

UNC Faculty Assembly Meeting
October 25, 2013
Spangler Building, General Administration, Chapel Hill, NC

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Assembly convened at 9:06 am on September 20, 2013, with a quorum present.

9:06 am. FA Chair Catherine Rigby calls the meeting to order and gives a quick summary of the main items in the agenda

- A. President Ross' presentation.
- B. There will be a session on the current status of the College Articulation Agreement (CAA).
- C. The centerpiece of the session will be a discussion of Core Competencies leading to a resolution which, if approved, will be sent to UNC campuses for endorsement.

9:10 am. Tom Ross, UNC President addresses topics picked by Faculty Assembly Executive Committee (FAEC) and answers questions from the assembly.

- A. Search for VP for Technology-Based Learning and Innovation.
 - a. Invitation has been sent to 4 candidates. Has not yet read the application packages.
 - b. No real concerns about the position not housed under AA. The structure was drawn by the BOG. The idea is to appoint a high profile person who reports directly to the president but will work closely with AA.
- B. Core Competencies.
 - a. Response to a question of what would the BOG will do if we don't do it.
 - The source of the initiative comes from the interest by the BOG and from national interest, partially triggered by *Academically Adrift*.
 - It is being questioned whether students are really learning. Some think the curriculum is too broad and as a result, students are not learning; that what we should be teaching are the classics and that general education should be focused on a core of some 20 courses.
 - But, surveys of businesses and corporations reveal that what employers seek are core competencies such as writing and communication skills, ability to manipulate data, team work.
 - An effective system needs to be clear about what is the core curriculum and ascertain if there is any improvement.
 - b. Response to questions of whether the problem is lack of rigor, lack of motivation, or lack of talent:
 - Drawing from personal experience, President Ross stated that he progressed from a rather poor student as a freshman to investing a lot of effort in his education by the time he was a senior.
 - Some parts of education have changed. In the old days education was mostly about content. But this is not really what we need today. Students need to know where to find information and learn how to learn.
 - We need to make it clear what are the goals and how to assess them.
 - c. Response to questions of how to do effective assessment and the increased cost of assessment of competencies, which to be effective requires smaller faculty/student ratio:
 - Blame for the change is not BOG but changing expectations of society.
 - We are not going to close campuses. Data show that residential students do better and online instruction is not as effective as face-to-face for incoming freshmen.

- We need both depth and content. Depth is improved by research experiences and internships, but MOOC's and technology can be helpful in the delivery of content. Technology advances that can provide hints to students working problems and can track progress to make it easier for instructors.
- Not every course can be 1-1. There are face-to-face constraints such as cost, students in the military, and global education.
- In the end, focus should continue to be on excellence of the quality of instruction.

C. Perceptions, quality

a. Comments/questions from the faculty:

- Perception problems. "Adrift" has pervaded thinking about Higher Education. Many citizens including legislators have overreacted, assuming we are doing a poor job. We would do better educating the public if instead of the 45% figure picked up by the media, we focused on the 40/20 Reading/Writing ratio that was really the emphasis of the book.
- Effectiveness/Quality problems. As we increase the former, excellence will eventually suffer. 40/20 requires labor.
- Competencies: Students only spend about 20% of their college experience in the classroom. Large proportions of their competencies are acquired in the other 80% of academic work and co-curricular activities (such as intensive thumb writing) outside the classroom. It is presumptuous to think the faculty "are it;" some have an inkling that we are not.

b. Response to perception/quality questions:

- Some people think that if we increase rigor, students produce more.
- Personal story on how a speech he handed to a German professor for comments was returned with a large number of corrections, clearly showing a meticulous and time consuming editing effort. He was lead to the realization that we can always to better. Story highlighted with a hilarious etymological lesson on the only two possible uses of the word "impacted," both painful.
- Uphill battle in educating the legislature. Fighting mostly anecdotal information.
- Example: Cost of education
 - The rise in the cost of education to the state is commensurate with inflation and the increase is really mostly in tuition. One reason for the increasing cost is that America has transferred the burden of research to universities which require buildings, labs, equipment and this drives up the cost.
 - It is true that there has been a large increase on the administration/faculty ratio, but a large proportion of the increase is due to compliance offices required by federal and state regulations. Some regulations are good but they require staff. Also, there are discrepancies on how faculty in partial or full administrative roles are counted.
 - Universities are like small cities. The residential model requires increasing support services. There are more first generation students, thus more need for financial aid; more complex societal challenges, thus more need for advising and counseling; more students, thus more security and health services; more technology use, thus more technology support.
- Of course, we can always to better.

D. Benefits

- In response to some faculty concerns about a memo from General Administration (GA) in regards to health care benefits for fix term faculty under the Affordable Care Act (ACA), President Ross remarked that he was not aware of any policies from GA; that there were unanswered questions in the ACA about the equivalence

of ¾ employment to the number of load hours; that facts should be checked before pointing towards GA; but that he would talk to HR about the issue.

9:45 am. Karrie Dixon, Senior VP for Academic and Student Affairs, CAA update.

A. Short History of CAA

- a. Presented a visual going through the process. Thanked faculty for contributions to make the project successful in spite of an aggressive timeline.
- b. [Current CAA](#) established in 1996 in response to House Bill 739.
- c. [Common Course Library](#) (CCL) first created in 1977.
- d. Why change now?
 - No major change in 16 years.
 - Questions on how well we are following the CAA policy.
- e. [CAA Review Steering committee](#) created. Ortega & Morrissey (2012)
 - [Roster](#): 4 UNC provosts, 3 NCCCS CAO's, one chief student affairs officer
 - Report to the [Education Oversight Committee](#) (2012)
 - Charge: Revision of CAA
 - Streamline transferability
 - Course alignment
 - CAO report twice a year on adherence to CAA
 - First report due Nov 01, 2013.
 - CCL being revised. 125 courses with low enrollment targeted for elimination.
- f. UNC participation
 - Phase I
 - Faculty disciplinary panels. 204 UNC faculty participated. Worked on courses on which all UNC campuses could agree.
 - Course alignment with 56 colleges - joint meeting results in the Universal 30.
 - Phase II
 - Pre-major discussions start on July 2013.
 - Participation: 109 faculty in 6 disciplines (Business Administration, Criminal Justice, Social Work, Biology, Elementary and Middle grade Education).
 - Next: October 30th. Add more courses to Universal 30. Currently there are 41 courses
 - 14 Natural Science
 - 07 Mathematics
 - 09 Social and Behavioral Sciences
 - 09 Humanities
 - 02 English Composition
- g. Changes to CAA ([Attachment #1](#))
 - AA: 64 hours → 60 hours
 - 44 core satisfied *all* lower division Gen Ed → Universal 30 will satisfy *some* of Lower Division Gen Ed.
 - New curriculum standards for AA and AS, as shown in [Attachment #1](#).
- h. Timeline
 - Campuses have 7 weeks to vet the new CAA. It was sent to campuses 2 weeks ago → CAO → Faculty → Provost → GA by December 02.
 - January 2014 – Final draft to BOG
 - February 2014 – Joint Board meeting – Sign off agreement
- i. Other issues

- NCSSM – Have not started aligning their courses. Request made by NCSSM Chancellor. Will start by sending copies of all documents. Yes there is documentation on the courses and corresponding SLO's.
- In many institutions, some pre-major courses are also Gen Ed. Not a problem. Let campuses make the adjustments.
- Discussion will continue in Academic Committee.

10:05 am. Panel: System-Wide Core Competencies (CC) ([Attachment #2](#)). Moderator, Till Dohse (UNCA).

A. Catherine Rigsby: Introductory remarks

- a. Fought hard to get faculty input.
- b. Either we do it or they will do it for us – back to pre WWII style.
- c. Lots of colleagues have spent lots of hours doing lots of work. Listen to them carefully.
- d. Need solidarity
- e. FA motion → Senates → FA: By December 02!

A. Process: Erin McNelis, faculty co-Chair of the GEC (WCU)

- a. One year ago when Strategic Directions was first announced, Catherine Rigsby, and the FA lobbied heavily for faculty participation. A Faculty Advisory Council was formed and that group worked heavily and proactively under very demanding time constraints to inform and respond to the BOG's work by producing the document [Our University Our Future](#). Substantial portions of the Council's report were incorporated into the BOG strategic plan ([OurTimeOurFuture](#)), including recommendations for the creation of the General Education Council and the inclusion of a set of Core Competencies.
- b. The FA successfully lobbied for continued faculty role in the implementation of the BOG's strategic plan. President Ross set up committees with significant faculty membership. The GEC is one of those committees. The GEC appointed several subcommittees with specific charges to address the implementation of the initiatives on general studies listed in OTOF. The main aspects under consideration today are the Core Competencies (CC's).
 - Care was taken to respect the distinct missions of the UNC campuses.
 - A survey on 5 categories was sent a year ago to all campuses.
 - An email blast with an additional survey was sent in last month (September 2013) covering 7 competencies.
 - Two CC's rose to the top in terms of commonality and breadth: Critical Thinking and Written Communication.
 - The two competencies do not constitute a prioritization. They are simply the two that are proposed for system-wide assessment.

B. Timeline: Katharine Stewart, Assoc. VP for Academic Affairs and Learning Strategies (GA)

- a. Conflict between the two goals stated in OTOF:
 - 1. National leader,
 - 2. Fast time line.
 - Fairly certain we can't do both.
- b. End of January. Have the GEC report drafted and send to BOG. Report will contain the two CC's mentioned above.
- c. Spring 2014. RFP for assessment tools and pilot assessment of CC's.
- d. Spring 2015 – Scale up to UNC.

C. Obstacles: Mike Wakeford, co-Chair of the GEC Qualitative Assessment Subcommittee (UNCSA)

- a. Conflict on goals as stated by Katharine.
- b. Formative vs. Summative assessment. Ensure to include more than one mode of assessment.

- c. 275 responses to survey. There is interest in digital portfolios. Working mostly on qualitative assessment.
 - d. Forget not that the force behind is a “political necessity” with tight time constraints.
 - e. Want more than standardized tests!
 - f. Fall 2014, 3-5 pilots. Evaluate over winter break. Scale up in Spring 2015.
- D. More on Obstacles: Andrew Morehead, GEC member (ECU)
- a. Cost. Just selected 2 competencies for assessment. Intersection of the ones most common. More would probably be prohibitive. In nerd language, not orthogonal.
 - Again, conflict with timeline
 - Development
 - Data coding
 - Infrastructure challenges
 - b. Avoided “disciplinary” type competencies on purpose and choose the two whose union encompasses the most.
- E. Long and lively discussion. Some topics listed below:
- a. Steer away from outside push for “reductive” assessment and especially of the push to sift out numerical comparison of scores across campuses.
 - b. Move toward multimodal assessment.
 - c. How do we capture competencies acquired in the college experience outside the classroom?
 - d. Cultural obstacles
 - Exemplified by survey results with comments such as “what is a digital port folio?” and “*If done correctly*, digital portfolios can improve learning.”
 - Training and support for faculty and staff. Technophobia.
 - Buy-in from the faculty – fear of reductive approach; grades to institutions. Time demands on faculty. Can we agree it is worthwhile?
 - Concerns about students:
 - If done campus-wide, portfolios may just end up in a repository.
 - Time for reflection compressed at end of senior semester.
 - Maybe be both cost- and time-prohibitive if done correctly.
 - Matching findings to regular class grades.
 - Conflicts:
 - Utility vs. cost
 - Summative vs. formative
 - All vs. sampling
 - Quality vs. quantity
 - New expectations vs. SACS
 - Old methods vs. new methods disguised under different vocabularies
 - internal constituents vs. external
 - Single vs. multimodal and comprehensive
 - Two vs. more competencies (not likely to be questioned by the mandate!)
 - Student self-assessment vs. Faculty assessment of student
 - Informed vs. uniformed interpretation
 - Innovation vs. risk; Cautious vs. bold
 - Continuous vs. “jump” improvement
 - Confidential vs. public. Need IRB? How will the data be used? By whom? The more comprehensive, the more identifiable. Keep pressing the IRB idea.
 - Compliance vs. education of BOG and legislators

- A. September 20, 2013 minutes were approved
- B. Chair's report – Catherine Rigsby
 - a. February meeting changed to February 14 to avoid conflict with BOG meeting that was moved to February 21
 - b. This will give three meetings after the GEC report is ready and the February meeting of BOG
 - c. Chair calls for committee reports
- C. Communication Committee report – Mike Wakeford (UNCSA)
 - a. Two members of GA attended the meeting: Drew Moretz (Government Relations) and Joni Worthington (Communications)
 - b. Drew explained his role as advocate and “informant’ for UNC at the legislature. Always working on ideas on how to “shape the message” for maximum effectiveness.
 - c. Joni – one stop shop for communications. Reiterated that often what drives legislators is anecdotal information.
 - d. Committee considering recommending part of plenary session to bring in Drew and Joni.
 - e. Committee thinking of formalizing the idea that the FA Secretary should co-chair the Communications Committee
 - f. Working on ideas to repair the internal communications flow.
 - Maybe a fast release, formal advisory prepared by the committee for rapid deployment to campuses.
 - In some campuses, active members of shared governance do not what is the FA. Local repairs needed.
 - g. Streaming FA meetings not on the radar screen, FA is advisory to the President and the meetings are not open.
- D. Academic Resources report – Andrew Morehead (ECU)
 - a. Most of the time spent on update to Protect Academic Core paper.
 - b. More data needed: IPEDS, cost to reach 89% salary level compared to sister institutions. Want averages and deviations.
 - c. Want to increase employer contribution rate to the Optional Retirement Program (as per [FA Resolution 2012-08](#)).
- E. Instructional Efficiencies – Steve Leonard (UNC-CH)
 - a. Two main topics:
 - Preliminary Strategic Directions (SD) action items.
 - Advising is not currently high on the action list. Good to start thinking about this. Two concern themes
 - a. Demographic targets.
 - b. Infrastructure changes.
 - Procedures and practices existing in the Action Items.
 - Exhaustive Discussion on eLearning
 - Concerns about online education across the system.
 - Some BOG members want online to be more prominent.
 - Need more sense of origin of items in strategic plan.
 - New position at GA, VP on Technology Learning and Innovation, may clarify tasks for eLearning group
 - a. Vigorous and exhaustive discussions
 - b. Effective policy for high quality of online courses
 - i. Require certificate of instruction competence.
 - ii. Require certificate of student readiness.
 - iii. System support staff.
- F. Senate Chairs – Andrew Morehead (ECU)

- a. Discussed policy on new definition of full term faculty: 1FTE = 13+ contact hours
 - Lecturers teaching 9 hours do not get health benefits under .75 Affordable Care Act rule.
 - Current full-time faculty not affected in terms of benefits because 12 hours is over 0.9 FTE.
 - Three campuses have implemented this policy: A&T, UNCW, ECU.
 - b. Discussed resolution on Core Competencies. Echoed many of the same items mentioned earlier in the minutes of the panel session.
 - c. Just had time to initiate a discussion on program prioritization.
 - d. Items from the floor
 - Retreat for chairs was very good.
 - Probably as a result, it primed several very informative discussions among senate chairs by email.
 - Would be good to include senate chair-elects if they have already been identified.
- G. HMI – Margery Coulson-Clark
- a. Assessment
 - Different types on collective campuses
 - More than qualitative
 - Make sure that Core Competency assessment reflects qualitative and multimodal approaches.
 - b. Discussed the deleterious impact of some aspects of Student Success on HMI's.
- H. Governance – David Green.
- a. Draft of resolution on System-wide Student Success Policy updated ([Attachment #4](#))
Motion on the Floor.
 - Discussion on whether to make the resolution more general and apply the “opt out” clause to all BOG policies or make it very specific to the Student Success to address immediate need. Hans Kellner moves that SACS style verbiage to the effect that “Faculty are charge with primary responsibility for student success” be inserted somewhere in the Resolve where it makes sense.
 - There follows a fast flurry of suggestions for word additions, deletions and syntax corrections and faculty eventually converge onto a resolve paragraph that includes the words of the amendment.
The amendment passes
 - Discussion goes back to the argument of general vs. specific. A motion is made to change the title to be inclusive of all policies handed down from BOG. Discussion settled by humorous but wise argument that generalizing to all BOG policies amounts to wishful thinking that BOG would go away. Amendment is lost.
 - After a few more corrections and over one objection that the resolutions is amorphous and it diminishes governance, the motion is called to a vote
The revised resolution ([FA Resolution 2013-10](#)) passes (with 1 dissenting vote).
 - b. Draft of resolution on Faculty Senate Communication with BOT's is brought to the floor. ([Attachment #4](#))
 - Motion to change “some faculty have not established communications...” to some faculty governance bodies do not have established avenues of communications...” passes.
 - After a minor edit, the motion passes as amended.
 - [FA Resolution 2013-09](#) passed as amended, without dissent.
- I. General Education report. Hans Kellner
- a. The Core Competency resolution is presented to the assembly ([Attachment #4](#))
 - The wording of the Core Competency proposal was discussed and amended.

- The amended resolution ([FA Resolution 2013-11](#)) passes without dissent.
- J. Chair Rigsby reminds delegates that the Core Competencies issue is both important and time-sensitive and urges them to discuss it with faculty leaders on their campuses, to ask to have it placed the November Senate/Council meeting agendas, and to report their campus response to the FA by the end of November.
 - K. The meeting adjourns at 4:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted
Gabriel Lugo – Secretary (UNCW)
October 27, 2013

REPORTS of the Faculty Assembly October 25, 2013 COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Academic Resources Committee Meeting October 25th, 2013

Present: Jim Porto (UNC-CH), Jerono Rotich (NCA&T), Harvey McMurray (NCCU), Dan Cohen-Vogel (UNC-GA), Jim Martin (NCSU), John Lepri (UNC-G), Shawn Collins (WCU), Jim Deni (ASU), Scott Bradshaw (ECSU), Jeffery Geller (UNC-P)

The committee had an extended discussion of the update to the "Protecting the Academic Core" white paper. Potential issues with the utilization of IPEDS Data and what sort of granularity is/is not available in that data was discussed. One example was how Part Time vs. Permanent employee non tenure track faculty are defined and whether some types of part time faculty even appear in the data.

Other issues included Faculty Workload-FTE generated per faculty member and other potential definitions, how we could potentially utilize students enrolled in research sections as a proxy for the work done teaching outside formal classroom instruction. In a similar view, what useful information could be gleaned from graduate expenditures/enrollments.

Dan Cohen-Vogel gave a report on 50 and 80th percentile average salaries at peer institutions for each constituent institution and the cost to the system to reach those levels. The committee asked for median and standard deviation for data on peer institutions. Reminded him of the resolution supporting raising the employer contribution to the ORP.

Submitted by Andrew Morehead (ECU)

Faculty Senate Chairs October 25th, 2013

Began with a discussion of the potential conversion of full time to part time status for NTT due to ACA and whether this was occurring on campuses.

The Chairs had a brief discussion of the Core Competencies Resolution to be introduced later at the full FA meeting and the importance of getting campus based support through the senates.

In the last few minutes, it was asked if during Academic Program Prioritization processes on other campuses if Faculty Senate committees were involved. Involvement appeared to be widely varied by campus.

Submitted by Andrew Morehead (ECU)

Academic Standards and Policies Committee – Instructional Efficiencies Subgroup

25 October 2013

The Instructional Efficiencies Subgroup addressed two issues at its 25 October 2013 meeting.

The first concerned action items in the UNC Strategic Plan pertaining to matters of academic advising. The group reviewed a series of themes and questions composed by ASPC co-chair Kelly Charles (see Appendix, below).

Three general categories of action items were noted: initiatives directed at reform of substantive advising goals; initiatives intended to support infrastructural improvements in advising systems; and initiatives targeting specific groups of students for special attention in advising programs.

The review was primarily informational: participants were asked to consider these matters for systematic discussion at future Faculty Assembly meetings. Presiding Chair Stephen Leonard suggested that academic advising would likely be the focus of the November or January meetings of the subgroup.

The second discussion item concerned the current work of the UNC Strategic Directions Implementation E-learning Workgroup. Professor Leonard and Professor Jimmy Reeves, both of whom serve on the E-learning Workgroup, reviewed recent developments in defining the parameters of an instructional personnel policy, the production of which is the Workgroup's present task.

The critical point of emphasis in this discussion was the importance of academic excellence in online education.

The consensus of the subgroup was that an effective instructional personnel policy intended to promote academic excellence in online education should stress the following:

1. The particular and unique challenges of online teaching and learning require forms of readiness that are not always effectively experienced in or readily complemented by traditional face-to-face course work.
2. A well-crafted instructional personnel policy would be comprised of readiness-certification and education programs that would assist instructors in providing high-quality online courses. Those programs should be designed to address the specific and different readiness needs of teachers, students, and support staff.
3. Readiness certification programs should be constructed on a “verification and advising” model. Instructors, students, and support staff should only be required to demonstrate competence in technological skills and pedagogical (teaching, learning, design, or delivery) skills minimally necessary for successful online education. Supplemental instruction and training should be offered to those who are unable to demonstrate competence.
4. Faculty should be responsible for oversight and approval of all readiness certification programs.

A number of members of the subgroup noted that there are programs already in place on a number of campuses that could serve as templates or models useful for promoting these goals system-wide, and urged the E-learning Workgroup to try to make good use of existing University resources.

The members of the subgroup also recommended that the E-learning Workgroup use for their policy proposals vetting procedures similar to those employed by the SDI General Education Council.

The subgroup asked Professors Leonard and Reeves to provide the Faculty Assembly with regular updates on proceedings in the E-Learning Workgroup.

REPORT SUBMITTED BY STEPHEN LEONARD, 1 November 2013

**Academic Standards and Policies Committee – General Education Group
October 25, 2013**

COMMITTEE NAME: Academic Standards and Policies Committee – General Education Group
MEETING DATE: October 25, 2013
PERSON PRESIDING: Hans Kellner (NCSU)
MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: 11 members of the Faculty assembly present
Lothar Dohse (UNCA); Tom Ellis (ASU); Gregory Starrett (UNCC); Floyd James (NCA&T); Suzanne Gullledge (UNC-CH); David Nikkel (UNCP); Laurie Patterson (UNCW); Britton Theurer (ECU); Katie Moulder (NCSSM); Catherine Rigsby (ECU, Faculty Assembly Chair)
GA LIASIONS IN ATTENDANCE: Katharine Stewart, Tenita Philyaw-Rogers
OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Erin McNelis (WCU, Co-Chair of GEC)

ACTIONS OF MEETING

The committee spent the bulk of its time discussing, editing and finalizing a resolution on System-Wide Core Competencies. At the core of this resolution was that “... the core competencies adopted by the UNC system must be approved by the faculty of the constituent institutions ...” and “... the faculty at the constituent institutions must have primary responsibility for the development and administration of assessment instruments ...” This resolution that also included wording in support of the choice of competencies was brought to the floor of the Faculty Assembly and passed with minor edits.

During the remaining part of the meeting the committee discussed the problems of assessing of core competencies, as well as possible strategies to do this assessment efficiently and effectively. Key topics that were discussed:

- The merits of using existing meta-data.
- The possibility of having consistent assessment strategies across campuses as an alternative to having one assessment instrument being used on all campuses.
- The merits of an e-portfolio and how it has been used at Clemson University.

SUBMITTED by Till Dohse (UNCA)

**Governance Committee
October 25, 2013**

COMMITTEE NAME: Governance
MEETING DATE: October 25, 2013
PERSON PRESIDING: David A. Green, Chair
MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Spoma Jovanovic, UNCG, Andy Koch, ASU, Linda Wilson-Jones, FSU, Christina Pacilla, WSSU, Margery Coulson-Clark, ECSU, Ellen Rosenberg, UNCSA, Chet Dilday, FSU, Patti Sink, UNCG, Melissa Burchard, UNCA, Mark Sprague, ECU and David A. Green, NCCU, Chair
GA LIASIONS IN ATTENDANCE: Tracy Ford

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: None

ACTIONS OF MEETING

Item: Draft resolutions on Faculty Senate Chairs Reporting to the BOTs of their respective campuses and Statewide Policies on Student Success

Discussion: We discussed the resolutions.

Action Taken: Finalized the resolutions

Duties assigned and deadlines: Present two resolutions to the full faculty assembly later that afternoon. After lengthy debates/discussion, both resolutions were adopted by full faculty assembly later that afternoon.

Item: Fostering Student Success

Discussion: Tracy Ford gave an update on the fostering student success initiatives and the changes in policy. There were extensive questions and answers.

Action Taken: None

Duties assigned and deadlines: None

Item: Completion of Shared Governance Survey

Discussion: We also discussed again who on each campus should complete the Shared Governance Survey and again agreed that should be decided on each respective campus. We also recognized/discussed that the survey as a pdf was difficult to circulate and get quick responses. Melissa Burchard graciously agreed to work with her faculty assistance to create a more user friendly format for the survey.

Action Taken: None

Duties assigned and deadlines: David Green to email Melissa the survey and Melissa will have a new format created as soon as possible.

Item: Other projects/needs

Discussion: There were three items identified that needed future actions.

- (1) Acquiring faculty input on campus security issues
- (2) Identifying potential "experts" within the UNC system who could serve as references on governance and grievance processes
- (3) Another Shared Governance Workshop (like the one co-sponsored with AAUP)

Action Taken: None

Duties assigned and deadlines: David Green, as a member of the UNC Campus Security initiative, will work to assure that faculty has effective input on campus security issues. After Melissa finalizes the new survey format, include in the updated email to the faculty senate chairs a request for a list of "experts" on governance and grievance. David Green to touch base with Catherine on another possible co-sponsored workshop with AAUP.

TASKS ASSIGNED FOR COMPLETION BETWEEN FA Meetings: Circulate update shared governance survey format

ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED and ACTIONS TO BE COMPLETED AT NEXT MEETING: Follow up on projects/needs

SUBMITTED by David Green (UNCC)

Communications Committee October 25, 2013

Communications Committee meeting:

Participants: XXXXXXXXXX

1. We were joined by Drew Moretz (VP of State Relations) and Joni Worthington (VP of Communications). Moretz and Worthington each offered a brief survey of their responsibilities. After hearing from each of them, the committee talked more, in general terms, about faculty desire to know more about the system-level communications and political strategy, and faculty interest in playing a more active role in reaching our various "publics," our committee decided to make a suggestion to the FA Exec. Committee consider dedicating a general session to these issues. That suggestion/request was communicated during committee reports.
2. There is clear interest for our committee to work with Faculty Senate chairs to provide, uniformly, a slot in each senate meeting (as necessary) for an FA delegate to report on FA business. This happens in some places, not in others.
3. We brainstormed the idea that it might be useful for the Communications Committee to take the lead on a new kind of communication instrument--i.e. a very brief "bullet point" summary of each FA meeting's highlights that could be distributed to FA delegates and Senate Chairs in virtually "real time," i.e. within hours of the end of the meeting. This, to expedite the process by which delegates could provide a brief to campus constituencies, even if formal minutes were still pending. The proposal was made that the Communications Committee could begin drafting this memo during its committee meeting, finalize it after each afternoon session, and distribute shortly thereafter. Exactly how such a memo would be constructed merits further discussion. Likely it would need to be generic rather than position-taking--i.e. it could offer 'headlines,' but would have to leave fuller statements of FA positions to more formal instruments.
4. Gabriel Lugo talked about the program the faculty produced for UNCW trustees recently. This could be a model for other campuses. This will be further explored.
5. We acknowledged, too, the need to follow-up on the committee's charges related to faculty welfare and will soon discuss a strategy for capturing feedback from campuses about issues including changes in healthcare coverage, and impact of Academics First policy implementation on the teaching and learning side of faculty experience.

SUBMITTED by Mike Wakeford (UNCSA)