

## NOTES ON THE 01/18/2008 FACULTY ASSEMBLY MEETING

1. **Proposed Changes to the UNC Code 603/604/Post-Tenure Review Policies** - Harold Martin (Sr VPAA) reported that an agreed-upon set of recommendations went forward to the Board of Governors (BoG) and that that set of recommendations benefited from the critical input from the Faculty Assembly and from faculty groups across the states. There was only one issue with the 603 recommendations by the time they got to the BoG. The BoG want Boards of Trustees (BoT) to be included in the faculty appeals process (the original recommendation from the administrative committee that proposed the changes was to take the BoT out of the loop, making the appeal process shorter - this change had not been opposed by the faculty). Because the BoG disagreed with the recommendations on this issue, Code 603 was not approved. It is expected that the BoT will be put back into the appeal process and the Code revisions will then be passed. Faculty Assembly leadership is watching this progress carefully.

The rest of the proposed changes - as amended following feedback from faculty and discussion with the Faculty Assembly - were approved. This includes changes to the administrative review process.

Importantly, it was the faculty vetted version of the post-tenure review (PTR) process that was passed. This means that the approved policy maintains PTR as a development tool *only* - not as a tool for dismissal of faculty.

2. **UNC Tomorrow** - The final UNC Tomorrow report is available at [www.unctomorrow.org](http://www.unctomorrow.org). President Bowles urged all faculty are urge to read the report carefully and to respond *critically and candidly*. He stated that there are simply too many things recommended in the UNC Tomorrow report, that it can not all be done (at least not soon), and that GA is setting priorities for response to the final report.

The final UNC Tomorrow report makes numerous recommendations that are likely to have direct impact on the academic nature of our campuses, hence are important to faculty. Professor Gary Jones (WCU; VC of the Faculty Assembly) has compiled a list of *Selected Point with Implications for Faculty Roles & Responsibilities, Workload and Evaluation* ([http://paws.wcu.edu/gjones/FA\\_UNC-T\\_Selected\\_Points\\_Implications\\_for\\_faculty.pdf](http://paws.wcu.edu/gjones/FA_UNC-T_Selected_Points_Implications_for_faculty.pdf)) that will be useful as faculty and administration work together to implement recommendations. Other information on the UNC Tomorrow report and its implications is available at various in-line locations. Several of these are included in the resource list attached to this report.

The Faculty Assembly passed a Resolution in Response to the UNC Tomorrow Final Report. The resolution was brought forward by the Faculty Senate/Council Chairs and is available at [http://paws.wcu.edu/gjones/Resolution\\_Response\\_to\\_UNC-T\\_2008-01-18\\_SenateChairs.pdf](http://paws.wcu.edu/gjones/Resolution_Response_to_UNC-T_2008-01-18_SenateChairs.pdf). This resolution calls for response deadlines to be appropriate to established feedback procedures (among other things).and it also raised four pointed questions concerning campus responses. Thanks to this FA resolution, these four questions

were raised last week at a meeting of top university administration officials from across the state (Chancellor's Administrative Council). The administrators, apparently, found it "interesting" that it was the faculty who were most clearly raising the question of connections between UNC Tomorrow and respective institutional missions. It is obvious that faculty believe that their involvement in any response to this report is critical to the academic missions of our campuses and that the in-place shared governance procedures are more than sufficient to provide response in a timely fashion.

3. **UNC/Community College/K12 Initiatives** - President Bowles also spoke to the Assembly about ongoing UNC initiatives related to both Community Colleges (CC) and K12 education. He said that he wants faculty to help break down the barriers between the CCs and the UNC system and to help GA "fix" K12. He went on to say that the systems have done a lot together, but not enough and that much of what has been tried has failed. He specifically asked faculty to come up with ideas and bring them forward, saying that he will try almost anything and everything and take the blame for failures.

The Faculty Assembly received several reports on K12 initiatives and on the need for "system-wide core competencies." Many of these reports are included in resource list at the end of this document. I urge all faculty who are concerned with the educational/academic mission and quality of our system and our campus to review them carefully.

Harold Martin spoke about the changes in minimum admission requirements that were approved by the BoG at their last meeting and about the UNC/CC "partnership." He says that much progress has been made, but that GA will now "back away" and take a more comprehensive look at the toughest issues impacting student transferability. The Transfer Advisory Committee has proposed solutions, but those solutions now need to be vetted by all constituencies. At the moment GA is working on "phase II" of the UNC/CC transfer issue. They are working on an electronic web-based system that would allow any student to do an audit for transfer (asking what will transfer and where) and have asked campuses to review their General Education requirements in light of the system-wide competency-based soft skills encouraged in the UNC Tomorrow report. Importantly, he suggests that this be done with a view toward some sort of system-wide set of GE skills that will aid in system-wide transferability for all CC transfer students.

All of these issues, obviously, impact the academic mission of our campuses, hence require substantial faculty input. Our established shared governance processes (including our Faculty Senate committees, *e.g.*, Academic Standards, EPPC, Faculty Governance, and others) will be of utmost importance as we move forward into the discussions about implementing the UNC Tomorrow recommendations, changing the UNC/CC transfer requirements, and enhancing the connection between UNC campuses and K12 education.

Respectfully submitted,  
Catherine A. Rigsby  
UNC Faculty Assembly Delegate

## Resource Documents Related to January Faculty Assembly Report

### UNC Faculty Assembly Documents

[http://paws.wcu.edu/gjones/UNC\\_FA\\_JAN18-08\\_OTHER-DOCS.html](http://paws.wcu.edu/gjones/UNC_FA_JAN18-08_OTHER-DOCS.html)

### Carnegies Community Engagement Classification: Intentions and Insights

<http://paws.wcu.edu/gjones/communityengagementdriscoll08.pdf>

### Attaining Carnegies Community Engagement Classification

<http://paws.wcu.edu/gjones/communityengagementchangencsu08.pdf>

### Resolution on an Equivalent Human Resource Management System

[http://unconfacultyassembly.northcarolina.edu/html/meetings/2007-08/January2008/Jan\\_2008\\_Resolution\\_on\\_a\\_Substantially\\_Equivalent\\_Human\\_Reso.pdf](http://unconfacultyassembly.northcarolina.edu/html/meetings/2007-08/January2008/Jan_2008_Resolution_on_a_Substantially_Equivalent_Human_Reso.pdf)

### UNC Fall 2007 Enrollment Report

[http://unconfacultyassembly.northcarolina.edu/html/meetings/2007-08/January2008/Fall\\_2007\\_Enrollment\\_Report\\_\(1-10-2008\).ppt](http://unconfacultyassembly.northcarolina.edu/html/meetings/2007-08/January2008/Fall_2007_Enrollment_Report_(1-10-2008).ppt)

### Public Schools-UNC/K12 Initiatives (report)

[http://unconfacultyassembly.northcarolina.edu/html/meetings/2007-08/January2008/K16\\_Policy\\_Presentation\\_to\\_BOG\\_-\\_January\\_2008\\_final\\_to\\_BOG.pdf](http://unconfacultyassembly.northcarolina.edu/html/meetings/2007-08/January2008/K16_Policy_Presentation_to_BOG_-_January_2008_final_to_BOG.pdf)

### UNC Tomorrow Final Report

<http://www.nctomorrow.org/>

### UNC Tomorrow, Selected Point with Implications for Faculty Roles & Responsibilities, Workload and Evaluation

[http://paws.wcu.edu/gjones/FA\\_UNC-T\\_Selected\\_Points\\_Implications\\_for\\_faculty.pdf](http://paws.wcu.edu/gjones/FA_UNC-T_Selected_Points_Implications_for_faculty.pdf)

### Resources for Ongoing UNC Tomorrow Discussions

[http://paws.wcu.edu/gjones/Resources\\_for\\_Ongoing\\_UNC\\_Tomorrow\\_Discussions.doc](http://paws.wcu.edu/gjones/Resources_for_Ongoing_UNC_Tomorrow_Discussions.doc)

### Resolution Regarding Response to UNC Tomorrow Report

[http://paws.wcu.edu/gjones/Resolution\\_Response\\_to\\_UNC-T\\_2008-01-18\\_SenateChairs.pdf](http://paws.wcu.edu/gjones/Resolution_Response_to_UNC-T_2008-01-18_SenateChairs.pdf)

**FA Resolution Regarding Response to UNC Tomorrow Report**  
Resolution submitted by the Faculty Senate/Council Chairs, January 18, 2008  
*[Passed, 1/18/2008]*

**Whereas:**

It has been recognized the faculty must play a critical role in the implementation of the UNC Tomorrow initiatives, and therefore must also be intimately involved in preparation of the response to the UNC Tomorrow final report, and

**Whereas:**

To date the faculty leadership of several campuses have not been apprised of the mechanism by which faculty input will be solicited, and

**Whereas:**

There is concern that deadlines for a campus response have been established before faculty have been apprised of the mechanism(s) to provide discussion either on individual campuses or across the system, and

**Whereas:**

If the UNC Tomorrow initiative is to succeed it is critical to approach the response and implementation from a system and not just a campus perspective,

**Therefore be it resolved:**

That the Faculty Assembly calls upon General Administration to request of Chancellors explicit mechanisms by which faculty will provide input to be incorporated into campus responses to the UNC Tomorrow final report, and to communicate said mechanism to their faculty senate or council and the Chair of Faculty Assembly,

**Be it further resolved:**

That to ensure an expeditious, effective and comprehensive response, the deadlines for campus and system responses be appropriate to established feedback procedures (rather than an arbitrary Spring '08 timeframe).

**Be it further resolved:**

That the Faculty Assembly recommends a system-wide forum be held in which the Chancellors and a representative group of faculty senators and Faculty Assembly delegates from each campus meet to discuss the integration of campus and system responses to the UNC Tomorrow final report

And to ensure a system-based response to the UNC Tomorrow initiative that each campus-based response be asked to consider:

1. Which initiatives are best addressed on your campus because of distinctive mission, resources, regional considerations, etc.?
2. Which initiatives cannot be addressed effectively by your campus?
3. Which initiatives are best addressed in collaboration with a sister institution?
4. Which initiatives are best done at a sister UNC campus?



## Early College High School at East Carolina

A Partnership of Pitt County Schools, East Carolina University, and Pitt Community College

Report to the ECU Faculty Senate – January 29, 2008

*“Learn and Earn will provide a new model of high school that will boost graduation rates, boost college-going rates, and boost the preparedness of our students to work in an economy that demands knowledge, talent, and skills.”*

Gov. Mike Easley press release, Sept. 8, 2004

What is an early college high school?

- A small, autonomous, nonresidential high school located on a college campus – providing “power of place”
- Supported by Governor Easley’s Learn and Earn initiative, New Schools Project, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and the State Department of Public Instruction; list of early college high schools in NC <http://www.newschoolsproject.org/current.html>
- In four years (grades 9 – 12), students earn an NC high school diploma AND 60 semester hours of college credit
- Maximum enrollment of 400 students (At ECU beginning with 40 freshmen)
- NC has 42 early college high schools with 77 scheduled by end of 2008.
- The school includes high school courses taught by high school teachers (employed by PCS) and college/university courses taught by university (ECU) and community college (PCC) faculty at ECU.
- “. . . places for learning, designed to help young people progress toward the education and experience they need to succeed in life and family-supporting careers.”

Why create an early college high school at ECU?

- The class of 2007 in NC represented only 69 percent of the students who had started high school four years ago. The early college high school movement is designed to provide another avenue for offering a high school education and promoting higher education.
- The ECHS provides opportunity for students who have potential for success but may fall through the cracks at a comprehensive high school.
- The ECHS provides small school enrollment (max. of 400), more counselor and other support, and, through exposure to the world of higher education, motivation to stay in school and aspire to college.
- The ECHS provides free tuition for 60 hours of college credit; graduates of ECHS will be eligible for additional financial support in completing a four-year degree.
- The ECHS provides opportunities for integrated high school curriculum and modeling of innovative learning in a smaller setting, with the hope of applying those ideas to larger settings.
- The ECHS provides an avenue to study high school, community college, and university curricula to see how they relate and what we can learn from each other.
- ECU is the largest (and best) educator of teachers in North Carolina; our students will benefit from the opportunity to learn about and participate through tutoring and practica in this significant educational movement.

What is the curriculum and who are the teachers?

- **Course work to complete high school graduation requirements and to support teacher education as a higher education goal**
- **High school courses taught by high school teachers on ECU campus**
- **Selected university and community college courses taught on ECU campus that can be used dually to meet high school graduation requirements and university foundations curriculum requirements; tutoring, mentoring, and other assistance provided by COE and other students in counseling, curriculum instruction, etc., to support student success in regular college courses**
- **No AP courses; regular courses from ECU and PCC – tentative program of study as follows:**
  - 9<sup>th</sup> - courses taught in cohort - HLTH 1000, EXSS 1000, CIS 110, ACA 111 – 40 seats first year; 100 seats per year thereafter**
  - 10<sup>th</sup> - ENGL 1100 and 1200 in cohort of 25; MUSC 2248, HIST 1050, and 1051 with college students – 40 seats 2<sup>nd</sup> year; 100 seats per year thereafter**
  - 11<sup>th</sup> - ENGL 1000, MATH 1065, PSYC 1000, COMM 2410/231, ART 1910, foreign language, if possible – 40 seats 3<sup>rd</sup> year; 100 seats per year thereafter**
  - 12<sup>th</sup> - ELEM 2123, EDUC 3200, SPED 2000, BIOL 1060/1061, major course, SOCI 2110/SOC 210, ART 1910/111 – 40 seats 4<sup>th</sup> year; 100 seats per year thereafter**

How will the ECHS at ECU be funded?

- **\$1,435,000 grant total for five years to start up this new school, including textbooks, college liaison, evaluation, support positions, NSP coach, faculty development – granted through PCS**
- **State and Pitt County funding – four high school teachers in first year, principal, counselor; other support; ADM earned by enrollment**
- **State Department of Public Instruction – ECU tuition and fees; transportation**
- **PCC – ADM for tuition**
- **Additional grants to be sought**

Where will the ECHS be located?

- **Under consideration. Initial year will need office space for principal, counselor, and 4 teachers, as well as two classrooms. Classes to be taught 11:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.**

When is the ECHS at ECU scheduled to begin?

- **Fall Semester 2008**
- **Will follow the ECU calendar**

**Lee, Lori**

---

**From:** Morrison, Robert C

**Sent:** Monday, January 28, 2008 8:45 PM

**To:** Ballard, Steve

**Cc:** Taggart, Mark Alan; Lee, Lori

Steve,

Here is a courtesy copy of a draft of some remarks I plan to make at the Faculty Senate meeting tomorrow. Hope to see you there.

Regards,  
Bob

1/29/2008

“Shared governance in an academic setting is a fragile balancing act that takes place between the administration and its faculty. It is an attempt by the administration and the faculty to solve problems and implement policies in a manner that benefits all the constituencies of the university.” Those are the familiar words of one of the founders of the Faculty Senate, Don Sexauer who was a 3-term chair of the faculty during the 1990’s. We sometimes forget about the fragile part.

Those of you who know me from my service to the Faculty Senate, know that I am very process oriented. So I want to talk about process, and I’d like to start with several quotes from the University of North Carolina Board of Governors Code and the Constitution of the Faculty of East Carolina University.

First, here is an excerpt from The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina, section 502 on Chancellor responsibilities.

**“In addition to ensuring the establishment of a council or senate, the chancellor shall ensure the establishment of appropriate procedures within the institution to provide members of the faculty the means to give advice with respect to questions of academic policy and institutional governance, with particular emphasis upon matters of curriculum, degree requirements, instructional standards, and grading criteria. The**



**procedures for giving advice may be through the council or senate, standing or special committees or other consultative means.”**

These appropriate procedures that have been established at East Carolina University are embodied in the Faculty Constitution in Appendix A of the Faculty Manual. The Faculty Constitution of ECU states, in part:

**“The Faculty Senate and the various committees on which the faculty serve shall be the primary media for the essential joint effort of faculty and administration in the government of East Carolina University. The Chancellor and the Chair of the Faculty shall facilitate communication which will enable continuing and effective faculty participation.”**

And further, under Functions of the Faculty Senate in our constitution

**“The Faculty Senate shall ratify, amend, or remand all matters of academic policy or faculty welfare which have been recommended by any standing or special committee of East Carolina University, or initiate any policies in such matters which it deems desirable.”**

These matters of academic policy, faculty welfare, and institutional governance referred to in the UNC

Code and in the Faculty Constitution have been developed over many years both by Faculty Senate committees and administrative committees. Recommended policies by these committees, both Senate and administrative committees, have been approved by the Faculty Senate and the Chancellor, and where appropriate by the Board of Trustees, the UNC President, and the Board of Governors. These matters of academic policy, faculty welfare, and institutional governance are contained in the various parts of the Faculty Manual and in Appendices B, C, D, F, I, J, L, U, V, W, X, and Y. The term "All matters of academic policy and faculty welfare" in our constitution represents a broad spectrum of issues in our joint institutional governance. The Faculty Manual is a complex document that contains the university's written policies on academic policy, faculty welfare, and joint institutional governance. This body, the Faculty Senate and its committees, does an enormous amount of work to keep this university running. Much faculty time outside of teaching and scholarship are required to make this a first-rate university. We should continue to encourage faculty to participate in university affairs outside teaching and scholarship as we move toward becoming an Engaged University.

It is unprecedented to make changes to the Faculty Manual without going to the Faculty Senate. And it is unprecedented to formulate university policy that is not compatible with policies in the Faculty Manual

without going through the Faculty Senate. It is unprecedented because it violates the written policy of East Carolina University, and it violates the UNC BOG Code.

The manner in which the new policy on the Appointment and Review of Administrative Officers at ECU calls into question its validity. That's too bad because there are some good elements in the policy. It fixes some of the flaws in the Muse policy on administrative evaluation. But there are other elements that are not quite as carefully formulated, and they warrant further discussion and revision. In my opinion Appendix L must continue to be followed in searches and faculty evaluations of unit administrators. To do otherwise would make the university vulnerable to legal action because of the question of the validity of the new policy.

The Chancellor and the Chair of the Faculty, as alluded to in our constitution, should get together and work out their differences so that the university can develop policies in a manner that's compatible with our constitution and policies outlined in the Faculty Manual. Their conclusions should be reported back to the Faculty Senate. Chancellor Ballard and Faculty Chair Taggart, you owe it to the university community to do so.

A serious mistake has been made. Let's fix it. I've invested too much time in this university to watch it come unraveled, as have you.

# Report of the Task Force on Fixed-Term Appointments

East Carolina University  
September 7, 2006

## Task Force Members

George Bailey, Philosophy, Former Chair, Faculty Academic Standards Committee  
Mary Gilliland, Pathology, Brody School of Medicine  
Phyllis Horns, Dean, School of Nursing  
Sally Lawrence, English, Harriot College of Arts and Sciences, Fixed-Term  
Representative  
Michael Lewis, Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences  
Deirdre Mageean, Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Studies  
Purificacion Martinez, Foreign Languages and Literatures, Chair, Faculty Governance  
Committee  
Robert Morrison, Chemistry, Harriot College of Arts and Sciences  
Henry Peel, Vice Provost, Academic Affairs  
Catherine Rigsby, Former Chair of the Faculty  
Marilyn Sheerer, Interim Vice Chancellor for Student Life  
James LeRoy Smith, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs  
William Sugar, Library Science and Instructional Technology, Former Chair, Faculty  
Welfare Committee  
Mark Taggart, Chair of the Faculty  
Alan White, Dean, Harriot College of Arts and Sciences  
Charles Willson, Pediatrics, Brody School of Medicine, Fixed-Term Representative

## Resource Members

Ruth Ann Cook, Personnel Administration, Academic Affairs  
Linda Ingalls, Personnel Administration, Academic Affairs  
Carla Jones, Communications, Academic Affairs  
Dianna Lowe, Personnel Administration, Academic Affairs  
Lisa Sutton, Personnel Administration, Health Sciences  
Kris Smith, Institutional Planning, Research, and Effectiveness  
Paul Zigas, University Attorney's Office

Prefatory Statement:

The work of the Task Force on Fixed-Term Appointments was initiated by Faculty Senate Resolution #05-45. The general directions of the task force recommendations are inserted *in italics*:

Resolution on Fixed-Term Faculty

Whereas, the faculty of ECU recognizes the important contribution of fixed-term faculty to the success of the university's mission; and

Whereas, faculty also recognize the diversity of roles played by fixed-term faculty in the various colleges and schools of ECU; and

Whereas, faculty recognize that for the institution to achieve its mission and to maintain quality it is necessary to have an appropriate mix of qualified, adequately compensated and supported faculty.

Whereas, the Non-Tenure-track Faculty Task Force of 2002-2003 asked academic units to provide data on fixed term faculty, however this data has not been forthcoming; and

Whereas, in February 2004, the Faculty Senate requested a Fixed-Term Faculty Task Force (Resolution #04-04) to further study the Board of Governors major recommendations and to provide recommendations and draft documents and policies pertaining to non-tenure-track faculty to the Faculty Senate by September 2004; and

Whereas, the Fixed-Term Faculty Task Force has not reported to the Faculty Senate; and

Whereas, in April 2005, the Chair of the Faculty requested the Faculty Governance Committee to form an ad hoc committee to review ECU's utilization of fixed-term faculty, specifically focusing on the recommendations from the Office of the President and on the voting rights currently allowed in ECU's unit codes.

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Faculty Senate recommends, in agreement with the Office of the President's recommendations of March 6, 2002, that the Academic Council recommend a plan to the Faculty Senate that:

1. Defines the desired mix of various types of faculty appointments and monitor its progress in moving toward its staffing goals. *The Task Force on Fixed-Term Appointments determined that each unit will discuss appropriate ratios of fixed-term and tenure-track faculty as part of the staffing plan. In creating the staffing plan, each unit can refer to parts 1 and 2 of this document for*

*historical perspective and guidance. Directions for creating the staffing plan are included in part 5.*

2. Provides guidelines and criteria for transforming some of the current fixed-term faculty lines into tenured and tenure-track faculty lines. *Fixed-term and tenure-track faculty lines typically can be converted as a campus decision. The decisions to convert or establish fixed-term or tenure-track faculty lines may be initiated through recommendations of personnel committees and/or administrators in accordance with Appendix D. (Faculty Manual Appendix D II.B.3: Initial recommendations for advancement in title for faculty holding fixed-term appointments is the responsibility of the unit Personnel Committee (see Section IV.A.1.)) Education of this process will be included in fall 2006 training.*
3. Encourages multi-year contracts of three years or more to full-time, fixed-term faculty who have demonstrated their effectiveness and contributions. *Multi-year contracts are addressed in part 3 of the report.*

After discussion, the chancellor, Faculty Senate officers, and the senior administration agreed that a task force evenly balanced with interested faculty and relevant administrators could best discuss the many and interrelated issues in order to formulate a deliberated basis for the formal shared governance work of further ECU policy changes regarding fixed-term faculty appointments that is planned for the 2006-2007 academic year.

The Academic Council (Drs. Lewis, Mageean, and Smith), several deans, Faculty officers, and faculty from the Governance Committee and other committees, as well as two fixed-term faculty joined in the efforts to produce this study.

The concluding recommendations should help inform the continuation of those formal discussions, wherefrom further revisions of Appendix C of the *Faculty Manual* (and perhaps other revisions) are expected to move through the Faculty Senate Governance Committee to the Faculty Senate and to the Chancellor.

There is much information in this report, including independent reports from each of the university's ten deans that enriched the early discussions of the task force regarding the use of fixed-term faculty appointments at ECU. Those reports are preserved in the appendix of the report.

For the sake of clarity, the task force recommendations are presented topically in a section following part 5 of the report. These recommendations convey substance related to where and even how Appendix C and perhaps other documents might be revised to house these or related recommendations.

Interested members of the ECU community are of course encouraged to read this entire report and take part in the discussions that ensue during 2006-2007.

January 29, 2008

Report to Faculty Senate of East Carolina University  
Elizabeth Layman, Scholars Council, UNC Tomorrow

North Carolina General Statute 116-1(b) states that "the University of North Carolina is a public, multi-campus university dedicated to the service of North Carolina and its people."

Working from that foundation, the Board of Governors, President Bowles, and the UNC Tomorrow Commission began a process of envisioning the UNC system for the future – or UNC Tomorrow, as it is called.

The process started in ~March 2007 with campus visits by President Bowles –I wasn't a part of that. In May 2007, 14 Scholars from across the University system were added to the process. Here's where I came in – I'm unclear about the selection of the 14 members of the Scholars Council – I just know that Chair Mark Taggart nominated me – he may have also nominated others. It was emphasized in many ways that we represented the system – we did NOT represent our constituent universities.

The BOG charged the Commission to learn what the people of North Carolina needed from their University and to make relevant recommendations. The Commission's work was guided by the research, analysis, and advice of the 14 Scholars.

During the summer 2007, the Scholars wrote briefing papers in their area of expertise – the papers focused on the current situation in North Carolina and nationally and internationally as relevant and the major challenges we saw in our area of expertise. These papers were posted to the UNC Tomorrow web site. They also became the basis of the video that was shown at the opening of the forums.

So, to learn what North Carolinians needed, 11 public listening forums (town hall meetings) were held throughout the state (~2700 attendees), 11 faculty forums near all 17 campuses (~1000 attendees), an on-line survey (~6700 respondents), and a blog.

The 14 Scholars were your eyes and ears. Almost all the 14 Scholars were at each the public forums (September & October). At the public forums, all the Scholars took notes during the open mike and during the small group discussions. The small group discussions were led by a facilitator from the Small Business and Technology Development Center. The Scholars distilled the notes from all 11 listening forums into a master list of issues.

We presented our findings at faculty forums for all the campuses (October & November). As many Scholars as possible attended the faculty forums. For example, I attended faculty forums here at ECU, at Wilmington, and at Fayetteville. At the forums, faculty members spoke at an open mike. Again, the Scholars took notes.

At both the public forums and the faculty forums, talking by the Scholars, President Bowles, and members of the Commission was held to a minimum. The forums focused on hearing what the public and you had to say.

All these data fed into drafts that the Commission and Scholars worked on at two meetings (November & December). Then, the final report went to the Board in January and was approved.

Now, we're in the response phase. The report has been sent or will be sent (soon) to all the campuses.

The purpose of the response phase is to develop specific plans as to how each campus and the University as a whole will respond to the UNC Tomorrow Commission's report and recommendations. Plans will include specific timelines for implementation, reprioritization of existing resources wherever feasible, cost estimates, and assessment and accountability measures.

The UNC Faculty Assembly has recommended some overarching questions as campuses examine the Commission's recommendations:

1. Which initiatives are best addressed on your campus because of your distinctive mission, resources, and regional needs and considerations?
2. Which initiatives cannot be addressed effectively by your campus?
3. Which initiatives are best addressed in collaboration with another (or other) institution(s)?
4. Which initiatives are best addressed by another institution?

The Response Phase takes a phased approach. Phase I responses are due May 1, 2008; Phase II responses are due December 1, 2008.

“Ultimately, the outcomes of UNC Tomorrow developed during the response phase will serve as the basis for prioritizing and realigning institutional missions, academic programs and other initiatives, resources, and funding decisions (including future budget requests and funding allocations) so that [the] UNC [system] can respond more directly to the state’s future needs.”

*During the response phase, campuses [and affiliated entities] will be asked to respond to 5 main questions:*

1. What *existing* programs, initiatives, and activities are already in place that effectively respond to the Commission’s recommendations?
  - a. How is their effectiveness assessed?
  - b. Can their effectiveness be improved, and if so, how?
  - c. What is the cost, if any, of improving their effectiveness?
  - d. Where will the funding for these improvements come from (with emphasis on utilizing and reprioritizing existing resources, and eliminating unnecessary, duplicative, or obsolete programs, initiatives, and activities)?
  - e. Who is accountable?
2. What *new* programs, initiatives, and activities are needed to respond to Commission recommendations?
  - a. What is the cost of establishing them?
  - b. Where will the funding for these efforts come from (with emphasis on utilizing and reprioritizing existing resources, and eliminating unnecessary, duplicative, or obsolete programs, initiatives, and activities)?
  - c. How will their effectiveness be assessed?
  - d. Who is accountable?
3. What *administrative and policy changes* are needed to successfully implement response plans in ways that ensure UNC’s efficiency, effectiveness, and relevance to both current *and future* challenges? *Examples: rewards and incentives for faculty, removal of administrative barriers that inhibit inter-institutional collaboration, more flexible personnel policies*
4. Where appropriate, what *interdisciplinary and inter-institutional collaborations* can be established (preferably within existing resources) and what “*best practices*” by campuses can be modeled and adopted by others to address needs identified in the Commission’s recommendations?
5. What are the clear *timelines* for implementation, *cost estimates and proposed internal/external sources of funding, assessment methods, and accountability measures* for proposals to improve existing programs, initiatives, and activities and/or establish new ones?

In the Response phase, to assist campuses and General Administration, the Scholars will be identifying, within their respective areas of expertise, best practices and barriers and obstacles to implementation. These documents are due March 1, 2008.