

DRAFT Minutes from Faculty Assembly 1/16/2009 Meeting

1. *Attendance.* The meeting attendance is provided as an attachment to these minutes.
2. *Initial Comments by the Chair.* Judith Wegner convened the meeting at 9:00 a.m. and asked the delegates to sign cards for several individuals (a sympathy card for Rob Nelson as his mother passed the day before the meeting; a congratulations card for UNCA delegate Gwen Ashburn , who was appointed Dean of Humanities; and a get well soon card for ASU delegate Chip Arnold who recently suffered a massive stroke). Wegner then reviewed the agenda for the day and discussed re-structuring of the committee meeting time. In lieu of committee meetings, there will be a discussion regarding budget cuts. She speculated that the Faculty Assembly may not be able to meet face-to-face in March due to the budgetary environment, particularly since Governor Perdue had issued a directive as to travel limitations and further budget cuts.
3. *Approval of Minutes.* Sharon Jacques (WCU) moved to approve the minutes and Gloria Elliott (FSU) seconded. The minutes were approved with a revision to be made to correct the spelling of Roy Schwartzman's name.
4. *Remarks by Senior Vice President Harold Martin.*
 - a. *Non-tenure-track faculty issues.* Dr. Martin reviewed the history of this issue, citing a prior General Administration study in 2002 and a request by General Administration (GA) to campuses to report on how they had implemented that report (submitted in summer 2008). GA found that there were great levels of inconsistency with regard to treatment of non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty members (e.g. providing office space, compensation policies, etc.). There had also been a growing use of NTT faculty on some campuses, and noted that many NTT faculty were funded from lapsed salaries. Martin said that he would appoint a new committee to review NTT faculty issues, and hoped it would meet in early February. The original commission has eight recommendations. Recommendation 1 was that each institution should develop and review staffing, plans and policy. Recommendation 3 was that the Office of the President should develop policy and guidelines and define faculty load and program array and then develop a 50, 75 and 100% load for NTT faculty based on the aforementioned formula. Benefits can and should be provided to NTT faculty on a fair and not arbitrary basis. The new commission should explore what would be appropriate, rights of appeal, dismissal, etc. The commission should also look at graduate teaching assistants. Previously some campuses have done nothing to go about this and some campuses have had extensive discussions. Each campus would also have to have an implementation plan. The commission would also get thresholds for each campus. In response to a question from Catherine Rigsby (ECU), Martin said that there had been feedback given to the campuses about their reports. In response to a question from Kimberly Cook (UNCW), Martin said that issues relating to NTT faculty had not been a focus of the UNC Tomorrow reports.
 - b. *Hate Crimes Commission.* This commission was formed due to the incident of racist statements painted on the Free Expression Tunnel at NC State University. The commission's charge is to look at and review all student codes of conduct on campus and assess if there should be a UNC system-wide policy. Many people mistakenly think that "hate speech" is the same as "hate crime." The 11-member commission includes students; staff and faculty from 10 UNC institutions. The commission will consider the development of a University-wide requirement for diversity orientation for all first-time students. The first meeting of the commission was held on December 17 at UNC General Administration. A second meeting was held on the 15th of January followed by a third meeting scheduled on January 26, 2009. At the second meeting, there were several emails, as well as persons from the community to make public comments. The Commission's work is to be completed by

March 31, 2009. Dr. Martin stressed that the Commission cannot legislate policy. The Commission will look at the campus codes of conduct and examine what student activities are already in place. The Commission is not suggesting laws should be changed but examining the policies on campus.

Several delegates offered questions and comments regarding how to address student bias. Kimberly Cook (UNCW) noted that there is a SACS accreditation provision that addresses this issue. Linda Florence Callahan (NCA&T) inquired whether a diversity experience requirement could be implemented through a class or seminar. Harold Martin said that students have indicated that an hour-long discussion is not enough to address the issues; a general-education requirement may be more effective. Jim Martin (NCSU) asked whether attention was being paid to helping people get beyond implicit bias and noted important work on that topic that had been done. Calvin Kelley asked to what extent a diversity experience requirement might focus on groups that have alternative life-styles. There was a question about whether employees were included in the focus of discussion by the Commission and Martin said they were not. Alan Freitag (UNCC) suggested that the Commission look at the military as a potential model inasmuch as they have been training on issues like diversity for over 20 years. The idea of diversity is good but it should be blended into the overall curriculum. Cynthia Carlton-Thompson (NCA&T) asked whether budget cuts would have an impact on the policies of the Hate Crimes Commission. She also inquired about the level of appropriate punishment and sanctions for hate crimes, and Harold Martin said that there are already criminal penalties for hate crimes. Wegner thanked Dr. Martin for his comments and update.

5. *Distance /On-Line Education Panel Discussion (Alan Mabe, Jim Sadler, Frank Prochaska)*

- a. *Framework for discussion.* Judith Wegner offered a framework to organize the discussion:
 - i. What was the mission of online education?
 - ii. Programming: Are we connecting students from home, from one campus to another or from within one particular university?
 - iii. Quality assurance and oversight: How do we assure quality for online programs? Who is teaching in them (NTT faculty? Graduate students?)
 - iv. Accountability and peer process: What mechanisms or procedures are in place?
 - v. Financing: There have been proposals from GA to move to tuition by the credit hour; why and is that a good idea?

b. *Comments from the Panel*

- i. *Alan Mabe* referred the Assembly members to the Enrollment Report that was placed in the folder of materials for the group. 215,692 students are enrolled in Distance Education. Many are non-traditional students, and 82% are 26 or older. There has been an increase from 14% to 19% in the proportion of African-American students taking courses on-line. Mabe noted that the primary focus of online learning is to provide access. For example, those who want to start at a community college, serve in the military, etc. There is little duplication in on-line offerings, with duplication only of courses that have been developed collaboratively. On campus students are also taking on-line courses.
- ii. *Jim Sadler* thanked Wegner and the Faculty Assembly for shedding light and having such a good discussion on online/distance education. He noted that North Carolina was the last state in the Southeast to get funding from the General Assembly to provide distance education (1998). He is working with the "Online Quality Council" to develop quality assurance strategies. The Council has designees chosen by the various provosts' offices.
- iii. *Frank Prochaska* noted that there is a projected 70,000 enrollment increase in online/distance education. This increase is larger increase than most campuses. Also, it is true that the cost to develop online classes is more than traditional classes.

c. *Questions and Comments from the Delegates.*

- i. *Mission.* Greg Starrett (UNCC) asked about the extent to which online education is creating a further stratification, in effect a distinct tier of education that is focused on students of particular backgrounds in terms of socio-economics, race, etc.? How do we know that online education can actually save money rather than giving a voucher? Is it worth it? 70,000 more students may want to come into the UNC system. However, they want the college experience of a campus. Given our limited amount of resources, how much money do we devote to online resources? Alan Mabe responded that, we cannot afford to build enough buildings on the campuses. Margery Overton (NCSU) asked whether on-campus students are taking online courses because it is a matter of choice/convenience or because there are not alternatives? Alan Mabe said GA does not know the answer to that. Judith Wegner said that there needs to be a clearer articulation of whether the mission relates to access or convenience for on-campus students. Joe Templeton (UNCCH) said that attention should be paid to the growing demand for graduate education in discussing how educational programs are balanced and delivered.
 - ii. *Staffing.* Judith Wegner (UNCCH) asked who is teaching on-line courses. Jim Sadler said that Scott Jenkins (GA Institutional Research) is trying to get a handle on that. Lora Holland (UNCA) asked whether graduate students are allowed to teach distance education classes. Kimberly Cook (UNCW) said that faculty work-load issues should also be addressed.
 - iii. *Quality Oversight.* Jeff Passe (UNCC) said that the problem is that that on-line education provides “education light” and creates a two tier system because they are not getting quality courses. The quality controls of these online courses are a bit like Alberto Gonzalez investigating the Justice Department. Marcus Comer (NCA&T) said it is an issue of quality. In order for quality we must train faculty on what is to offer a quality online class. Sandie Gravett (ASU) asked whether anyone knows if there is a progression to graduation more quickly with online classes? Jim Martin (NCSU) said that the Quality Counsel that Alan Mabe mentioned needs online skeptics for a quality counsel. If the mission is access and convenience then why are we talking about budget cuts? Gloria Elliott (FSU) said that she that she thought at FSU many on-line courses might be better in quality than in-person courses. Ken Wilson (ECU) said that it is not necessarily right to assume differences in quality based on format of courses; there may well be both good and bad on-line classes. What’s critical is being sure there is adequate departmental oversight. Zargros Madid-Sadjadi (WSSU) asked how tests could be administered on-line to be sure that the person taking the test is authenticated. Catherine Rigsby (ECU) said that SACS has an initiative requiring in-person testing for online courses.
 - iv. *Financial Considerations.* Linda Florence Callahan (NCA&T) asked whether students pay more for online classes? At NCA&T that is the case. Alan Mabe said he thought that should not be the way things worked but noted that institutions are allowed to charge a technology fee. Bruce McKinney (UNCW) said that there seem to be assumptions that online offerings allow better access and wondered about those who cannot afford a computer or a high-speed internet connection. Is the State doing something for folks that cannot afford computer or connection? Alan Mabe noted that educational delivery through the community colleges had been proposed as an alternative. Judith Wegner raised the question of changes in policy to require campuses to charge tuition by the credit hour and said that the UNC-CH Faculty Senate had passed a resolution rejecting that change on educational grounds and that UNC-CH had been told that GA had backed off that requirement.
6. *Remarks by President Erskine Bowles.* Bowles began his remarks by commending the eight UNC campuses that had earned recognition for community engagement through the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. These include new recognition for North Carolina Central, UNC Charlotte, UNC Greensboro, UNC Wilmington, UNC Pembroke and Western Carolina. NCSU and UNC-CH had previously been recognized as well for their commitment to collaborate with communities through

teaching, research and outreach. He went on to address the economy and the budget, saying that these are tough times for neighbors, families and children. This is the toughest economic crisis in his lifetime. We are not at the end of it. There are likely at least 9-10 more months to go and getting through it is all we can do. He said that he is fighting on behalf of the University in discussions with the Governor and the Legislature. There have already been substantial cuts but so far enrollment growth funds and financial aid have been retained. Bowles then took questions from the delegates.

Sharon Jacques (WCU) asked whether we should be required as faculty to give some salary to the University system through faculty engagement. Catherine Rigsby (ECU) asked whether we are to be only concerned for the academic mission of the University as opposed to the full budget of the University. Bowles said that he had given discretion to the Chancellors at each campus as to how to cut their budgets. Andy Koch (ASU) asked whether faculty salaries can be cut legally. Bowles said no, not unless there is authorizing legislation. Sandie Gravett (ASU) asked how we do long-range planning in order to avoid a repeat of similar problems in the future. Bowles said he was trying to protect the core. He is committed to try to hold onto faculty salaries. Nina Allen (NCSU) asked how faculty retirement might be impacted by budgetary decisions. Bowles promised to maintain flexibility for the campuses.

7. *Vice President for Finance Rob Nelson.* Nelson spoke briefly. The chancellors are still responsible for hiring freezes. State travel is still a matter of interpretation, but there are likely to be freezes. All positions are frozen at GA. As we look to the past, some cost-saving measures have been effective and some have not. Look for 5-6% budget cuts next year. He agreed to provide slides used with the Board of Governors (distributed). He observed that, rather than asking many employees to take salary cuts, it was likely that employees would be asked to do more work. He stressed that it is really going to be up to the Chancellors to handle budget cuts. Cynthia Carlton-Thompson (NCA&T) asked whether GA's PACE initiative had been considered in connection with budget cuts. Nelson said that PACE obligations had been verified with the campuses. Ken Wilson (ECU) asked how the anticipated cuts would impact enrollment growth, and how administrators would be impacted. Subash Shah (WSSU) said that data needed to be reconciled and information should include faculty.
8. *Discussion of Budget Reductions.* After breaking briefly for lunch, the Assembly met as a committee of the whole to discuss various strategies for dealing with budget reductions. Judith Wegner reported on discussions with Kelly Eaves-Boykin (UNC Staff Assembly Chair) at the FA Executive Committee meeting on January 18. Wegner also provided an outline of strategies that might ultimately be raised and should therefore be debated so that the delegates can take hard choices and possible scenarios back to their campuses (for example, faculty offering financial donations, agreeing for furloughs, possible temporary salary cuts in order to protect others from layoffs provided that retirement and health benefits were protected). Wegner advocated for the Assembly to think ahead and take positions on what must be done.

There was a very active discussion and disagreement on many topics. Ellen Jones (UNCG) said that she could not go back to her campus and propose that faculty take a voluntary 1% reduction in their salaries. She did not think that the Faculty Assembly should be making such a recommendation. Roy Schwartzman (UNCG) said that a 1% salary reduction was a bad idea since a cut today becomes the norm tomorrow. He also said that any willingness to accept salary cuts would undercut advocacy at the General Assembly. Subash Shah (WSSU) disagreed with that view and said that: two years ago a group of Faculty Assembly delegates went to the legislature and the bottom line is if we take a stance on a voluntary basis, we are sending a message. If we offer no input, then the Legislature will make cuts as they choose.

Jeff Passe (UNCC) said that some campuses are better managed than others. Why should we come from a centralized point of view than a decentralized? Zargros Madid-Sadjadi (WSSU) asked about protecting the libraries and said it was a bad strategy to offer things up. He also said that teaching universities have

less funding than the research universities. Greg Starrett (UNCC) said that there's no guarantee that the Legislature will look at campus by campus. Chet Jordan (UNCP) said that the legislature last time gave no raises. Catherine Rigsby (ECU) said that she is very concerned that we are hiring new faculty at the same time talking furlough.

John Mattox (FSU) said that the reality is that all of us have "fat" on our campuses...we do not need fat, we need lean mass and maybe during this process we will emerge lean. Sandie Gravett (ASU) said there is no transparency from the folks making the decisions on furloughs and cuts. Erskine Bowles promoted transparency. We have some opportunities to think about who we are and what are mission is and we fund it. Charles Bodkin (UNCC) said decisions come from bottom up. Where are they and who are making the decisions?

Alan Freitag (UNCC) said that the value of the suggestions offered is that they could add an understanding and perception that faculty care. George Wilson (NCCU) said that sometimes members of the legislature look at pinholes. We need to give Erskine Bowles something to use as a trump card. Paul Williams (ECU) disagreed and said that UNC Tomorrow showed that 90% growth comes from brain power. The legislature has the responsibility for funding the University. The time has come to find out what they have been benefiting from. Ken Wilson (ECU) said we need to have something to give legislators, not just other departments. The Faculty Assembly needs to give up something too.

Kevin Lowe (UNCG) said that either 10 people take one year off or 100 people take a little time off. This is the airline analogy. He also said that it would be well to give faculty flexibility in the event they chose to take time off. Bruce McKinney (UNCW) said that we need the flexibility to be able to give something back to the state. Sharon Jacques (WCU) said that based on her experience in nursing, it's important to take these discussions down to the campus level and ask for volunteers.

Hazel Brown (UNCG) asked what liberties faculty have as opposed to the liberties given the campuses. Margery Overton (NCSU) said that transparency is the issue. We are not in a position to cut because we do not have all the information. Maybe the Faculty Assembly has more information than the campus? Jim Martin (NCSU) commented on the notion of "having skin in the game." He stressed that we already have a higher number of students to teach, more work on committees that to perform, etc. If we take a cut then maybe the money would not be used the way we want it to. Also, there should be a focus on administrative bloat. He expressed doubt that in the event faculty members offered up cuts there would be adequate accountability regarding use of funds. Lloyd Kramer (UNCCCH) asked how any cuts would be used? Even in the worst of times, we have to build for the future.

Mark Sprague (ECU) said he had two concerns. We have to have hooks...how would we sell something like cuts to our own colleagues? Would we rather take a 1% cut or lose your job? Raymond Burt (UNCW) posed the issue in terms of: Let's take a cut and preserve, let's transform vertical cuts. Andy Koch (ASU) said: But haven't we all been already sacrificing?

Bruce Ezell (UNCP) said he was concerned about the Faculty Assembly not meeting in person in March. We need a unified approach. Richard Beam (WCU) said he thought it was important to go back to campuses and encourage consideration of these hard issues. George Wilson (NCCU) said: Make a plan! Get over yourselves and stop being selfish. 1% pay cut is not a lot given the fact that others (perhaps even in our own families) have lost their jobs or have had their homes foreclosed.

S.D. Stith (ECSU) said that the Chancellors should afford absolute transparency. Everybody should bear the costs. It's important for faculty to raise their viewpoints on the campuses. Catherine Rigsby (ECU) said that the cuts are not being looked at across the board. As a body we should come together and give guiding principles. Hazel Brown (UNCG) said that before "we" the faculty, Erskine Bowles would see

that other administrative people will make the same cut. Linda Florence Callahan (NCA&T) also stressed the importance of transparency.

The discussion ended with various delegates noting which of the options on Judith's memo might be acceptable to them, as well as emphasizing that it was unlikely that individual campuses would accept some or any of the ideas that had been raised. Judith Wegner thanked the delegates for the discussion and noted that the point of the exercise was to put some hard choices in front of all of us as we prepare to deal with some very hard times. She also noted that she hoped that the Assembly would be able to meet in person in March for its final meeting, but feared that budget cuts and constraints on travel would result in the need to use video-conference techniques instead.

9. *Discussion of Charter Amendment.* Judith Wegner led discussion on a proposed Faculty Assembly Charter amendment to deal with an issue regarding the size of campus delegations. The delegates discussed the matter and resolved several issues raised in the memo accompanying the draft proposal. The delegates voted that, as revised, the Charter amendment, passed first reading. It will be resubmitted, with revisions integrated for action at the March 2009 meeting. Wegner asked that delegates let their campus senates know the changes were coming so that they could approve the change before the end of the academic year.
10. *Committee Reports.* There were brief updates on committee discussions and anticipated work for the balance of the year. The Governance Committee said it was collecting information on campus governance systems, compositions of faculty senates, office space and other matters relating to campus governance. The Academic Freedom committee said that they wanted an update on whether General Administration was going to issue guidelines relating to gifts affecting curriculum on the campuses. The Research committee would like to consider how the budgetary crisis will impact teaching loads and research. The Historically Minority Institutions committee wants to develop a system for collecting data about the success of African-American male students in order to identify best practices. Neither the budget committee nor the Faculty Development and Benefits committee had reports.
11. *Other Matters.* Judith Wegner explained the developments at UNC-CH regarding "tuition by the credit hour" and said that Jeff Davies had agreed to work together with her on a white paper on this subject. The delegates agreed that would be a good idea. Catherine Rigsby (ECU) said that her campus was waiting for approval of its post-tenure-review policy. Hunt McKinnon (ECU) asked where things stood on branch campuses and Wegner responded that there had been some debate on definitions for purposes of regulations presented to the BOG. Wegner closed the meeting by asking about what had been good or bad. Although the news had been generally down-beat, a delegate commented that it was good to develop ways to be proactive. Wegner also thanked Kelley Gregory for her assistance. The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.