**Minutes**

**UNC Faculty Assembly Meeting: Friday, October 26, 2012**

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

9:00 am Faculty Assembly Convenes.

Catherine Rigsby (ECU) welcomed the assembly, gave an overview of the meeting, and then introduced President Tom Ross to address the strategic planning process currently underway by the Board of Governors (BOG).

President Ross began with a discussion of incorporating faculty input into the Strategic Planning process through the formation of a faculty advisory committee (FAC), and hopes that group will be present in some number at strategic directions committee meetings and will work with the staff and that committee as they progress.

One area they (the FAC) will be very helpful is around the question of quality and the process of developing and assessing learning outcomes. What the strengths and weaknesses are of the models out there? They may be able to introduce some new ways to assess learning and academic quality.

Another is the area of E-Learning, with the question of what’s taking place already on campuses and what can be enhanced. President Ross met with a representative from the consulting group who does E-Learning work last night and he was talking about a lot of the things we do really well already and some steps we can take to enhance what we are already doing. Part of the message we need to promote is that technology is not just about DE, but is useful in the classroom. Important not only to make those tools available to faculty but also providing training in how to incorporate these tools. It takes time and effort to learn new technologies. President Ross suspects technology will end up being more useful in the classroom than outside.

Q (Rigsby): One of the issues for faculty is that it is really hard to get input from the faculty on all the campuses. Do you see any loosening of the timeframe to allow for more faculty input?

A (Ross): No, the target is still early 2013. We want to be ready as the Legislature is still early in the budget process before they get too busy. We want to be ready; we want to be able to talk about where we are with our goals and where we want to invest. We had a very healthy and good discussion at the last meeting of the advisory group meeting. It was very helpful in thinking about the direction the university and state should go. Do we want to be on same path or be more aspirational? Do we want to be one of the top five or ten states in the country in degree attainment and what does that mean? What does it mean for quality of life, higher personal incomes, and lower social costs that seem to correlate pretty directly with higher educational attainment. Still gathering data. Also helpful to hear at the meeting what employers want and need along with traditional liberal arts education. Also the need for the depth part of the “T” description of learning; the internship experiences, the research experiences, the ability to learn lifelong in their field.

Q&A with Delegates:

Lloyd Kramer (UNC-CH): Thanks for facilitating faculty involvement. On our campus has been a lot of discussion about these things. One of the issues is those things beyond job creation. The argument is that there is not enough quantitative date on the value of education. Cites paper on “education for the common good” from the United Way.

Ross: At a meeting of the Institute for Emerging Issues and already looked at some of this data. Essentially, if you are between 18-24, what are the odds that you have participated in a group charitable event? For society as a whole it is just 2%. That point has come up during discussions of the strategic planning group.

Steve Leonard (UNC-CH): Reiterate point, concerned about claims made by some folks (Tuesday night?) that these other social effects are non-quantifiable. And that’s just not true.

Ross: If you have data like that, please share data with the GA.

Mary Jane Herzog (WCU): Are the goals just attainment of degrees, or to take seriously that we be one of the most educated states? Are we to compete with the top five most educated states in other areas, for example, Colorado is one of the five skinniest states?

Ross: There is some evidence for that…

Notis Pagiavlas (WSSU): Easy to generate argument of negative social cost to lack of educational attainment. I challenge all of us to form a committee to examine this issue.

Ross: Please share anything that applies. It is important, and we had a discussion about cost avoidance.

Hans Kellner (NCSU): Discussion has been occurring around campuses. During UNC Tomorrow there was a response generated. Would some kind of campus-by-campus response be expected and welcomed?

Ross: yes, and maybe the advisory committee is the avenue or directly to us.

Rigsby: One of the things we should discuss during the plenary session.

Reeves (UNC-W): One of the problems with being creative is that we are seeing more and more restrictions on the money generated. For example, DE money is given to departments, but so restricted that the money is not usable.

Ross: Give me an example?

Reeves: If we get money for DE, it can only be used for DE for undergraduates, but we need money for funding graduate students. Another example is that all money from the technology fee is now in a trust fund, but that money is now restricted in uses and vanishes in July.

Ross: Urge you to send to me or your legislative liaison those examples and they can take them to legislature. Don’t know who places those restrictions, but if GA gets them, they can work on that issue.

Stella Anderson (ASU): Question about shared governance. UNC Code lays out principles but campuses need more specificity when implementing those. That’s the purpose of the 2005 statement from the faculty assembly and I think what we need from you is more specifics about how that principle is enacted.

Ross: I believe in the principles of shared governance, and I will follow them myself. Campuses are required to work with faculty. The GA is not supposed to dictate the form. I will talk to the Chancellors about the importance of shared governance and urge them to work with the faculty. The campus senates should take those to their chancellors. Some of the 2005 document is inconsistent with the UNC Code, for example, program discontinuance is a BOG and not a faculty decision (although faculty should participate in the process). While decisions may be unpopular with the faculty, they should always be part of the process.

Michael Roberto (NCAT): Reality is that shared governance on many campuses is often top down. However, what I want to say about strategic planning is that the university can play an important role in meeting both business and community needs. Often business and community have different definitions of terms.

Ross: Attainment is about both meeting business and state needs, but part of the five goals is also meeting the needs of the state in a broader sense.

Frederick Buskey (WCU): Hitting on the themes, here is an example. Often the Provost or others will have a preconceived goal, and those who speak up are charged with not being collegial or become damaged in their career progression. It is a real problem for junior faculty when we have a façade of shared governance.

Ross: I have run a campus, and it’s not always smooth. My advice is to get a group together and go to Chancellor Belcher and say we need to work together.

Steve Bachenheimer (UNC-CH): We have just lost Bill Friday, and he was a member of the advisory committee for strategic development. I hope we have an empty chair when they meet to remind people that he is still present and his leadership is still a model.

Ross: If you look at the video stream of last meeting, I reminded committee of exactly that. He was a huge loss to the state and his strong voice will be missed.

Rigsby: The Faculty Assembly is an advisory committee to the President and thus these are closed meetings. Typically people ask for permission to attend and we say yes. Today, we have a guest (Mr. Jay Schalin) from the Pope Center. A representative of student governance will be here this afternoon.

9:40 am Report from Kimrey Rhinehardt, Vice President for Federal Relations.

She began with an update on the work of the UNC Strategic Directions Committee (the “working group”). This working group is one of the workhorses behind the scene, gathering information and bringing it to the main strategic planning group.

How do we frame this process? This is a tipping point in higher education, but I don’t think it needs to change what we do in a radical way. Our students have changed, and what we need to figure out is how to bring what we do to the students through multiple pathways.

There will be big, bold print about the University’s commitment to the Liberal Arts. We want students that can read, write, and communicate. One of the ways we are proposing to do this is by framing it as a “UNC Compact” or promise to the state (see External Communications Committee Report below). The University will produce multidimensional graduates.

* A possible frame is academic quality and efficiency.
* Fresh eyes on what our missions are as individual campuses.
* Embracing new technology
* What are our goals? Do we want to be a top ten state?
* How do we reach all our possible students (military, those near degree completion but not currently enrolled, Community College, etc.)
* Increased research support and partnership with NC industries.
* Strengthen and improve faculty pipeline.
* Improve resource management and efficiency. (i.e. do we need every campus to determine residency for those applying to multiple campuses in state)
* Prioritize performance and efficiency.

Sarah Russell (NCCSM): Not hearing specifics about how the group interprets these goals. We have really different constituencies depending on campus, how sensitive is this committee to those differences as we pursue excellence across the board?

Rhinehardt: that’s where institutional mission comes in.

Dale Knickerbocker (ECU): Two words really caught my attention. In particular, entrepreneurship classes. Entrepreneurship, how is it defined? It should not just be starting a small business, but should be faculty coming up with novel solutions to problems. That brings me to the point of accountability. I now spend 25% of my life justifying my existence. Increasing accountability demands is the opposite of efficiency.

Rhinehardt: We all agree that we don’t want the K-12 accountability model. Outcomes as defined by this body(FA) will be very important. Leslie Boney will discuss entrepreneurship

Margery Colson-Clark (ECSU): I suggest you look at access in the entrepreneurial way. Would like to see some way to address the fact that some students arrive unprepared, and that some can’t get in due to lack of preparation. We need some way to address that these students arrive unprepared for college level work.

Rigsby: That brings up Leslie Boney.

10:00 am Report from Leslie Boney, Vice President for International, Community, and Economic Engagement about the work of the Engagement Committee and proposed Engagement Metrics.

This process began before the strategic planning process, and comes from President Ross’s five goals. President Ross in May 2012 addressed a group at Wilmington at the second summit about engagement, and asked them to make some suggestions about a committee that could look at and summarize and analyze what the UNC system was doing in this area. Another group had a couple of failed attempts at analyzing economic development metrics. We have asked two people from UNC-G to head these two efforts.

We have moved into a world where everything is thought to be quantifiable. Have to explain to groups that doubt assertions without proof. Also now in a world where there is a two year cycle and folks who ask what have you done for me lately?

Some campuses have done studies, and depending on the methodology they come up with billions of dollars in impact, the question is how many billions is that. In some cases they count state dollars and in others non-state dollars. In terms of degree attainment, university graduates outperform the next lower level of attainment, and that amount is about 8 billion additional dollars. To some extent this is a political point, demonstrating value.

They have tried through these committees to look at a few things that were meaningful, measureable, and adjustable. What has emerged is a draft of a draft, and the committee will look over the next quarter what can be collected and to look at the meaningfulness of that data (and how hard it is to collect). Then those metrics will be revised and the data will be collected over the next fiscal year.

Some example metrics:

* Student Curricular Engagement
* Cutting-Edge Research, Inquiry, and Creative Activity through Community Engagement and Economic Development
* Transformative Community-University Projects and Partnerships for Mutual Benefit
* Transformative Continuing Education and Outreach to Enhance the Quality of Life in North Carolina
* Success Stories of Community Engagement and Economic Development

Rigsby: We do need feedback, and there is a push from the BOG and public to show engagement.

Chet Dilday (FSU): Everything is heavily weighted to production; surely we need to more long-term impacts.

Boney: Both committees were absolutely focused on how to get to there, but we don’t have the resources to get at year-to-year measures and outcomes. Starting here with inputs and outputs, and recognize that this is inadequate, and that they do not tell the story. Over time, hope to get to a more outcome based analysis.

Holly Reilly (UNC-W): Call into question the term “real life”

Melissa Burchard (UNC-A): Think it would be wise to set agenda, and this document is a little too focused on economic impacts. Don’t cave into this language, we should set agenda.

Boney: Doesn’t view entrepreneurship as a negative word. We want skill sets that apply to every aspect of the sorts of things we want in every field.

10:30 Panel discussion on the subject of measuring academic quality ran until lunch at noon.

Panelists – Mike Carter (Associate Dean of The Graduate School, NCSU)

 Bernice Johnson (Associate Provost/Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, NCCU)

 Dan Cohen-Vogel (Senior Director of Institutional Research)

Moderator – Andrew Morehead (Chair, Student Success Subcommittee)

All the panelists spoke on assessment at their campuses and national/state trends. Some clear messages were articulated about the danger of adopting any “one size fits all” assessment measures, the importance of tying assessment to mission and inputs. The discussion and the resulting work of the Student Success Subcommittee are reflected in the report appended below.

2:30 Plenary Session

The Assembly voted to Approve the September 2012 Meeting Minutes.

The Chair’s Report was presented by Catherine Rigsby:

First, the shared governance resolution is actually on agenda for discussion with the Chancellors. Next thing to do is to have faculty chairs send that document to their Chancellors, particularly on those campuses having issues. Chair Rigsby will be traveling in the spring to campuses to help with faculty manuals, and there will be a workshop in Chapel Hill on December 1st from 9-1 about shared governance and specifically about crafting faculty manuals, jointly sponsored by Faculty Assembly and NCAAUP. Chair Rigsby will email flyers out to everyone about that upcoming event for distribution on their campuses.

Second, the resolution on faculty input into the BOG strategic planning process was affirmed by President Ross and we now have the faculty advisory committee. It is only an advisory committee and is not a perfect solution, but the best we could get on such short notice and in the current environment. That committee will work very closely with Faculty Assembly EC.

Sandy Rogers (NCCU) would like to thank UNC-P for starting that resolution.

The third resolution from the September FA meeting was the affirmation of Academics First, and the CAO’s received it and were appreciative.

The Ombuds resolution from Governance was tabled, and will be revisited in the spring once the Strategic Planning process is finished.

Chair Rigsby acknowledged the members of this body that have been working on GA committees. Notis and Zagros have been working on the engagement committee. Steve Leonard (UNCCH) is now our representative on the statewide distance education committee. She is looking for a representative on the common core committee that has been working with K-12 and community college statewide articulation issues. Starting in January, Dale Knickerbocker will be on the Foreign Language committee.

The next item was a strategic planning process update. The first meeting of the Faculty Advisory Committee was on the Monday following this meeting. Plan is that all publicly available materials (which should be everything) get out to this body, which includes the chairs of all the faculty senates, and the process depends on us to distribute on our campuses. There was a survey sent out asking for general input, and the nice folks from Chapel Hill have modified to make it better and it should be distributed asap. We need as much input as possible and as quickly as possible. She asks that the chairs please have forums on individual campuses.

Next meeting we will discuss the concept of a common general education minimum set of requirements across the system. The articulation group has already worked on this today, and Chair Rigsby has already spoken to the working group about this issue. We need to ensure that anything academic is ours, and we need to make sure that we shape the discussion.

Jim Martin read a resolution honoring Bruce Mallette. Passed by the assembly (see text below).

Bruce Mallette thanked the assembly members past and present, and the GA staff with whom he has worked. Commented that we need to be able to explain what we do as a University system, more money is not coming so we need to make it clear what benefits we bring.

Q: Do we need to sharpen shared governance resolution to bring into compliance with UNC Code?

Rigsby: The interpretation by Ross was very strict, and the reality is that most of the policies have advisory roles for faculty.

Committee Reports and discussion (summary below, see attached reports):

Chairs group (Hans): We would like to continue to have the Senate Chair’s meeting for an hour and leave early for other meetings if desired. It is clear that more time than an hour was often necessary. The committee talked about the shared governance document; did it need to be redone? Heard some serious questions about program reviews and forced resignations. Discussed the ombuds issues, who has, how do they work, should everyone have one? Retaliation for SG activities was discussed, and in particular how universities went about restructuring. A number of resolutions were discussed for a later date.

HMI(Chet Dilday): The committee discussed the new minimum admission standards, and the effect on HMI campuses. Lots of data has now been collected, and it is now clear that the GPA is much more predictive than SAT. Clearly, there needs to be discussion with GA leadership of why thousands of students at HMI’s will not be admitted while other institutions are much less affected. While recognizing that it is unlikely to change standards in short term, but ask that more flexibility be granted to Chancellors for exceptions.

Commented that they haven’t seen anything in strategic plan that addresses minority access, summer programs that need funding.

Statements:

We think that “and” should be changed to “and/or” in the MAR.

We think that faculty should be included in discussion of Chancellors’ MAR flexibility. The current 1% limit (and whether of admitted or applied number is an open question) is too small.

Bruce Mallette discussed correlations of SAT and GPA with student retention, and that a case could be made that with certain GPA but low SAT scores, exceptions might be with negotiated.

Catherine Rigsby will take that idea to the CAO meeting.

Governance (David Green): Committee took view that faculty should work internally with their campuses in so far as possible to institutionalize shared governance.

Training on grievance committees is not complete enough or consistent from campus to campus, and goal is to come up with a document that will be of use (as a starting point) to someone going through the process. Will table the omsbuds issue until spring to gather more information about best practices.

Budget Committee (Raymond Burt): Update on Academic Core white paper. Have decided to review the ratio of tenure track/NTT faculty, as the old data is from 2008, and since that time the system has had some significant budget hits. May have been some significant changes in that ratio.

The performance funding model has given about $1M to each campus, which is a small amount. Might become larger in the future (the projected goal is for 8-10 Million). Those funds go to campus administrations, and how should we interface with those administrations (probably depends on size of funds available)?

Biennial state budget is still unknown, but Charlie Perusse is optimistic that it will not be as gloom and doom as some of us feel.

Last question is whether allocation of faculty lines changed to become more based on high performance rather than balanced curriculum? If that is true, administrative decisions will have impact on academic programs.

Student Success (Andrew Morehead): the committee affirmed the faculty’s commitment to academic quality. Moved on from that to suggest some core competencies similar to the AACU’s value rubrics. Recommended including the position that programmatic and content knowledge are also important indicators of program quality. Any assessment should be tied to mission and considerations of student inputs and resources. Note that development of the “soft skills” is labor and resource intensive. General education is very important in the development of such skills.

To the question of how do we measure this? Assessment measures must be mission and campus specific. Must include multimodal ways of looking at outcomes, must be broad based to include “soft skills” and programmatic content. Might also include surveys of alumni and employers. Should utilize, if possible, existing data (SACS, etc.), engagement metrics, peer review.

Q: Can we find different words than “soft skills?” These are central to liberal arts education and the very thing we value highly.

Morehead: Agree completely, but this is the term used in the working group, and skills and core competencies are the language politically used. We emphasized general education and core competencies in the report, and that it is everyone’s job (in the university) to teach these things. Clearly, if you are in the Chemistry department, like I am, you depend on other departments to work on writing and math skills.

Q: What are the distinctions between social capital and skills?

Morehead: Some of the skills in the forthcoming document do work with those social competencies, and we expressly chose language to emphasize the importance of these skills in all areas of a graduate’s future life. We want skills that transfer from job to job and place to place. We are trying to not use the term productive citizen because of the political context, but that’s really the goal.

Rigsby: we all agree it’s a bad name, but everyone understands what we mean. We should work long term to fix that issue.

Articulation Subcommittee (Jim Martin): The committee split into two groups for today’s meeting, one talking about the minimum core studies and the other about technology.

Technology utilization (Leonard, UNC-CH): Most of you know about the recent dustup at UVA, which was partially fueled by the perception that the faculty and the institution were technologically backwards. The GA needs information on technology used on the campuses. The committee will put together an instrument (survey) and gather information on technology utilization in classrooms to be used by President Ross to answer critics. You will be getting that soon.

Minimum Core of Studies (Jim): Broad resistance to idea on first pass when the concept sounds like a common set of course requirements for all campuses. It really is a shared vision across campuses, looking for commonalities and communicating them to the public. We need to recognize differences between campuses, but address the need of students to have the expectations communicated in such a way that no one gets surprised when they transfer in.

External Communications Committee (Eddie Souffrant, in response to Ms. Rhinehard’s comment earlier):

“The faculty considers the following an extension and more succinct articulation of the 2007 document (UNC Tomorrow) and it reasserts in that voice, that the University of North Carolina is committed to help academically prepare students to become productive members of society through a high quality liberal arts education. This commitment will be facilitated by an admissions process that maximizes diversity, and by a commitment to a low tuition structure. As a community of scholars, we are also committed to contribute to make the citizens one of the top five educated in the nation.”

Premises to be forwarded later when articulated more clearly, draft reflected in report below.

Chet Dilday discussed visiting the Legislature by a broadly representative group, with some training, and a common message.

The committee would also like us to consider having the legislaturers come to campus for a day. That doesn’t mean come and meet with Chancellor, Board of Trustees, etc., but actually meet with students, staff, and faculty.

They have come up with long list of stories (to be included in committee report, attached below).

International Committee (Margery Coulson-Clark): The committee thought we were discussing international engagement, but found ourselves discussing economic development matrices and the problems with it.

Definition of entrepreneurship on campuses needs to be broadened; international engagement tends to be excluded as currently defined.

Q: Could a department get back part of DE monies generated for the campus as faculty development funds?

A: (Leonard, UNCCH): DE managers at individual campuses are aware of this and will be talking about it. The way these programs are funded, where the money goes, needs of the program are all on the table.

Jim Martin moved to pass resolution to Honor Bill Friday, seconded by Eddie Souffrant. Passed (Text below).

Adjourn

**Faculty Governance Committee meeting on October 26, 2012**

Present: Dale Pollock, UNCSA, Ralph Scott, ECU, Gabriel Lugo, UNCW, Mary Jean Ronan Herzog, WCU, Dmitri Argyropoulos, NCSU, Stella Anderson, APPSTATE, Susan C. Staub, APPSTATE , Mellisa Burchard, UNCA, Patti Sink, UNCG, Andy Koch, ASU, Floyd James, NC A&T, Linda Wilson-Jones, FSU, and David A. Green, NCCU, Chair

There was a discussion about members being disappointed that President Ross was not willing to express his support for the principles of faculty governance approved by the faculty assembly in April 2005. The committee recommended that faculty members work within their campuses to institutionalize through a formal process, including their faculty handbook, the principles of shared governance.

There was a discussion about the full faculty assembly’s decision to table the motion on ombuds for each campus. The recommendation was for the committee to assure itself that it was educated on the ombuds issues before the issue is raised in the spring. The committee recommended that we ask Jan Boxill to invite her colleagues from UNC-Chapel Hill to present at the committee meeting on November 30, 2012.

The committee discussed following up the efforts from last year on training for grievance and hearing rights. We discussed circulating a power point presentation prepared by Raymond Burt and Sandie Gravitt. Also Mary Jean Herzog shared a presentation that was prepared by the School of Government that will be circulated as well. The committee members will review the two presentations and make further recommendations. Dale Pollack offered students at UNCSA to assist in filming vignettes. David Green offered students at NCCU School of Law to assist as well.

The committee recommended that each University have a faculty delegate attend the workshop on December 1, 2012 entitled “Academic Excellence, Shared Governance, and Faculty Handbook.

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

**Student Success Subcommittee Report**

**Faculty Assembly October 26, 2012**

 All committee members agree that the Faculty are committed to the academic quality of our programs. The Faculty select the outcomes, create the curriculum, deliver the content, and ensure its quality.

 A program of study with high academic quality is intentionally designed to create a graduate who has the skills, competencies and dispositions to be well positioned for success in a global, ever-changing society. The American Association of Colleges and Universities (AACU) has created a series of essential learning outcomes that could serve as a model (<http://www.aacu.org/VALUE/rubrics/index.cfm>), although other models could be equally as useful so long as carefully selected to ensure a broadly applicable approach to education designed to build core competencies coupled with depth of program content knowledge.

The AACU essential learning outcomes:

**Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World**

* Through study in the sciences and mathematics, social sciences, humanities, histories, languages, and the arts

*Focused* by engagement with big questions, both contemporary and enduring

**Intellectual and Practical Skills, Including**

* Inquiry and analysis
* Critical and creative thinking
* Written and oral communication
* Quantitative literacy
* Information literacy
* Teamwork and problem solving

*Practiced extensively*, across the curriculum, in the context of progressively more challenging problems, projects, and standards for performance

**Personal and Social Responsibility, Including**

* Civic knowledge and engagement—local and global
* Intercultural knowledge and competence
* Ethical reasoning and action
* Foundations and skills for lifelong learning

*Anchored* through active involvement with diverse communities and real-world challenges

**Integrative and Applied Learning, Including**

* Synthesis and advanced accomplishment across general and specialized studies

*Demonstrated* through the application of knowledge, skills, and responsibilities to new settings and complex problems.

 One of the keys in accessing the success of any program is defining specific outcomes related to the mission of each institution. Every UNC campus has a distinct mission related to its unique role within the system, the region it serves, and the students it accepts. In addition, each campus’s faculty and administration is best situated to ensure academic quality utilizing multiple modes of assessment that includes both degree specific skills and the broader outcomes (many of which will be anchored within the general education requirements).

 Assessment processes might include any number of the possibilities listed below (and many others), but cannot be limited to any one measure that captures all the complexity of the desired competencies. Assessment must also be coupled with a continuous cycle of improvement designed to maximize the success of our students.

Some possible assessments include:

* Employer and graduate surveys
* Existing accreditation data (SACS, etc.) as formative
* Subject specific content
* Core competencies such as those listed above
* Measure of impact on state
* Peer review

 There should be recognition that high academic quality programs of study require high quality faculty, adequate resources, and are labor intensive. As an investment in the future, the general education and core competencies are likely to be the most transferrable and valuable components of student success, and thus the success of North Carolina as we move to the future.

**October 26, 2012**

**Faculty Assembly - Budget Committee
Meeting Notes**

Committee Members Present: Beth Kurz-Costes, UNC-CH; 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. We will draw on the same data sources used by the academic core sub-committee which included institutional planning and research websites and campus factbooks. Additionally, we asked Charlie Perusse to check and see if GA has a single data source for this information.

2) The committee recently received the most recent version of the 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 this amount could increase 10fold in the future.

Funds from performance funding (13-14) will go to the campus administration. General Administration does not specify how campuses can use this funding. There may have been Guidelines for possible funding targets by GA provided to the campuses, and Charlie will check on that and provide that to this committee

Question: Would FA engage in a discussion on the campus plans for performance funding?
If so, then the data is being gathered this year, the amount of funding will be determined in the coming budget round, and so this would be the time for faculty senates to engage the administration in discussions about these funds.

1. 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.

GA sent out request to the chancellors for top 3 budget priorities and received them.
**Question**: Faculty input at the campuses on creating these priorities - should FA look at this – the faculty senates should consider the faculty input in the budget requests from the campuses.

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

**Articulation Committee**

Updated on our progress in three categories:

·         DE/Technology survey for system faculty

·         Common General Education Requirements proposals

·         Transfer student data and experiences across the system

1)      Maggie O’Hara, Steve Leonard and Jimmy Reeves are working very hard and fast to create an concise and comprehensive survey to send out to all faculty in system schools that will collect data on the number of DE courses taught in the system as well as the varied and many technologies employed in traditional classroom pedagogy.  This will be coming out soon – stay tuned and be ready to pitch it to your colleagues – this information will be very helpful for our input into the strategic planning process!

2)      Catherine Rigsby and the **Faculty Council to the Strategic Planning Process** are currently working on creating a position paper that will address common general education competencies across the system schools, the need to protect the unique differences between the schools and the need to create much more easily accessible information on transfer equivalencies among all the schools

3)      Regarding this last initiative, those of you who have collected transfer resource data for your school and have it in easily attachable form,  please send it to me! (if you have not done so already)  If you have not done this, please follow through with questions below, and then send it to me.  Hopefully, we can build a system-wide overview that will improve communication on transfer credits throughout the system

**QUESTIONS on Transfer Resources**

*1)      What information is made available (via website or link or other public information) to potential transfer students about accepted credits/preparation for majors/methods for succeeding at your university etc.?*

*2)      What are the issues/concerns that those on your campus who deal directly with transfer students and credits have about the process? \**

Additionally:

*3)      What information/studies exist that track the success of transfer students at your institution?*

\*In terms of question 2, it would be helpful to talk to whoever is in charge of transfer support/articulation and allow them to outline their concerns without too many leading questions – in other words, do their concerns align with ours, unprompted?

Their answers may lead us to a better sense of what key issues are emerging  – including DE course articulation , Int’l credits, Early College  - beyond the traditional transfer

Continued request/need to collect information about transfer process.

Roy Fielding provided connection to all campus links.

Not too much consistency of issues campus to campus.

About half track transfer success, half don’t so much.

**DE System wide meeting of DE reps** (Maggie O’Hare, Steve Leonard)

One of first system wide DE meetings.

* Looking for system wide quality standards.
* Mechanics, starting dates, registrations, funding structure…
* Faculty training and support for development. More sharing among campuses.
* Research into DE…student achievement, faculty support, … Have a lot of data that can now be looked into.

Faculty related issues:

How to overcome philosophical opposition to DE?

Need to facilitate any ramping up to make sure appropriate developing and training.

Steve L. notes that can’t effectively teach good DE course with more than 20 students. So how does this relate to efficiency? Need to counter the mythology of scaling up. Will have major implications of faculty governance, support/benefits…

M. O’Hare says report already exists…DE more to develop but ~same to run as face to face.

J. Reeves and S. Leonard note many issues of how pay for, what credit counts for what…

Concern that some of external company efforts are looking for UNC system to partner as validation for their program. Are there true benefits to department or University?

Need access to at least a share of revenues generated to Depts.

Split into DE and technology subgroups.

* DE charged to work on technology inventory.
* Articulation charged to look at core of Gen Ed and how they transfer institution to institution. “Minimum Core Standards”

**Discussion on Minimum Core Standards**

Raised question of the potential tension between being liberal for transfer students who are doing well and the need for a barrier to avoid using transfer as way out.

AP, for example, says students must pass a subsequent class to get credit for the exemption transferred class/credit.

Challenge to make hard and fast rules…what do you do when you find a student does not know how to write?

Challenge when there aren’t subsequent level courses to use as “barrier” to poor performance. Which is often the case with Gen Ed where only one class may be required in a category…no way to assess performance at next level.

Make sure we’re only looking at the *minimum* that must be eligible for transfer.

Cannot require that specific core courses necessarily transfer…even if hours in program.

Do we need to specify minimum level (e.g., lower division) as well as minimum of courses, credit hours that are transferable?

Here, we are specifically looking at only within system transfer. Here, we are asking to accept that decisions at each campus. . . accept the evaluation process of each campus’s faculty.

Emphasize that this is not at all to impact courses specialized to a major. This is just focused on non-major gen ed courses.

Note that there can be a challenge test, e.g. for foreign language. (Found largest areas where this is important are English and foreign language).

Related to credit by exam…could require that students have taken class then have them take an exam.

For subsequent courses could look at where gen ed may be prerequisite .

Need to find mechanism to address perception vs. reality. Sometimes perception is that quality is not the same campus to campus. A performance measure could work around perception.

Question about how the proposed minimum core maps onto all campuses already established Gen Ed. Particularly looking at CR requirements. Where are the gaps?

Also need to understand where there can be some double gen coverage areas—global studies…is that a special course or can it be integrated to another course?

Need to interface with articulation agreements, as well as Career and College transfer.

B.Mallett sees need to show tax payer a guarantee that minimum requirements really are valid…How can there be 16 different entry level Englishes?

What do we mean about health and wellness…relates to concern that that too much push xyz into gen eds and results in too many requirements for a regular major.

Need to decide if there is a minimum that every student needs to have. . . I.e., a minimum Gen ed for every school? Or is this an “if you have had a course at campus x then it needs to be accepted at campus y?”

For transfer, some campuses have found it best to note that there is a maximum number of courses that can transfer in. And/or do not let 300/400 level courses transfer in because those presumably those should be associated with major or special course of study. May be an elective…

Some concern to make sure students don’t go over the 140 limit.

Gen Assembly is having a study about tuition sur-charge. Goal to make sure students don’t stay forever, while not hinder students who have taken a variety of courses before coming for a degree.

Need to know what campuses currently accept from one intuition to another. Have data already in CFNC database.

Need to be aware that BOG, legislature… will try to define what Gen Eds should be.

Do need to know what we mean by a degree?

If minimum Core…concern is does this amount to almost half of a total degree?

Catherine needs to know is there something we can philosophically agree on? Is there is a common core of gen ed? And, can we agree to accept transfer from constituent campuses?

Can we define a set of commonly agreed upon concepts of gen ed while respecting that each campus has unique identity? Start with statement that there is something in common…specifics to be determined. Need to assure faculty are in control of course content.

Challenge is how do we deal with the huge wish list that pleases everyone…personal finance, global learning, health…but will an engineer learn to be an engineer?

The work is in disciplinary panels of faculty to assess compatibility.

Conceptually group agrees to endorse “page-1” for Catherine to take on to strategic planning discussion.

One of the biggest problems/challenges/needs is to make sure requirements at campuses are communicated to those who are transferring in. Need queriable database so that a transfer councilor can communicate to students.

\*\*\*\*Need to do gap analysis to show where there are commonalities. Then make sure to communicate where there is the differentiation. DON’T try to force into one mold.

Need to insure students don’t find necessary information too late in process. Cost too high to ignore the “hassle” index.

Bottom line summary

* Must acknowledge one size does not fit all.
* Need to look for, acknowledge and communicate where there is overlap. There are many areas where we have shared vision across all campuses.
* Need to communicate the differences in programs and expectations, particularly with respect to transfer and articulation, so that students are not caught off guard about requirements.

Evaluate the designated “minimum CORE” against the established Gen Ed courses to determine how much and where the overlap is.  Then (and this is the most important point) communicate very clearly and publicly which standards are common to every campus and communicate equally clearly which standards are not, ideally at one centralized obvious location or website.  Bruce made  a good case that all campuses do not have to be identical, they just have to make sure that prospective students can get the information on critical differences in standards easily, often, and well before they get into credit or transfer difficulties—

**Faculty welfare and external communication**

The faculty considers the following an extension and more succinct articulation of the 2007 Document (UNC Tomorrow) and it reasserts that the University of NC is committed to help academically prepared students become productive members of society through a high quality liberal arts education

This commitment will be facilitated by an admissions process that maximizes diversity and by a commitment to a low tuition structure.  As a community of scholars, we are also committed to contribute to make the citizens of this state one of the top five educated population in the nation.

The UNC Compact is too long but we have modified crudely its content:

(To be read aloud)

The University will educate productive NC citizens

The University will educate students who can adapt and collaborate with their regional, national and global contemporaries

The University is committed to educating all willing K - 12 NC students

A University of NC education is academically rigorous and of high quality

The University is committed to recruit and retain highly trained tenured and tenure track faculty

The University affirms its commitment to the Constitutional requirement to keep access to all students.

The University will invest in its commitment to research and knowledge generation

The University will build on its culture of inquiry and innovation by generating and disseminating its faculty's disciplinary expertise

The University is committed to the tradition of liberal arts education

The University is committed to (support/partner with) the community colleges and their Mission

The University is committed to identity the problems of concerns to the community and society at large

The University is committed to engage its students and faculty with the problems and concerns that affect the community at large.

We have added, Catherine, to Kimrey's suggestion and at times modified them.  The above could help make the case for the preamble read to the group on Friday.

Suggested Stories (From Brainstorm Session on November 7, 2012):

1. Pembroke - 125 year celebration - contact: Dr. glen Burnette

2. Award to top faculty - O. max Gardner award

3. Greensboro LGBT 14% safe zone etc. and Charlotte or system wide info concerning LGBT

4. Dental school satellite offices from ECU

Also: Carroll Dashielle

5. Faculty profiles such as from "Endeavors"

6. Student success stories from various campuses

7. Philosophy and Religion Department at UNCW making TV show

8. Facebook pages with libraries and departments throughout system

9. Service learning examples especially from uncch

10. Stories that speak to use of UNC portal

Resolution Honoring Bruce I. Mallette

Whereas Bruce Mallette served the University of North Carolina meritoriously for four and a half years in Academic and Student Affairs at UNC General Administration and over twenty years at North Carolina State University;

Whereas Bruce Mallette joined with the UNC Faculty Assembly to generate the “Academics First” initiatives as a commitment to academic rigor and student success in a time of limited and declining resources;

Whereas Bruce Mallette worked tirelessly to put forward an affordable student health insurance plan;

Whereas Bruce Mallette provided leadership on increasing access to a university education for many North Carolinians through the College Access Challenge Grant, GEAR UP, the Minority Male Mentoring Program, Summer Bridge, creation of new tools with the College Foundation of North Carolina, improved financial aid resources, and focus on articulation and transfer navigation from the North Carolina Community College System;

Whereas Bruce Mallette lent his expertise in data gathering and reporting to Institutional Research and improved the processes for such at General Administration;

Whereas Bruce Mallette fostered collaboration between faculty, staff, students and administrators by establishing and utilizing structures of shared governance;

Whereas Bruce Mallette not only maintained an open door during business hours, but also an open email and phone line on many early mornings, late nights, weekends and holidays;

Whereas Bruce Mallette always reminded the leadership at General Administration to include a wide circle of opinions, including faculty voices, and to keep campus concerns at the forefront of their deliberations on issues;

Whereas Bruce Mallette demonstrated an uncanny ability to pull up institutional memory of and detailed knowledge about an extraordinary range of subjects;

Whereas Bruce Mallette consistently employed a team approach, honed the skills of persons working with him, and openly praised the contributions of his staff and other partners;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED: The Faculty Assembly expresses its deepest appreciation to Bruce I. Mallette for his outstanding service to the University of North Carolina, and thanks him for his contributions to the greater good of our students, the University system, and the state of North Carolina.

FACULTY ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION PRAISING THE LATE WILLIAM C. FRIDAY

Whereas William Friday recognized that higher education could be a driving force in the improvement and modernization of the state of North Carolina, and

Whereas William Friday recognized the need for racial and gender integration in the University system of the University of North Carolina, and achieved a diverse system of integrated universities including the historically minority institutions, and

Whereas William Friday recognized that academic excellence must prevail over any other factors in the area of higher education, and showed foresight in his warnings about the power of money in college athletics, and

Whereas William Friday guided the University of North Carolina from 1956 to 1986 with such calm and humane direction that a later President of the system could say, “for me, the University of North Carolina will always be Bill Friday’s university,” and

Whereas William Friday worked tirelessly to insure that the students of North Carolina could afford the finest possible education, thus contributing immeasurably to the cultural, economic and social development of the state, and

Whereas William Friday has stood for many years since his term as system president as the symbol of leadership for the University of North Carolina higher education system, be it

Resolved, the Faculty Assembly of the University of North Carolina, a body created by Mr. Friday to represent all the campuses of the university, mourns the death of William Friday, a wise, devoted, and inspirational figure, and be it

Resolved, the Faculty Assembly of the University of North Carolina commends his memory as a visionary leader of higher education in North Carolina for half a century, and as a unique and respected force in North Carolina, and be it

Resolved, the Faculty Assembly of the University of North Carolina proposes that the spirit and example of William Friday be a model in the future for all who seek to improve the state of North Carolina and the nation.