**Minutes**

**UNC Faculty Assembly Meeting**

**Spangler Building, General Administration, Chapel Hill, NC 30 November 2012**

9:07 am Faculty Assembly Convenes

Catherine Rigsby welcomed the delegates and gave a quick overview of the schedule (the Assembly has gone back to one hour lunch break, with GA staff invited to lunch to have discussions with the committees and delegates). There is also a minimum of three potential resolutions coming up, so the delegates should ensure their presence until the end of the plenary session so we maintain a quorum.

9:10 am Suzanne Ortega, Vice President for Academic Affairs, presented an overview of the progress by the GA and BOG on the comprehensive articulation agreement and the strategic planning process.

Scott Rawls and Tom Ross (and Sharon Morrissey from the Community College (CC) system) promised the General Assembly that we would have a comprehensive articulation agreement ready to go by Fall 2014. We have spent the last six months collecting as much data as possible and identifying unanswered research questions that ensure that this process results in a living document that is constantly evaluated. We have identified the fundamental questions (not decisions yet) that have to be answered.

The current agreement is based on the completion of the “Core 44” credits or AA/AS degree before transfer; new process is moving towards a “Core 30.” This change reflects that few transfers occur after completion of the “Core 44”, and that the only course that all campuses accept is ENGL 111 (composition).

In many cases, the core credits are also embedded in the major (i.e. many majors advise students to take courses that fulfill multiple requirements beyond the general education requirements).

Thus, the CC system is trying to figure out which courses are common in terms of the skill sets and that result in success once transferred. The CC system is interested in narrowing the number of courses that are options, thus simplifying advising. The second thirty hours, which comprise the Associates degree will have many more options. This will grow from the ca. 35 current pre-major agreements, but the frustration is still that no common accepted set of courses.

In January, the process will start with ENGL 111 for sure, and also will need faculty disciplinary panels around mathematics, sociology, history, biology, etc. to look at courses.

Question and Answer Session with delegates:

Zagros Madjd-Sadjadi (WSSU): I am comparing the proposed pathways with the WSSU articulation agreement, which is also now based on skills (seven). I noted that Foreign Languages, Arts, and Social Sciences are missing from this proposed set. We should mandate that this be part of AA/AS degree.

A: This is just the proposed approach to the first 30 hours, not the requirements for an AA/AS degree. The CC faculty have been looking at the Foreign Languages requirement, and we may need to align requirements, but note that not all colleges and majors within the University require a foreign language.

Gabriel Lugo (UNC-W): This proposal seems to be going from one extreme to the other, going from too many to too few, and there are many courses now missing (geology, physics, philosophy, art, theatre, anthropology, and on and on). It seems that too many students will come to the university and choose majors without exposure to the full range of possibilities.

A: This was an issue also raised by CC faculty, and I remind you that this is still a starting point, not a finished product. Note that some skills (such as writing and math) must be in first year, but more specific selections are usually required in the second year. At what point during those two years do you introduce more choice? The idea is that there is a set of courses during the first thirty hours that will transfer and fulfill some of the general education requirements.

Hans Kellner (NCSU): I want to repeat what Gabriel and Zagros have said. I have always thought that general ed is the anti-major, so designed to broaden rather than lead to a major, but that’s a small thing. The major point is that foreign languages, in particular, is important in all majors. I personally would oppose accepting any CC student to NC State that has no exposure to a foreign language.

A: I agree 100%. An introductory sociology class, for example, is also a portal to the major. The question is one of sequencing. Foreign languages has come up, and the question of where it belongs is the issue. The point here is what can students take in the first thirty hours that we all accept as transfer general education courses.

Coleen Reilly (UNCW): If you give people a narrow list, they may succeed better, but aren’t we supposed to be preparing them for making choices? Isn’t this moving in the opposite direction.

A: I am less conversant with all the literature. The CC response would be that students they receive are generally less prepared, so what they need is preparation for course work at the university level. Some literature support for the concept.

Andrew Morehead (ECU): I am asking about the concept here. I am concerned about the majors like Biology or Chemistry, where you can’t stack up the labs later on. There are specific sequences that have to be followed. You may be setting up a student for a five-year degree, which is the opposite of what we want to achieve. Are we saying that you would come in with the general education requirements nearly completed?

A: No, the general education will not be completed, but what we want is a list of courses that fulfill some of the general education requirements and won’t have to be transferred as electives. We will probably add some more pathways, including something like a pre-education pathway.

Rigsby: I know you have more to cover, so I am cutting the question and answer session now to give you ten more minutes to cover the strategic planning work.

Ortega: I found your documents on strategic planning very thoughtful, and I was pleased with the speed of the response. When I read the first three sections of the plan, I was pleased to see how many of the elements from the FA and FAC are reflected in the first three parts of the strategic plan.

Dan Vogel will discuss in more depth, but in terms of attainment the goal is to be a top ten most highly educated states in the nation. The five-year goals in this plan won’t get us there, but should put us on the pathway needed. Current strategy is to improve the success rate of those who we have not well served, the transfers and CC students, thus the emphasis on articulation and general education requirements. Another route is to identify and improve the rate at which we graduate those who stop short of degree. We need to be intentional and thoughtful about improving access.

Academic quality: look at the alignment of admission standards and academic success. Improve transparency of the assessment already underway, and how can we publicize our efforts to students and parents about those plans.

Articulation: As previously discussed, we aren’t going to course standardization, but competency-based articulations in five years. By year three we need to have a plan to move to that type of agreement.

We also want to propose a goal of being a national leader in using technology and course redesign to improve student success rates in “killer courses”. Sometimes they are gateway courses, but we need to consider how to help faculty use emerging educational and instructional technology to improve student success rates.

Last point is career and academic advising; there is a set of possible approaches to changing methodology. Exploring technology like e-advising and portfolios, additional staffing will likely be necessary.

Zagros Madjd-Sadjadi (WSSU): Can’t do the prereqs and calc I and II in the first 30 hours, so maybe Calc II should be kicked back.

A: Remember this is a draft version of the guidelines, these sorts of things will have to be worked out.

9:40 am Kate Henz, Senior Director for Academic Policy and Funding Analyses, and Dan Cohen-Vogel, Senior Director Institutional Research lead a discussion of the attainment goals.

The fundemental question is how do we anchor a strategic plan around a projection of where we want to go as a state around degree attainment. Started with a lot of discussion about employer and workforce needs, which broadened into a discussion of broader educational goals. Needs to be anchored within the degree attainment, then as part of that, the discussion is around components of each and the quality of those components like engagement and research.

The first part of that is discussing the workforce demands of the state, which quickly got into the weeds of that data, which varies depending on the source. Really what we are discussing here is directional, and we can’t really project precisely where we should be, which was a controversial question with some having strong opinions on how precise those numbers should be. Eventually the committee arrived at setting a strategic direction with projections based on assigning educational levels to jobs (and how those are assigned was also discussed in depth). Ultimately, the direction became that 32% of the population should have a Bachelors degree or higher by 2018 (which is approx. 4% higher than we are now). The higher numbers required to make us a top ten state were considered as long term goals.

With that in mind, began to lay out the pieces of the pipeline that would need expansion:

The first are the transfer students, particularly CC students. Thousands of students graduating with AA or AS degrees, many of which are really designed as transfer degrees, so there is a potential pool of students who could move on to a bachelors degree. There is also a pool of students with 30-40 hours who have dropped out of the educational system, can these students be brought back in and complete a degree.

NC also has a large military population (both those who have separated from service and those on active duty) and in many cases there is a feeling that with improvements in our services and policies we could increase the number of students here.

There is also a large pool with 90 or more hours accumulated, but have left the system. There are probably 10K students in this pool that might also be pursued.

These pools, plus an increase in the K-12 pool of students potentially pursuing college degrees, are the key players in reaching this goal.

Rigsby: If you put together all those populations, at what point in the next five years do we get to that 32% goal. What happens if we don’t (although you probably can’t answer that)?

Cohen-Vogel: When we look at modeling where we are and how we get to where we want to go, we have a good idea of where we are and how they will age out of the workforce, and we have an idea of how many we need to add back to stay where we are currently, and thus how many more we need to add. While there are many sources of degrees (both public and private), we will still need in-migration to meet that goal. A reasonable projection looks like a 2-3% annual increase from the UNC system. While slower than growth has been in the last decade, it is still very ambitious, since the K-12 growth has slowed since then.

Brian Kerry-Sims (NCAT): Seems to be an across the board assumption that getting higher degree attainment will help all. Two examples, in the last 50 years the degree attainment for African-American’s has exploded but the median income for that community has not reflected that growth. If we are saying that degree attainment helps the state, but the data don’t support that nationally, are there other options that might address that need? Second example is that largest influx is Hispanic, but life expectancy is very low in that group. What else can be done, if degree attainment isn’t shown to help?

Henz: Degree attainment is one goal of the five, and serving the NC communities is another. Our data shows that as the demographics of our students change, to achieve those degree attainment goals we will have to graduate those people.

Hans Kellner (NCSU): Listening to all these ways, this all sounds like closing loopholes and gaming the system by bringing in people from elsewhere. How many degrees does the UNC system need to generate, and where do you think that growth will come from?

Cohen-Vogel: I threw out the range looking like 2-3% annually. That will have to come from the existing universities, and there is a recognition that investments will need to be made to achieve these goals.

10:00 am Report from Kimrey Rhinehardt, VP for Federal Relations.

Starting on the Federal side, there are serious issues that need to be dealt with by January 1st. There are high-level negotiations going on between John Boehner and the President, and Harry Reid will also need to deliver on whatever deal is agreed to. These are high level negotiations and the rank and file will have little input. There are several things that could and should be excluded. At this point, Pell grants are excluded, but the next year there will be an issue with a significant shortfall.

So there is a short term problem, where congress needs to figure out how to not go over the “Fiscal Cliff.” The President holds the high card, Republicans will need to make a deal. What is unclear at this point is how much is cut on the discrestionary side. If sequestration occurs, that is an immediate $80M cut to UNC research funding which will trickle down, and that’s just year one. Summary, we are in the middle of a wait and see period, and they will likely kick the can down the road with tax reform on the docket as well. With the new lines, we have new house delegates, and the faculty should get to know them asap. Status quo at federal level in terms of the House in Replublican hands and the Senate in Democratic hands. Still, with house leadership as currently set, everything is done with high level leadership and negotiation, the rank and file will have little to do with it. Immigration reform on docket, which is certainly going to be an issue with recruiting foreign researchers.

At the state level 60% of the General Assembly are new or second term delegates this year, and strategic planning is timed to address that need for buy-in and education of the new delegates during the impending budget discussion. Higher ed has a reputation for doing as we darn well please, and it is a communication issue that needs to be addressed.

Ralph Scott (ECU): Is there a chance they will just pass the buck and do another continuing resolution?

Rhinehardt: Unlikely, as the sequestration must be dealt with, while things like tax reform will take more thought.

Zagros Madjd-Sadjadi (WSSU): The problem though is that the President can’t overplay strong hand.

Rhinehardt: Congress can’t pass a law that they know will be vetoed, since there is not time enough to play games.

Steve Bachenheimer (UNC-CH): Wondering if you can give us some sense of how our delegation is positioned on committees.

Rhinehardt: Our members are well placed to help us with education issues. Kay Hagen and Richard Burr are on the education committee. We have Virginia Fox in the house who remains the sub-committee chair for higher education. We have folks on armed services, and we have one member on appropriations, unfortunately not more, and we continue to suffer there. At least one will be on Ag Committee, which will help NCSU and NCAT. Our delegation is weak, we only have one, and David Price can’t lift all. Folks like GK Butterfield have been effective. We are well placed for higher education, but not always with agreeing agendas.

We have just hired a new Assistant VP for Federal Relations (Emily Dickens from NCCU) and about 25% of her job is to work with ensuring title 3 funds.

10:30 am Panel Discussion: Common General Education Competencies

Jeffery Braden – Dean, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, NCSU

Susan Cannata – Associate Professor of Literature and Composition and Chair of the Faculty, UNCP; Member, Faculty Advisory Council

Scott Simkins – Director, Academy for Teaching & Learning, and Chair, General Education Review Task Force, NC A&T

Gabriel Lugo – Associate Professor of Mathematics and Chair of the Faculty, UNCW

Moderator – Sarah Russell – Chair, Articulation Subcommittee of the ASP Committee

3:00 PM Plenary Session

The FA voted approval of approval of the October 2012 Meeting Minutes.

Catherine Rigsby gave the Chair’s report, beginning with Leslie Cates preparing the faculty for a legislative day in the spring, and she will come to the next meeting to begin the process.

The FAC has completed its preliminary work, and is now in discussion with the Strategic Directions Group.

From her perspective, these are what sounds like (from the faculty perspective) are the greatest threats in the strategic planning process:

Biggest threat is common core and general education requirements (i.e. loss of liberal arts) and the importance of diversity on our campuses. Some progress is being made, but there are still a few people who believe that every similar class at the same level across the UNC system have a common syllabus and common numbers for courses. This is unlikely to happen but provides insight into the mindset of the people doing the planning.

The next threat is the diminishing faculty role in governance. If you have common syllabi and numbers, you don’t need faculty to plan and create coursework, just people to present the material. It is very important to communicate these issues and the problems with such an approach to both people on our campuses and the public. This is not a subtle conversation that is occurring and it is important to be aware of this as we proceed and communicate with stakeholders outside the faculty assembly.

The third is the threat to tenure. While we are unlikely to lose tenure completely, there is an ongoing discussion of the value of tenure to the system. There has been a request by BOG to have three presentations by Promotion and Tenure Committee to the larger BOG on issues around and the value of tenure.

There has been extensive discussion of standardized assessment. All the literature and the experts say it doesn’t work, but there are people who still want it because it is easy. There will likely be language in the draft strategic plan that will propose some form of standardized assessment and we need to be prepared to discuss it and propose alternative models that work better.

Finally, research is being discussed, and often the tenor of that discussion is that only UNC and NCSU need research. Again, people in the UNC-GA understand the importance of all three aspects of everyone’s job (teaching, research, and service), but we should be aware such discussions occur when we are not present and be prepared to discuss the value of research if given the opportunity.

Issues for the Spring and proposed topics for the FA meetings:

January Meeting-focus on response to the draft strategic plan

February Meeting-Omsbuds, non-tenure track faculty issues (which will likely be lead by Governance)

April Meeting-Maybe revisit the comprehensive articulation agreement?

Budget Committee Report (Raymond Burt, see complete report below)

The committee talked about the performance funding model which was designed to provide an extra incentive, not to replace the current enrollment growth model. The next budget round ($8-10M total) will go to the universities to enhance improvements in student success.

Charlie Perusse reported that he is still pretty optimistic about the biennial budget process.

The committee discussed if faculty line allocations at campuses has been between tenure track and non-tenure track faculty lines based on the budget cuts. At UNC-G, half of new money for faculty went to about 20 high performing programs the rest to others for curriculum needs, meaning that it is affecting academic programs significantly. The committee wonders if they should study this at the other campuses as well, and the FA believes it is worth following.

The committee plans on keeping an eye on how strategic planning processes around enrollment growth (target of 32% with degrees) will affect budgets including how it affects enrollment growth funding, targeting “part way home” students (which will likely be online) and summer school utilization.

The committee presented a resolution on raising the ORP match to 8.25% from 6.84% (attached below).

Zagros Madjd-Sadjadi (WSSU): Does this cause a difference between the ORP and traditional plans? Will the employee contribution increase?

Steve Bachenheimer (UNC-CH): Actuallarily, they are supposed to be equal (i.e. roughly the same contributions and same outcome for the same years of service). Don’t know if the equal outcomes are currently occurring. A second issue is the ratio of contributions (i.e. when we are competitive in total contribution with our peers, we may not be competitive in the ratio between employer and employee contributions).

Rigsby: all of those data have been available for three months on the BOG website, and the resolution addresses what Charlie Perusse and William Fleming are trying to do, which is to increase the amount contributed. If you look, we are behind on the total contribution compared to our peers.

Tammy Hunt: Have been behind for years compared to peers in total contribution.

Steve Bachenheimer (UNC-CH): I think it is important to really drill down. What is overall difference between NC and other state supported peer institutions? It’s not just a question of what the contribution is, but whether the employee can contribute to social security for example. The question is really what is the total of all employee and employer retirement funds and is that competitive, and when on this committee before we found the state to be competitive.

Rigsby: Our benefits people would disagree, and I suggest we all go and look at the data.

The resolution on ORP contributions was passed by the assembly.

Margery Coulson-Clark (ECSU): Does the GA intend to change summer so it is treated the same as the regular year? Many students can’t get financial aid.

Burt: Considering students to be targeted, likely to be online and through extension. Early in process.

Coulson-Clark: If the summer is not considered part of the academic year, many students can’t get financial aid for the courses as part of their package which is based on the academic year.

The Chairs Committee report was presented by Hans Kellner (NCSU).

Introduced a resolution on General Education (attached below): passed (as amended by Steve Bachenheimer that the EC modify the first ***whereas*** to include language from the UNC Mission or enabling legislation).

The committee also discussed the issue of the review of administrators from the department chair on up to the Chancellor and the faculty role on campuses. The campuses varied from -2 to maybe 8 or so on a scale of 1-10. They vary from whether they actually ever occur to every 2nd or 3rd year, and the committee will consider how to improve the situation across the UNC system.

We also discussed the issue of mandated office hours, which varies by campus. In some cases campuses have a number of office hours mandated, others just mandate that they be offered.

There was a brief discussion of campus grievances and hearings but without an outcome at this point.

HMI report (Chet Dilday)

Discovered that many of the HMI administrators had been meeting about what has been called a “blackmail initiative” about money ending from the Lumena foundation, and we want to support the GA efforts to find replacement funding.

The resolution about Chancellors’ flexibility in the MAR has resulted in a meeting but no change in policy. Would still like to press for action. Bruce Mallette reported that it is still in front of President Ross, some action likely coming.

While probably too late in the strategic planning process , the HMI committee would like to see some additional (targeted) funding for retention efforts of minority males.

Finally, the committee would like to change from 8 am meetings, maybe alternating with the Chairs’ meeting at noon.

Faculty Welfare and External Communications Committee (Chet Dilday)

The committee feels that education of the new legislaturers is very important, and we are trying to figure out what are the priorities to express while working with such members. We would like to invite legislative education committee members to come and form a panel, maybe at the last meeting of the year? Maybe some from the appropriations committee?

The committee is also exploring a lobbying day in conjunction with the GA. We feel that the invitation of legislaturers to campus is still a good idea, making sure to have them visit classes and faculty, not Chancellors and Provosts.

The committee would also like a report from Leslie Boney about what was learned and discussed in the meetings with business leaders. While too late for feedback to the strategic planning group from the faculty assembly about what was gathered, the discussion might be useful to the assembly and could possibly be scheduled for the last meeting of the year as well.

Academic Standards and Policies Committee – Articulation Subcommittee (lead by Jim Martin)

The first part of the report was Steve Leonard reporting on the technology survey. We received 1700 responses from collaegues across all the campuses. The survey was in response to the common view in the public that faculty don’t utilize or are underutilizing technology and that therefore the administration should take a more active role. Only 5% of the responses suggest resistance to the utilization of technology. The survey strongly supports the position that faculty are not averse to new technologies and should have the primary responsibility for selecting and implementing new teaching technologies.

The general education issues being discussed have resulted in a new draft of the resolution concerning minimum general education competencies. Moved and passed (attached below).

First look at the comprehensive articulation agreement presented earlier today, and are working on crafting a report that should help shape the final agreement. Committee concerns were centered around the issue that only administrators are involved with the process and were working on the mechanics of the process; there needs to be faculty involvement in the student success piece. The role advising and communication will be critical to success. Concerns were expressed about the language offering the guarantee of admission, and the potential that these incoming students who maintain a 3.0 gpa will get tuition remission is a fairness issue and also has the potential of becoming an unfunded mandate. The committee also wants to make sure that pathways offered are not over determined (i.e. expand pathways to include other options).

Governance Committee Report (David Green)

Discussed with guest speakers Wayne Blair and Laurie Mesibov (University Ombuds from UNC-CH) the role the UNC omsbuds office plays in grievances, and will be drafting a report for next meeting. Jill Moore, Chair of UNC-CH Grievance Committee, gave a presentation about her committee and its objectives. The committee also spent a good deal of time discussing due process and academic freedom issues around suspensions, but are not yet ready to submit a resolution. The committee plans to draft such a resolution for the January meeting.

Academic Standards and Policies Committee – International Programs Subcommittee (Margery Coulson-Clark)

The committee offers a recommendation that the UNC Strategic Plan include recognition of the importance of international experience for its graduates and include policies in support of that outcome.

Academic Standards and Policies Committee – Student Success Subcommittee (Andrew Morehead)

The committee had a discussion with Kate Henz about the concept of a “Transcript or Credit Warehouse” in which all college level work in NC would be stored in one place. The committee is in general support of the concept but expressed concerns about feasibility.

The group also had a discussion of the change in CC General Education Articulation agreement from 44 to 30 hours, expressing concerns about that this is mainly an advising and communication issue.

Finally, we discussed why students drop out while in good standing, and have a long list of data needed for further work on this issue (see appended report).

4:15 pm Adjourn

**Resolution Concerning Optional Retirement Program Employer Contribution Rate**

Approved by the UNC Faculty Assembly

November 30, 2012

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

***Whereas*** recognition is growing that the costs of retirement are increasingly derived from the retirement funds of individuals; and

***Whereas*** retirement benefits of UNC employees at 6.84% have remained static for at least 15 years despite this recognition; and

***Whereas*** UNC’s peers match at a greater proportion of retirement funds;

***Therefore, Be It Resolved*** That the UNC Faculty Assembly supports the initiative of the UNC General Administration to raise the Optional Retirement Program Employer Contribution Rate to 8.25%.

**Resolution on General Education**

Approved by the UNC Faculty Assembly

November 30, 2012

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

***Whereas*,** the education of North Carolina students for effective living is the fundamental goal of the University of North Carolina system; and

***Whereas***, effective living is only possible with a grounding in the social, cultural, civic, and economic aspects of the human environment and the natural environment; and

***Whereas,*** for the study of nature and human culture, tools for understanding them are crucial; and

***Whereas***, higher education is an efficient tool for preparing students for effective living and for understanding both nature and human culture; and

***Whereas,*** a general comprehensive education enhances the human experience in and with the world at**‐**large; and

***Whereas,*** the Continental Congress of 1787 articulated the essential need for public education when it stated that “knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged;” and

***Whereas,*** North Carolina General Statute 116**‐**1(b) states that “teaching and learning constitute the primary service that the university renders to society” and that “the mission of the university . . . is accomplished through instruction, which communicates the knowledge and values and imparts the skills necessary for individuals to lead responsible, productive, and personally satisfying lives;” and

***Whereas,*** the University of North Carolina is committed to equip its students with the highest quality of Higher Education;

***Therefore, Be It Resolved*** That all students in the University of North Carolina system receive an education that affords the broadest possible vision of the natural world and of the human condition in its social, cultural, civic and economic forms; and

***Be it Further Resolved*** That the University of North Carolina system takes steps to insure that such education be provided in a form envisioned by the academic faculties of its various constitutive universities.

**Resolution Concerning Minimum General Education Competencies**

Approved by the UNC Faculty Assembly

November 30, 2012

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

***Whereas,*** the ability to transfer core courses across the UNC system campuses is a goal of the UNC General

Administration; and

***Whereas,*** a set of minimal competencies for UNC campus General Education programs could facilitate this goal;

and

***Whereas,*** the General Education programs currently in place on UNC campus vary in detail, but contain many common core competencies, including critical thinking and quantitative analysis, scientific inquiry, communication skills, historical and social perspective, and human expression and creativity; and

Whereas, the campuses of the UNC System have varied missions designed to serve the needs of our state and their regions; and

***Whereas,*** UNC does not receive accreditation as a system, but each institution must independently meet the SACS Standards for Accreditation; and

***Whereas,*** any transferred credit must meet transfer‐level quality SACS accreditation standards and the evaluation of transfer quality can only be made by the faculty; and

***Whereas,*** the content and delivery of General Education courses, as well as the design of General Education programs, on UNC campuses is primarily a faculty responsibility; and

***Whereas,*** UNC Policy 400.1 states that “Campuses shall continue to have the lead role in identifying academic program needs and in formulating proposals to meet those needs,” and “In these processes, faculty expertise is essential for sound academic decision making at the campus and system levels;”

***Therefore, Be It Resolved*** That the UNC Faculty Assembly supports the Faculty Advisory Council’s recommendation for the formation of a state‐wide General Education Council charged to undertake a comprehensive review of existing General Education programs across all sixteen UNC undergraduate degree awarding institutions, provided that this new General Education Council is made up of full‐time UNC faculty members (at least one from each campus), appointed jointly by President Ross and the UNC Faculty Assembly; and

***Be It Further Resolved*** That the General Education Council’s review will form the basis for any system‐wide effort to determine a set of common General Education competencies that will strengthen and streamline learning outcomes across the system; and

***Be It Further Resolved*** That as per UNC Policy 400.1 any General Education Program common competences must be approved on each campus by the appropriate faculty curriculum‐approval processes and the faculty on each campus (while ensuring that any approved common competencies are met) shall continue to exercise control over both the specific content of their General Education courses and the format of their General Education program; and

***Be It Further Resolved*** That faculty engagement be structured in such a manner so as to ensure that SACS and individual program accreditation standards are met, and

***Be It Further Resolved*** That any General Education Program common competences complement and not restrict the varied missions of the constituent campuses of the UNC System; and

***Be It Further Resolved*** That, in addition to normal campus‐based General Education assessments, any common system‐wide General Educational competencies must be evaluated and assessed periodically by an interdisciplinary group of faculty using appropriate shared governance structures and procedures; and

***Be It Further Resolved*** That at such time as UNC minimum core competencies are established, a system‐level Equivalency website shall be created and maintained to ensure the campus‐to‐campus transfer process as seamless and transparent as possible; and

***Be It Further Resolved*** That, once established, this Equivalency website shall be expanded to include courses from the NC Community College system (as they are approved by disciplinary faculty committees as per the CAA).

Faculty Assembly ‐ Budget Committee

Meeting Notes Nov. 30, 2012

Committee Members Present: Richard Bernhard, NCSU; Michael Wakeford, UNCSA; Raymond Burt, UNCW; John Lepri UNCG

GA Liaison present: Charlie Perusse, Vice President for Finance

1) Following up on the decision to revisit the “Academic Core” White Paper, the committee members reviewed that paper and decided that it would prove useful to update data on the non‐tenure track vs. tenure‐track faculty ratios for the last 4 years (2009‐2012) as this period may include the effects of the budget cuts on this ratio. Charlie Perusse provided us with data from 2009 & 2010 which is the most recent information available. The committee will continue examining this issue.

2) Performance Funding model. Charlie Perusse reported that this model will not replace the current funding model, but would provide extra incentive funding to campuses. For each of the past two years, the amount of funds distributed to campuses totaled $1 Million, but General Administration plans to significantly increase the request ‐ 8‐10 million.

The funds would be aimed at improving student success on the campuses.

The model was based on the “best practices” throughout the nation. All campuses are on a level playing field for these funds. Enrollment growth is uneven among the campuses – i.e. some are not growing, or do not want to grow, whereas Performance funding is a source of funding for all campuses.

3) No one knows how the Biennial State Budget will treat the university system, however, Charlie Perusse takes an optimistic view due to a number of factors – the collaborative strategic planning process, the improving economy, the recognition of the huge hit taken by the university in the last budget, etc.

General Administration will work very hard to promote a strong budget outcome for the university system.

The economy for NC is doing better – October‐ ahead of the projections for the year.

4. Allocation of faculty lines – has that changed? Based on academic program review, tenure lines allocated in greater numbers to strong departments. Not on balance of curriculum, but on strong departments

Question: Is your campus shifting allocations of faculty positions based on a new rubric based on the budget situation?

UNCG completed their academic program review 241 programs and about 40 were discontinued. No tenure‐track/tenured faculty lost jobs. Allocation of new positions – 1/2 given to the top 20 programs and the other half distributed to the other programs based on curriculum needs.

Question: Would it be useful to gather this information from all campuses?

5. Strategic directions: too early to tell what the budget ramifications

32% ‐ 2‐3% growth per year – how would this affect the budget situation?

Enrollment growth could cover the costs of new students, and then funds may be generated in tuition from targeted populations: part‐way home students, military, etc. GA will ask the legislature for additional funds to reach these populations.

Under discussion is the use of summer school to better facilitate this goal. Have summer school incentive money to lure back – part‐way home students. An excellent model: UNCC 49 program. Summer School can also be used to address the retention of first‐year students transitioning to the sophomore year.

As an example of creative use of the summer school: allow faculty workload flexibility by having faculty choose to use summer classes as part of the semester workload. Thus a faculty member could distribute their teaching workload over the semester and the summer. Summer school would compensate the department with replacement funds. This would entice some faculty to teach in the summer.

Student infrastructure efficiencies could result in student retention through strengthened efforts in improving advising, mentoring, and tutoring.

In the personnel area, there are discussions in GA and the Board of Governor’s Personnel and Tenure Committee about an increase of the ORP optional retirement plan contribution from the university. 6.84% to 8.25%.

The Committee offered the attached budget resolution.

Faculty Governance Committee meeting on November 30, 2012

Present: Ralph Scott, ECU, Gabriel Lugo, UNCW, Mary Jean Ronan Herzog, WCU, Stella Anderson (by phone), APPSTATE, UNCA, Patti Sink, UNCG, Andy Koch, ASU, Floyd James, NC A&T, Linda Wilson-Jones, FSU, Jan Boxill, UNC-CH, Hans Kellner, NCSU, Himanshu Gopalan, WSSU, Susan Cannata, UNCP, Brian Sims, NCA&T, and David A. Green, NCCU, Chair

Jan Boxill invited her colleagues from UNC-Chapel Hill to present at the committee meeting to discuss their Ombuds office, Grievance Committee and Hearing Committee.

Wayne Blair, University Ombuds and Laurie Mesibov, University Ombuds gave a thorough and impressive presentation on their Ombuds office and the objective of the office. They discussed the four principles of the office: confidentiality, informality, impartiality and independence. There was an extensive question and answer period following the presentation.

Jill Moore, Chair of UNC-CH Grievance Committee, gave a presentation about her committee and its objective. She discussed the separate role of the grievance committee from the hearing committee. Richard Whisnant, former Chair of the Hearings Committee gave a presentation about the objective of the hearings committee. The grievance committee handles employment matters and institutional relationships and the hearing committee handles discharge, failure to promote and suspension.

Andy Koch provided some brief details regarding the suspension of Professor Jammie Price and the process the campus followed in suspended the professor.

The committee decided to draft a resolution to be presented at the January 18, 2013 faculty assembly meeting regarding due process, which should include suspensions, academic freedom, and shared governance; possible separated.

The committee decided that David Green would circulate a draft of a resolution for committee input and then have the final proposed resolution about available for the members of the faculty assembly two weeks prior to the January 18, 2013 meeting.

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

Student Success Committee meeting on November 30, 2012

Present: Andrew Morehead, ECU, Chair, Bob Gotwals, NCSSM, Floyd James, NCAT, Ellen Jones, UNC-G, Kelly Charles, FSU, Tammy Hunt, UNC-W, Sandra Rogers, NCCU, Deb Eaker Rich, UNC-CH, and Kate Henz, UNC-GA

The committee had a discussion with Kate Henz about the general concept of a “Credit Warehouse” or “Transcript Warehouse” in which a centralized repository of credits earned at all UNC, community college, and (ideally) NC high schools would be available to admissions and advising offices at those institutions. The committee was in general agreement that, if possible, such a repository would be very useful (and monetarily advantageous) for both the institutions and students applying to more than one campus or transferring from one to another within the system.

The committee also had a brief discussion of the concept of a community college general education articulation agreement. As the current version was not available, the committee felt the concept was worthy of implementation but concerns were expressed that this not become too restrictive and that the main issue in any case was advising of the students in an appropriate manner.

To begin the task of examining performance funding models and related matters such as retention rates, graduation rates, and other academic success measures, the committee began assembling a list of the types of information that would be required to make a meaningful set of recommendations. The initial thoughts are listed here:

1st, 2nd, 3rd Choice of University (and if possible how that is related to retention/transfer rates)

Why students don’t return (and how one might collect such information)

Correlation of retention rates with student debt

Correlation of retention rates and family income

Correlation of retention rates with campus on/off living (by 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th year if possible)

Correlation with number of credits transferred with retention (both CC/HS AP)

Number not returning but still qualified to return (i.e. years since last credit earned, GPA at time, etc.)

Correlation with types of aid (loan, grant, fellowship, athletic scholarship, academic scholarship)

Correlation of number of credits earned DE/Face to face with retention/graduation rates (by 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th year if possible)

Submitted: by Andrew Morehead, Chair, Student Success Committee