curriculum, using words like responsible, not just engaged.

Ross: We would happily take some language to make sure that is clear and consider it.

Lloyd Kramer (UNCH): Thanks for the hard work representing our interests. I want to raise three principles that need more stressing in the report

1. Different mission of campuses is central
2. Liberal Arts are the core of our education
3. All areas of focus on page 59 are very specific, research in all fields must be emphasized as important

Ross: Setting priorities doesn’t mean we quit doing all things, it just means targeted investments in those areas. Research in every field is very important if you want scholars teaching your students. It’s also important that students get the depth component of their education, and research is one of the best ways to get that depth. That’s a transferable commodity.

Lloyd: Also, how about the supplemental fees for online courses?

Ross: That specifies that differential fees for online courses should be phased out for online, on-campus students.

Gabriel Lugo (UNCW): The statement about Rainmakers makes the assumption that there is a drought. Our campuses are full of rainmakers and students who are storm chasers. The money is much better spent on people and facilities we currently have.

Ross: That is a loaded word, and has been edited. The term is more appropriately “key” people for pulling together groups within the University system in the priority areas. Faculty compensation is clearly an important issue and is meant to be addressed in many ways.

Hans Kellner (NCSU): It looks to be tremendously expensive and with an enormous expansion of administrative costs. There are page after page of things that will require new planning, policies, procedures, etc. at great cost and inefficiencies that will draw from the academic core.

Ross: It is hard to have action items without action words. There is a budget (199M dollars) over the next five years. In the environment that we are working, we will have more requirements for accountability. We will be required to be more efficient. We have tried to put in the costs of the things we think are important. The choice is not if we change, because we will, but how do we change? We certainly will have to find people to do more, administrative support for these initiatives. In every operation, there have to be support staff for the people who do the work.

Thanks again for your help, and continue to provide feedback.

*9:40-9:55 Leslie Boney, VP International, Community, and Economic Engagement,* presented a report about the Regional Listening Sessions with Businesses (see webpage at <http://www.northcarolina.edu/public_service/econ_dev/strat1.htm> for a more detailed set of data and reports.

The sessions were held across the state, with multiple purposes.

One purpose was to identify areas multiple campuses were interested in, and if that synced up with economic priorities. Heard from business leaders that they favor higher degree attainment, and heard various permutations of the idea that T-Shaped education gave people who can think to fulfill new directions.

The Center for Creative Leadership (CCL) future needs survey shows change over time in what business leaders want. Has changed in previous iterations from wanting technical mastery to those who can adjust and think their way around a problem. What these results illustrate is that the business community wants things that University education can provide beyond technical knowledge. Helped address sections 1 and 2.

You have now seen section 3, and one thing has been officially added since the last draft. The basic outline is that there is a priority placed on UNC as discoverers of new knowledge. In this time of constrained resources, if there are expansion items maybe we can find areas that multiple campuses can work together to move forward.

Chris Brown: Section 3, Goal A: Support game-changing research and scholarship lists some specific areas of emphasis that are also national priorities and in a time of limited resources are potential opportunities. We also want to invest in faculty and staff needed to support these efforts. We want to support infrastructure. We want to prepare our students to not just be “job ready” but also ready to adapt to changing demands of those jobs. For Goal B: Convert Discovery into Innovation, we want to establish multidisciplinary seed funds, teams that bring in a business/scientific perspective to bring such concepts to market. We want to fully utilize REACHNC to help bring together people both within and external to the system for these purposes.

*9:55-10:10 Drew Moretz, VP for State Government Relations* gave an overview of Long Session, Legislative Day, and Training for Lobbying.

We are now seeing (post 2012 elections), another huge change with many new legislators and a new Governor. Now seeing ramp up time for identifying and hiring new staff in many agencies. Historically, the Governor introduces his budget in February, but likely to be pushed to March this year. As a system, we have got to develop new champions for the UNC system as many of the old allies have moved on.

The key question is how much weight does the General Assembly give the Governor’s priorities? The unemployment money the state owes the Federal government ($2.7B) and tax reform will be discussed early in the process. On the education side the efficiencies that are part of the strategic plan need to be retained so they can be reinvested on-campus.

Governor wants everyone in education (pre-K, K-12, CC, and UNC) to work together, not clear what that means yet.

There was a brief discussion of the Lobbying 101 handout. Important to discuss your visit with your legislative liaison before going, hear where the rep stands before approaching so you can tailor your remarks.

*10:10-10:30 Charlie Perusse, the Chief Operating Officer* presented a report on the University Budget outlook.

The 20,000 foot view: the economy is good, not great. We continue to proceed on forecast through the first six months, so no mid or end of year budget reversions are currently anticipated. We are seeing 3-4 percent growth in the state economy, less than the 5.5-6% rate historically. That is better than in the last few years. The new Governor, Governor McCrory is currently deep in the budget process, and we anticipate the budget will be sent in mid-march to the senate. The GA, Chancellors and CAO’s have put together a package to forward to the State Budget Office.

The continuation budgets are done, which includes enrollment increases, building requests, and a little bit of inflationary adjustment. The expansion budget recommendations will be presented to the General Assembly in the next couple of months: the items in the Strategic plan, and changes on the benefit side (like the ORP contribution rate), financial aid and maybe some individual campus requests. The third piece would be the reduction options, most of which is currently reflected in the strategic plan (operational and administrative efficiencies ($10 to 15 M/year, portfolio management (about 1% the first year, or about $15M and 1.3% or $20M the second year on the academic side) and carry over options). Might increase carry-over cap to 5%.

Going forward, the big issue is obviously developing the budget. There are still big issues like Medicaid going forward, the question of tax reform.

Jimmy Reeves (UNCW): I am fascinated by the ability to carry over, but bigger problem in improving efficiency is the way they pigeon-hole monies and that improving flexibility might also lead to increased efficiency. Hope you send that forward.

Ed ?: Holding back 25% looks like a budget cut.

Colleen Reilly (UNC-W): Looks like budget is reduced in the next year.

Perusse: It’s an accounting thing. That means the 25% of the amount carried over comes out non-recurring, giving a net to the university of the other 75% for the next year’s budget.

Chet Dilday: Is there some other way that different language can be used to describe the tax issue? It’s not modernization, it’s moving backwards to the more regressive sales and use taxes.

Perusse: The GA won’t say a thing, taxes are a legislative issue. Our job is to advocate for the University.

Paul Williams (NCSU): Consumption taxes are often variable, so maybe the system does need to weigh in on the issue since it may have direct impacts.

Perusse: at this time there are still no bills brought to a revenue committee to address.

Mary Jean Herzog (WCU): Is there any truth to the rumors that they mean to get rid of tenure in NC?

Brown: No

Dale Knickerbocker (ECU): Is there a statistical breakdown of the budget cuts and how much of those cuts are in academic areas? Can you make it available?

Perusse: There is some data we can make available. We can demonstrate that while there might be some inefficiencies, the cost to degree has gone down across the system.

Knickerbocker: Administrative efficiencies are often illusory. There are documented examples of administrators being reclassified and yet getting raises despite the “demotion.”

Rigsby: would also refer back to the core paper from a few years ago on the Academic Core.

*10:30 am -3:00 pm Lunch and Roundtable Discussions:* the UNC Strategic Plan for 2013-2015 followed by *Committee Meetings*

*3:00 pm Chair’s Report (Catherine Rigsby):*

Sarah Russell has left us (gotten a job at Duke) and we need to replace her with a representative from a two delegate university. We will have an email vote once nominees have been identified. The FA had no objection to the electronic vote. In addition, we will elect a new Chair elect in addition to the usual slate of candidates at the April meeting.

The Chairs of the Faculty and Staff Assemblies have been invited to sit (as guests) at BOG committee meetings. The FA Chair will sit on the Educational Planning Committee and the Staff Chair will sit on the Personnel Committee.

Last week, five people including Catherine Rigsby, gave presentations on the history and value of tenure to the BOG, next week there will be presentations on post-tenure review.

Next Faculty Assembly meeting will be a discussion of the ombuds issues and grievances lead by the governance committee.

*3:10 pm Committee Reports and discussion*

Jim Martin (Parliamentarian) gave a brief discussion of the procedures for passing resolutions in response to the strategic plan.

Moved and seconded that the Faculty Assembly present concerns and resolutions and allow the Faculty Assembly EC to modify if necessary, passed by acclamation.

David Green (Governance Committee): Presented a Resolution in Response to the January 16, 2013 Draft Strategic Plan drafted during the roundtables and committee meeting. Passed as amended by Dale Knickerbocker. Included below as Resolution 2013-1 along with notes from the meetings.

Andrew Morehead (Student Success Subcommittee): Presented a Resolution on Faculty Responsibility for Assessment. Passed and included below as Resolution 2013-02 along with the roundtable notes.

Steve Leonard (e-Learning Subgroup of the Articulation Committee): Presented a list of concerns to be written into resolution form by the FAEC called Faculty Assembly Concerns on E-Learning.

Catherine Rigsby proposed endorsement of document by the FA and CAR and FAEC will edit and present to GA and BOG. Passed following extensive discussion, final version below as Resolution 2013-03.

Chet Dilday (External Communications Committee): Discussed (with Drew Moretz) working with the Legislators, including “University Day”, but the committee wants to wait until after release of the budget by the Governor (probably late March or Early April). Would also like to bring legislators to campus.

The committee also plans on collecting information about adjunct titles, standing or special committees in Faculty Senates dealing with adjunct issues, evaluation, governance, workload and salary linkage.

Chet Dilday (HMI Committee): Expressed concerns about the Rainmaker Faculty concept, and how the funds and positions would be distributed between campuses. Additionally, they are also concerned about how it affects other faculty and their resources within each campus. Want to express congratulations to the GA about the Minority Male Initiative funded by the Lumina Foundation, and the pilot programs have been showing some positive effects and that the program should be expanded to all campuses (bring up on Lobby days).

Chairs Group (Hans Kellner): Many campuses are dealing with SACS issues. UNC Greensboro has voted to admit non-tenure track (NTT) faculty to their Faculty Senate. The committee discussed Faculty Senate support for the Faculty Governance resolution (five senates have passed resolutions in support, five more are planning on voting on it).

Budget Committee (Raymond Burt): There is a Faculty Assembly report from 2002 available on the GA website about NTT faculty.

The committee also had a Q+A with Charlie Perusse about the 4th and 5th sections of the draft strategic plan. Questions included how much flexibility will the campuses have in meeting targeted cuts, and the answer is that there will be some. Another important question is if there are any studies on loyalty of on-line degree students. In some good news, there will be appropriated Pell grant funds for summer school. Another questions is if there are going to be additional funds included to address expansion of the online courses? The committee is very excited about carry forward reform. (Notes below)

November minutes approved.

*4:20 pm Adjourn*

2013-01

**Resolution in Response to the January 16, 2013 Draft Strategic Plan**

Approved by the UNC Faculty Assembly

January 18, 2013

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

***Whereas***, the Faculty Assembly of the 17 constituent campuses of the University of North Carolina has met and considered the January 16, 2013 draft report of the five-year strategic plan “Our Time, Our Future:  The UNC Compact with North Carolina;” and

***Whereas***, the Faculty Assembly and President Ross constituted a Faculty Advisory Council (FAC) which submitted a set of recommendations in the document “Our University, Our Future: A Faculty Vision for UNC Strategic Directions;” and

***Whereas***, the Faculty Assembly affirms the goals of the strategic plan to increase the population of college educated North Carolinians; to provide excellence in teaching, research and service; and to serve the people in North Carolina by ensuring access to the University for all qualified students while maximizing efficiencies and effectiveness; and

***Whereas***, the Faculty Assembly endorses the commitment to North Carolina as articulated in the “UNC Compact” section of the draft Strategic Plan; and

***Whereas***, the Faculty Assembly asserts that the commitments of the UNC Compact require the experience and expertise of faculty in determining the direction of the UNC system’s constituent institutions to ensure that administrative decisions reflect the missions of each institution; and

***Whereas***, the Faculty Assembly understands that strategic planning is an ongoing process and looks forward to faculty and student involvement in the implementation of the strategic plan’s programs and initiatives;

***Therefore,*** ***Be It Resolved That*** the recommendations articulated in the FAC response report and in Faculty Assembly resolutions 2013-02 and 2013-03 be incorporated into the final strategic plan.

2013-02

**Resolution on Faculty Responsibility for Assessment**

Approved by the UNC Faculty Assembly

January 18, 2013

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

***Whereas***, the UNC Board of Governors is proceeding through the strategic planning process for 2013-18, defining current and future priorities, examining resource allocation, and seeking efficiencies; and

***Whereas***, the faculty of the UNC system embody the University’s commitment to help North Carolina respond to changing state needs and economic challenges; and

***Whereas***, the our regional accrediting agency, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), requires that the institution place primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of the curriculum with its faculty; and

***Whereas***, the University already applies a robust, diverse and mission appropriate set of student learning outcomes; and

***Whereas***, the faculty are leaders in the development and utilization of technology and new teaching pedagogies; and

***Whereas***, single measures such as the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) or other standardized exams have been established as inadequate measures of the depth and breadth of general education programs; and

***Whereas***, institutional average scores on the CLA and similar exams are highly correlated with the institutions’ average SAT scores, hence provide no new information; and

***Whereas***, SACS and other accrediting bodies periodically and comprehensively examine and affirm the quality of educational programs, and require that the faculty lead the assessment of the academic programs of the University;

***Therefore,*** ***Be It Resolved That*** the strategic plan must endorse the expertise and control of the faculty in selection of the appropriate method of delivery and assessment of academic programs; and

***Be it Further Resolved*** ***That*** the strategic plan must reflect that the faculty, in their role as educational experts and as those charged with ensuring the highest academic quality programs, are the primary body to select, design, and assess all academic programs.

2013-03

**Resolution on Concerns with e-Learning as Presented in the Draft Strategic Plan**

Approved by the UNC Faculty Assembly

January 18, 2013

***Whereas***, the UNC Faculty Assembly has serious concerns with the understanding of e-Learning in the January 16, 2013, draft of the UNC Strategic Plan; and

***Whereas***, it is faculty who are responsible for curricular content and its delivery;

***Therefore, Be It Resolved That*** the Faculty Assembly requests that the final version of the 2013-2018 UNC Strategic Plan explicitly address the concerns listed below.

1. *Concerns about effectiveness and efficiency of e-learning*:

We are concerned that the strategic plan be well-grounded in the extant evidence and research on the effectiveness of e-learning practices and the cost-effectiveness of those practices, as compared to traditional instructional delivery modes.

Although course learning outcomes must be consistent regardless of delivery mechanism, measures of learning must be tailored to course structure and delivery mechanism. The use of appropriate measures for determining desired learning outcomes is crucial to successful assessment of e-Learning courses. These measures should produce robust evidence for assessing learning outcomes in comparable institutional and discipline-specific settings, disaggregated by e-learning, traditional, and (where appropriate) hybrid (or ‘blended’) modes of instructional delivery.

It is essential to evaluate the time and financial costs, to both students and the University, of alternative instructional delivery methods. . Cost effectiveness evaluations must employ appropriate, institution- and discipline-specific measures for assessing cost effectiveness of alternative delivery methods.

2. *Concerns about instructor qualifications*:

The quality of e-learning opportunities is primarily a function of instructor skills. Expertise in the substantive intellectual content of course material is essential. And, support for training and use of instructional technologies can be important for successful delivery of e-learning opportunities.

Appointment to e-learning teaching positions requires demonstrated discipline-specific expertise and a capacity for effective management of instructional technologies. This expertise and instructional capacity must be assessed by appropriate disciplinary departmental faculty using appropriate departmental policies.

3. *Concerns about appropriate target groups*:

There is an extensive literature demonstrating that success and completion rates for e-learning opportunities vary widely by the demographic characteristics of student populations. Extant studies also suggest that targeting e-learning opportunities to populations of students who have limited resources for pursuing other educational alternatives can maximize the potential usefulness of e-learning arrangements.

We recommend that e-learning opportunities be targeted primarily to student populations with demonstrated likelihood of success in an e-learning environment, and especially those in resource-limited situations.

4. *Concerns about infrastructure cost and support*:

Instructional and information technology is in very early stages of development. Rapid hardware and software obsolescence is the rule, not the exception. Institutional investment in these goods can be very risky. A thoughtful investment strategy should, wherever possible, maximize adaptability, compatibility, and serviceability.

We recommend the development of investment policy that can leverage system wide expertise and efficiencies in software deployment and development (*e.g.*, utilizing open source programs where appropriate), and which promotes hardware and platform compatibility.

**Round table discussion on Assessment in the Strategic Plan**

**Student success group on assessment**

Andrew Morehead stated that he has started a resolution on the assessment group. He wanted to know the faculty reaction to the document

What was the first thing that struck you as problems?

One size fits all assessment tool when we know that multiple means of assessment is necessary.

UNC Wilmington: We are open to assessment. The faculty supports assessment.

East Carolina: Standardization of curriculum and something that smells like no child left behind. They have not realized that standardized testing has become a failure.

UNC Ashville: Assessment can be added on a tremendous amount of cost to develop and implement. Assessment becomes efficient then we don’t know if being assessed any more. Who develops the assessment? Who pays for this assessment?

UNCW: no recognition of local nuances related to particular courses

UNCW: student evaluation of faculty question 16 is not useful as it is not a good question and does not answer the right question. They look only at the number.

Rachel Willis (FAC) Chapel Hill representative

Ridiculous one size fits all assessment; everything is wrong with this. We are measured by SACS and our disciplinary accreditation. We have mission specific programs and we should be mindful of our regions, missions and demands from our regions.

North Carolina School of Science and Math: Concern about articulation agreements: if students come in with the 30 hours what is the quality of the preparation? Are they prepared for our programs?

Morehead: Institutional CLA score has an r correlation with the SAT score and you measure the same thing again two years later.

UNCW: SACS is external assessor and they come in as experts. They demand transparencies. Does the transparency with the external SACS assessment include the personnel reviews? Personnel discussions should not be put out there with the assessment

James Holloway ECU: Our students are treated as consumers. Are we assessing a product or a consumer? Student driven or employer driven? SACS requires that assessment is carried out by faculty. SACS is specific about what they want to see in assessment and clearly written rubrics when we assess students learning outcomes.

Faculty are writing these assessments.

Margery ECSU: there are program accreditation as well as SACS accreditation that measure learning outcomes.

Andrew Morehead- (ECU) I think they want to know that the students we are taking are prepared.

Who are the students? How do we educate them?

What do you think about e-learning? This push to have it?

James Holloway: concerns about e-learning for on campus students? Do you cancel the face-to face course for the e-learning course?

The success of e-learning, on campus, students is not the same. Physical chemistry courses on line every time on campus student take it on line, they fail. Local students struggle to keep up because they do not have the discipline. Space crunch is driving us to hybrid course and this way you can provide more on line stuff for them to get the material.

There is huge value to having the students in front of you .

Hope UNCW: Massive open on line courses (MOOCS) My MOOC is 5 hours with certification; how are we going to assess that? They are talking about using it.

They single out languages as an on line

*First move during round table: Feedback from faculty on assessment*

NC school of Science and Math Cora Wiley: Contradiction develop standardized assessment with ETS counter to the objective of the assessment promoted in the plan point seems contradictory to the goal. Are we trying to move to a more qualitative yet quantifiable means of assessment? It generates only the types of student we do not want-a student who can take standardized tests. These will struggle with critical thinking

Andrew Morehead ECU: What is the role of the faculty input in the strategic plan? Big chunks of what faculty did was incorporated but some of it got marked through and there seems to be an agenda.

Gabriel Lugo-UNW: SACS section on assessment is precise and the processes are according to institution. So to us the ETS test you have no way to show what to expect or what the students are going to be assessed. It looks like we are recreating “no child left behind”. Why do they need centralized assessment? They don’t trust us? Procedures need to be shared so that different campuses can learn from each other.

UNC Charolotte: It is not true that students will automatically learn how to memorize but these do not know how to think, be creative, or problem solve. Every campus is short on faculty. We are seeing more adjunct with masters and we are showing faculty shortage that changes the way we teach and the way we assess. We need more terminally qualified faculty.

UNC School of the Arts: A positive E portfolio is a good way to show depth of student learning

Georgie Donovan Appalachian: Academically adrift: more rigor is good for the outcome but you cant grade 200 students papers. There is no support for professor to make them better.

Eddie Souffrant: Inconsistencies are there in the document.

Tom Ellis: we can play their games and show that the CLA will not be able to measure adaptability, versatility.

UNC Charlotte: we have a hard time asking the students to give us their best

UNC Charlotte: How can homogenize test for all of the campus when each campus have a different approach.

APP state: A second and four year test is that what they want us to use?

Gabriel Lugo UNCW: We don’t have in a catalog that they must take this test in order to graduate.

Rachel Willis UNC Chapel Hill: The strategic direction group is made up of diverse stakeholders that have varying degrees of understanding of SACS and institutional missions. Many employers want the critical analysis. There are some very well informed employers who understand the need for these various assessment instruments.

We do not want a system wide level of a standardized accreditation

*Second move Third Group*

Concern or observation: Steve Bachenheimer from UNC-CH the historical role of faculty in discipline specific ways of doing assessment. Relying on a standardized assessment is off- putting to the faculty. It is already done by outside evaluator and discipline specific accreditation and how do we respond to ‘academically adrift” to rely on CLA for assessment? Develop a white paper to rebut the major findings of “academically adrift” worry about persons outside the discipline latching on flawed discussion and adapting procedures to implement these flawed approaches.

Kellner-NCSTATE: Three quite different and discreet levels of assessment. We should point these out and show the differences in relationships. The disconnect is the issue is when they move to core curriculum, we are as an institution are assessing.

Margery (ECSU): Somebody needs to explain all the levels of assessments SACS and the discipline specific accreditation demand.

Andrew Morehead: E-learning strategies? How does it impact the financial model? Problems for faculty workloads?

Lloyd Kramer: Page 45 expected outcomes they are asking us to collect data for alumni satisfaction in 5 and 10 years. Is this an efficient way to do this? Community interaction is essential to the development of the students’ ability to communicate, collaborate and to adapt to others.

Morehead: The difficulty is to mandate us to do specific things. Universities are asked to do this. Grades and retention rates for on campus students plummeted when there was an emphasis on elearning. How do we communicate with the strategic plan folks that? They are proposing that we do a number of thing: MOOCS, elearning. Freshman and sophomores don’t do well in e courses. They don’t do as well and they drop out of our courses. Faculty should spend some time developing the tools and rolling it out.

Hans Kelner: some things are un assessable. When NC State changed the fees they got a lot more demand for the e-courses.

Mary Jean: UNC Charlotte: I would rather have faculty experts who know the discipline than to have ETS. ETS is a problem in education. There is study of neurological affects of screen time.

Steve Bachenhiemer UNC Chapel Hill: There are no settled answer for financial advantages of MOOCS

Paul Williams: I was in college because it was a privilege. This issue of assessment overlooks the question of what is a good student?

January 18, 2013

**Faculty Assembly – Roundtable Discussion Notes**

**Research Group**

*Group one comments:*

David Green: Drew up a resolution based on FAC meeting last night. Designed to be a starting point in the discussion.

Steve: we need to first have a discussion.

We embraced the idea of priority areas, but this is a top down method, but the genius of research universities is the bottom up approach. Most innovations occur when the environment allows free exploration and investigation. Most of the funding from foundations is from investigator-initiated proposal.

If someone sees resources allocated to priority areas, it may narrow the research inquiry base by discouraging researchers in other areas.

There appears to be a confusion of how research is done. The plan says, we want the state to pay the university to conduct research in very specific private sector interest. The state will be subsidizing certain industries. Who will really benefit? Does it really serve the people of NC. There is talk about being entrepreneurial faculty, but if we are told from above what to research, how can that be entrepreneurial?

Chris Brown: This plan is an expansion – not a restriction of research areas. This is an investment which will draw in more dollars. I don’t agree that it doesn’t serve the people of NC. What about energy resource. These are broad areas which lean heavily on faculty choosing the area.

But this is about the Government trying to pick the winners and that doesn’t work out.

The wording in the document has sent the message to many faculty that what they are doing is not appreciated.

Chris Brown: The wording of the second draft does take into consideration the rewarding of faculty based on input.

Leslie: Under the new engagement section – a study of the new economy in NC to see how many people are employed in these areas. Between the first and second draft, we added more emphasis on creativity and the arts. By beginning to quantify that area and the people who graduate and work in the creative arts, we can make the case of the importance of this research to NC.

Brian: The FAC response last night: while the plan neglects all but a few of research areas, the scientific research works hand in hand with culture and humanities research. These are also “game-changers”

Health care: Leslie: We need to pull together a group to talk about how we can improve in this area. Can we expand medical schools? Need for more primary care physicians, for nurses – but we didn’t know how to include that within the constraints of a budget for this plan. There is a group that is working on this – apart from this plan.

P. 59 Can we change this language where “game-changing” research is restricted to only certain areas. This university is known around the world in a wide range of fields. This needs to be affirmed , not only for the faculty but to the legislators to let them know what a jewel we have in this system.

The game your changing here is the economic/monetary game – if the state wants to create a manufacturing industry, then we need to retain the benefits of that. This state should “own” what we develop. We need to maintain the control over the benefits – what is discovered here falls into the hands of companies that take those innovations and export it to other states, countries etc and we do not bring direct benefit to the people of NC.

When we add arts & humanities, we cannot neglect other disciplines. Also, the emphasis on Marine Sciences is odd to those who live in the mountain areas. These areas should be more general.

*Group 2:*

Leslie Boney and Chris Brown: what was missing in our shortened presentation

What changed between 1st and the 2nd draft: the notion of assessing where we are in engagement. There is a pilot underway that will track this

The belief that there were a lot of students who don’t have a concept of the working world, so there is a recommendation that we increase internships.

Also redesigning B.A. and degree programs by having baccalaureate programs which propose to support culture and arts and tourism. The creative economy is important to NC to bring in faculty from all areas to help public policy research.

Health care: important part of NC’s future. We don’t have a series of strategies in this area and there is a need to bring together a task force to make recommendations.

Need to increase the number of medical residencies and increase primary care physicians.

Discussion:

The approach we have taken in our department is that we have a MS in Chemistry online, but it is thesis based. We are now taking another approach – they can now get a certificate in business and other areas in addition to the MA. This allow us to carry out our primary mission in science but also through interdisciplinary way, add value to their degree.

Health care: No attention is paid to the delivery to rural areas, Hispanic communities, and this needs to be in the discussion.

Leslie: page 63 would have the task force look at geographic areas and could include demographic aspects.

Each university has its own particular emphasis of in research and region.

Leslie: Consortia are going to be the ones making the decisions. It will be driven by the researchers’ initiative and not GA determined.

Faculty don’t see the direct reward for having students engage in the community. How do you incentivize faculty to encourage and promote engagement.

When you read the report, then it seems as if research is for generating revenue and teaching is separate from that. But when I do research, it informs my teaching. This type of research does not translate into a “product” but in the improvement of my students’ learning. There is no recognition of that in the document.

The plan should recognize the value of what faculty have been contributing in their research.

How do you educate administrators to see the value of engagement. You could be heavily involved in this activity but then this activity is not recognized or valued. For example, ECU had a role in the development of the 911 program in the state, but this is not recognized.

Sometimes administrators are blind to the strategic plan of their own institutions. It is important to connect any activity to the institution’s strategic plan.

We have “rainmakers” “national leaders” – but the plan which states that we are going to hire 20 more, it tells faculty that they are not receiving needed support. We will be in danger of losing the national leaders in our existing faculty.

If you dangle a position out there, I will do my best to justify it coming my way, even if I don’t need it in my department.

The document should have sufficient faculty input and should show a broad recognition of the efforts of faculty.

Chris Brown: as President Ross indicated, this document is a plan which must have some level of specificity and not just broad statements in order to address the expectations of the legislators and stakeholders.

Leslie: There is some benefit in having the specificity in this document.

*Group 3:*

Leslie Boney & Chris Brown: Changes between 1st draft and second

Principle section added on engagement – calls for assessment on engagement of where we are in the system. How to add job experience to students coming out of college. Provide funds for campuses to develop certificate programs in areas not covered by community colleges.

Also based on input, the addition of research in other areas that contribute to community needs, for example – culture and tourism. Implied public policy is also an important area.

Also an additional goal: Health care – to establish a Health Care Task Force – to look at issues – for example, how to reach rural areas.

Discussion:

There is still an assumption with the rainmaker/superstars that there is a drought – that we do not have any superstars – but we have them. We need to make sure that they are incentivized in salary and equipment to do their job.

Chris Brown: the intention was not to state that we don’t have really great faculty. We also understand that we don’t have every “national leader” in every field we want. The way this will be determined will be by a consortium of faculty in the field (for example – energy) which determine a gap in expertise. There is faculty funding for both existing and new faculty.

Some of the feedback from our faculty – sure it is good to hire superstars, but what about all the water-carriers – those who support ramp-up the existing research areas.

If we are concerned about students being experienced in work, but there is a model at GA. GA could identify a body of researchers in an area, GA could have funds for supporting a research direction – without seeking external superstars. The morale issue should also be addressed by the plan. If the BOG has a business interest, the GA could be a repository of funds from business to support development among students in these areas.

There is a systemic barrier that emerges with superstars – many are not necessarily good teachers – if they teach at all. It provides an incentive to reduce teaching – since grants have instructional buy-outs.

This superstar idea will create a 2-tier system among the faculty and in the system. The superstars will go to the research institutions and will not be spreadout.

This is more about the language as it is ambiguous. Allowing for the fact that there are superstars on the existing faculty, - the writers of the document need to be clearer of their values – do you want just to hire superstars – state that. If you want them to rise out of existing faculty, state that.

Section A.9. we can’t just increase the number of students to meet the goals of graduating more STEM students.

Leslie: we are clearer in the second draft – see page 65.

Chris Brown: I know that there is a focus on the superstar, but there is an investment greater than just superstars. The funding is for more faculty than superstars.

The areas of research priority are too restrictive. Some of the areas of excellence are not represented at all campuses.

Chris Brown: Speaking frankly, that is not strategic to have every university in every area of priority.

Superstars don’t necessarily hit the ground running. Sometimes the superstars are quickly bought up by other institutions and companies.

I suggest that we hire rainmakers in administration and GA. If the plan is a top-down plan, then we need superstars in the administration to accomplish this.

Superstar is a relative term. What is a superstar for a comprehensive university is different than for a research institution.

I am concerned that these superstars will be concentrated in certain schools. Every school should get a piece of the pie. Identify the strengths of the campuses and make sure that each benefits from these investments.

One thing that would please me if there was one area of interest that isn’t just corporate interests. What about a K-12 area, or global awareness, etc. Give us one thing that is important to the human spirit and to people who are not business oriented.

There are lots of places in the document that point to the importance of the skills developed by the liberal arts, but the areas of research priority don’t address these.

**Notes from budget committee Jan. 18, 2013**

Charlie Perusse:

The savings through efficiencies are quite specific in each of the categories. We asked if campuses would be responsible to meet these targeted savings in each of the categories. Response: Probably in the implementation the campuses will have discretion in how to reach the allocation mark.

The draft plan is not clearly articulated at a first read.
Response: the document will have a variety of summaries and these will no doubt be clearer in their brevity.

Question: Has any data been gathered about alumni of online degree programs and their loyalty and support?
Response: Not that I am aware. It is an interesting question.

Question: what area in this budget are you excited about?
Response: Summer school- Support for summer school will come from appropriated funds for the first time. It has a focus on underrepresented students to subsidize tuition: Pell eligible students

Question: how has the online expansion figured in the budget calculations?
Response: None, it is an unknown.

Question: Some faculty have interpreted the efficiency of centralization of IT as a moving of all IT functions to GA.
Response: This is just a continuation of what is happening with those campuses that use the pool of GA staff. There is no plan for moving all IT centrally.

Carry forward reform – enthusiasm about the advantages for the campuses – it rewards the efficiencies of the campus.

The last two pages of the plan is on the expansion budget request. This does not include the continuation budget or the campus-initiated tuition increase.

We were assured that the increased university contribution to the ORP is still actively included in the budget request.