

1. Proposed changes to UNC Code 603/604

Over the summer, an administrative committee reviewed sections of the UNC code pertaining to tenure and dismissal of tenured faculty. The Chair of the review committee, NCSU Provost Larry Nielsen, was present at the Faculty Assembly meeting to present the committee's proposed changes. Details of the proposed changes are available on the [UNC Faculty Assembly website](#). A [summary of the main proposed changes](#), along with the response of the Faculty Assembly Executive Committee, are compiled on the ECU Faculty Senate website. There were 2 active Faculty Assembly representatives on the review committee and one of those representatives was present for the presentation to the UNC Faculty Assembly. The proposed code changes are not the result of unanimous agreement among the committee members.

As detailed in the supporting documents, the Faculty Assembly delegates believe that many of the proposed changes would be detrimental to the UNC system and that could eventually result in the abolition of tenure. Delegates present at the meeting suggested that the proposed changes would not only result in the loss of academic freedom for UNC faculty, but would also ultimately result in the loss of our best faculty.

One of the specific concerns is the proposed introduction of "unsatisfactory performance" as cause for dismissal of tenured faculty and the use of an enhanced post-tenure review process to establish that "unsatisfactory performance." Faculty Assembly delegates pointed out that this is in direct opposition to the original intent of post tenure review and to the AAUP position, which states that the post tenure review is to be used for faculty development purposes only.

The Faculty Assembly unanimously passed a resolution (attached) concerning the proposed changes to the UNC Code (Sections 603/604) and *requesting that faculties at the constituent institutions review the proposed changes and respond as soon as possible*. Both UNC-CH and NCSU passed resolutions concerning this issue at their September Faculty Senate meetings.

2. President Bowles' Report

In his report to the Faculty Assembly, President Bowles focused on the budget, Chancellor's raises, and UNC Tomorrow. He reported that he is happy with this year's budget, because it reflects the system's priorities and because the system got its fair share. Some of the items he highlighted were need-based financial aid, faculty salary increases (making real progress toward the 80th percentile goal), summer program funding (especially a pilot "boot camp" transition program), lots of money for on-line education (if you have ideas for on-line programs, he says he has money), increased graduate student stipend funding (a "good start"), competitive research funds, and approximately 1 billion dollars in new facilities.

He stated that he has no apologies to make about what some thought were rather high Chancellor raises, that he wants to keep his good Chancellors, and that his goal is to get the Chancellor salaries up to the 80th percentile (just like the goal for faculty).

Bowles wants more faculty involvement in the UNC Tomorrow program. He wants to have a "listening session" on this topic with the Faculty Assembly soon. Reports from the UNC Tomorrow campus visits are online. He says that the "big message" is that our graduates need "soft skills," which he defined as general education/liberal arts. Hence, GA wants campuses to refocus GE programs on the liberal arts basics. He says that those who contributed to the program also pointed out the state's needs for teachers and nurses, the need to provide better education for black males, and the need bring the state's growing Hispanic population into the system.

In the Q&A session, Bowles said he has asked each campus to reactivate its insurance committees and to replicate best practices regarding domestic partner benefits. He also noted that the state personnel committee has recently introduced a non-discrimination policy (not yet through the system) that might help here. He acknowledged that the call for competitive research proposals funds was last minute, but insisted that in no case would showing results by March of 2008 be a criteria for funding. He stated that the funded proposals would be in "focus areas."

In answer to questions about what is driving changes in the system, he said that most of the drivers were economic. GA has been favoring 1st job training rather than 5th job training and that needs to change. He says that we need to focus on providing a sound liberal arts foundation for our students so they will be better able to adapt to changing economic conditions.

He stated that the UNC sustainability efforts were not a mandate from the legislature - that GA is working on a policy of its own and trying to get campuses to think about cooperative projects with utility companies (no luck yet on this last point . . .).

In response to a remark about the allocation of new funding for new programs (instead of to sustain core programs and long-term viability), Bowles stated that the system got a 14% increase in appropriations and that allocation of funding on campuses is up to individual Chancellors, but that it is obvious that some monies should go to basic core functions. He mentioned that he hoped that Chancellors would reallocate some funding to core programs, that campuses need to look at data to determine the appropriate balance between graduate and undergraduate programs, and that the system is likely to develop a satellite campus (of UNCW) in Jacksonville to accommodate growth in that region and to use facilities more efficiently.

He noted that tuition benefits for faculty is "on the agenda," but there is not enough money yet and the legislature needs help understanding the importance of this benefit.

Finally, he noted (in response to a comment about the difficulty of funding good liberal arts and writing programs) that one of the purposes of UNC Tomorrow was to educate the people of the state about the importance of this kind of education. This would allow reallocation of resources to writing, arts and sciences, and other core areas. The faculty members of the UNC Tomorrow commission will write up the results of the program's findings.

3. Sr. Vice President for AA, Harold Martin's Report

In his report to the Faculty Assembly, VP Martin told the delegates that the BOG wants to focus more on the "needs" of the state (UNC Tomorrow program), the "engaged university," and "demand-driven" curriculum. He asked the Assembly to consider what all of this means to faculty and to the university. He suggested that policies might need to be changed to allow "extension-like" interactions to be recognized in the promotion and tenure process. But, he emphasized, we do not want to be less supportive or less active in basic research as a result of such changes.

He also stated that all of these changes will result in "substantive changes to the degree/program approval process," but was not specific as to the nature of those changes.

He suggested that the needs-driven changes in the system might require new faculty, but acknowledged that enrollment growth drives position funding and that the funding formula may be inadequate to hire sufficient tenure-track faculty to meet these needs. Also, he noted that the funding formula makes it difficult for us to build a core research faculty (no start-up funds, etc.).

Martin noted that GA is looking at increased minimum admissions standards for undergraduate students admitted to UNC system campuses; that campuses are being encouraged to enhance retention rates; and that data suggest that the system has been admitting too many students with poor reading, writing, and math skills. Increasing minimum admissions standards could help here, as could enhanced relationships with community colleges. GA is also looking at "transition" programs that may improve the preparedness of incoming students.

Finally, VP Martin reported that GA may co-host a shared governance conference in the Spring (if the Faculty Assembly is ready at that time) and that one of President Bowles' focuses is on creating/engaging in/enhancing shared governance on all campuses - so much so that President Bowles makes support of shared governance a requirement for all chancellors.

4. Committee Reports

The Sustainability Task Force reported on its efforts and on Senate Bill 668, which will legislate increased efficiency for both in-place and new buildings on our campuses and across the state, on the "American College & University Presidents Climate Commitment" (which was signed on to by UNC-CH Chancellor Moeser in June of this year), and on "Sustainability Across the Curriculum" efforts across the nation and the state. (As a related aside, the ECU Carbon Neutral Committee will hold an open meeting on Thursday, October 18, at 5:30 PM in the Howell Science Complex Room N102.)

The Welfare Committee reported on the changes in federal law that effect UNC system retirement benefits (these changes were announced on our campus last month); on a report and resolution passed last Spring regarding the need for functioning/active insurance committees on all campuses; on resolutions they passed last Spring requesting after-tax benefits and health insurance coverage for domestic partners; on the phasing out of the indemnity plan option for state health insurance coverage; and on changes in the funds menu for the optional retirement program.

The Faculty Development Committee reported that its major work this year will focus on post tenure review and the proposed code 603/604 changes, on UNC/community college articulation agreements, and on faculty engagement issues.

The Faculty Governance Committee distributed the results of a survey on current Administrator Evaluation processes on the constituent campuses and asked for further input/updating of the survey results.

The Budget Committee reported that it is designing a interactive website that will help educate faculty on the budget process.

The Engaged University Task Force is working with UNC Tomorrow issues and will hold listening forums to get faculty input regarding educational issues facing the state. They also requested that Faculty Senates provide as much input on this issue as possible this semester.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine A Rigsby
UNC Faculty Assembly Delegate

1 **DRAFT FACULTY ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION: On Proposed Changes in University Code**
2
3 WHEREAS, the Faculty Assembly has reviewed proposed changes in the University Code proposed by
4 the "Code 603/604 Committee" as of July 17, 2007; and
5
6 WHEREAS, Faculty Assembly delegates have sought additional review from Faculty Senates and
7 colleagues on their campuses; and
8
9 WHEREAS, the Faculty Assembly believes that there are significant problems with key aspects of the
10 proposed revisions particularly including those relating to relating to institutional guarantees of tenure and
11 grounds for discharge and rights of "special faculty"; and
12
13 WHEREAS, the Faculty Assembly also believes that there are areas in which language needs to be
14 clarified in order to avoid possible future confusion; and
15
16 WHEREAS, the Faculty Assembly believes that the Code Review committee's work exceeded its charge
17 insofar as it included recommendations regarding post-tenure review processes that are inconsistent with
18 policies reviewed and supported by the Assembly in late spring 2007, as reported to the Board of
19 Governors Committee on Personnel and Tenure in June 2007; and
20
21 WHEREAS, the Faculty Assembly understands that the Code Review committee spent considerable time
22 and effort on its proposals and wishes them to move ahead promptly, but believes that important changes
23 will lack legitimacy if more widespread consultation with faculty is not allowed; and
24
25 WHEREAS, the Faculty Assembly's Executive Committee has developed alternative language to address
26 its concerns with the original Code 603/604 proposals in an effort to move matters forward but wishes to
27 allow faculty members to review and understand these recommendations;
28
29 **NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**
30
31 1. The Faculty Assembly affirms its belief that the Faculty Assembly Executive Committee's proposed
32 alternative language is strongly preferable to language proposed by the Code 603/604 Committee in
33 its July 2007 draft;
34 2. The Faculty Assembly asks that Faculty Senates and colleagues on the various campuses be given an
35 adequate opportunity to review this alternative language, relevant background, and up-to-date
36 proposals from the Code 603/604 Committee before General Administration and the Board of
37 Governors acts on the Committee's recommendations;
38 3. The Faculty Assembly asks its officers to refer this resolution, the alternative language, background
39 information, and up-to-date proposals from the Code 603/604 Committee with a request that
40 comments be submitted by the end of October for further consideration at the November Faculty
41 Assembly meeting;
42 4. The Faculty Assembly requests that General Administration defer submitting the Code 603/604
43 Committee's recommendations to the Board of Governors until at least December 2007 so that
44 comments can be received and meaningful review completed;
45 5. The Faculty Assembly requests that, in the future, changes to the Code or other University policies
46 directly affecting faculty should be undertaken only with more extensive faculty representation on
47 relevant committees or task forces, more open involvement in deliberations from the outset, and
48 adequate opportunities to comment during the academic year except under pressing and unusual
49 circumstances.
50