

12-7-10 Faculty
Senate
mtg.

NOTES ON THE 11/12/2010 FACULTY ASSEMBLY MEETING

1. **New Budget** – The prediction for the state budget is for slow growth with the possibility of double dip recession . . . The new system budget is “lean” and complicated.” The new make-up of the state legislature is being monitored by GA because it will certainly have an impact on the university’s budget (first time since 1998 the both House and Senate have had this political balance). The GA budget presentation entitled *2011-13 Budget Priorities* is available on the Faculty Senate web site.
 - Cuts are likely to be higher rather than lower. GA estimates at least 10\$. If this is correct, it may mean 1700 to 1800 jobs lost.
 - This is one of the reasons there is much talk at GA about “a new vision for the university,” new “performance models,” and “curtailment of programs”

2. **Program Curtailment** – a “program curtailment committee” (chaired by Marilyn Sheerer) meet during the first week of November. Provost Sheerer has spoken about this committee to the ECU Faculty Senate and has had meetings with individual departments about potential committee decisions. At the moment, this is what is known by the Faculty Assembly:
 - No one knows how any of this will be viewed when the new UNC President takes over in January, but he will have new people at the helm very soon. There are (or will soon be) search committees for VP of Human Resources, VP of Finance, and VP of Academic Affairs.
 - Marilyn Sheerer (ECU Provost and the committee chair) and Laura Luger (the GA’s attorney) reported about the Program Curtailment Committee’s work at the Chief Academic Officers’ meeting in November. Their report included the following:
 - The committee had already met at least twice. The next meeting will be in January. The committee will continue its work and research will continue in the interim.
 - Current committee members include Marilyn Sheerer (chair), Laura Luger (GA attorney), Laurie Ch (VP Human Resources), 3 campus VC-level people, Alan Mabe (Senior VP of Academic Affairs), and Ernie Murphy (VP Finance). This is a partial list. Note that 3 of these individuals are leaving in January and will be replaced by President Ross. Note also that there is no faculty presence on this committee.
 - The committee is thinking long-term savings – program curtailment results in cost savings, but not for 2 to 3 years, at least.
 - They are discussing “the shape of the university to come.”
 - They are discussing ways to deal with the curtailment, elimination, and redeployment of faculty without invoking financial exigency.
 - They do not want to create new policies. They are trying to determine what is and is not permissible within our current policies. By doing this, they hope to be able to tell

campuses how to use in-place policies to curtail/eliminate programs and eliminate and/or redeploy tenured faculty within those policies.

- Here are some of the specific questions they are asking:
 - What is a program?
 - What does “major curtailment” mean and how can it be done?
 - What factors other than finances guide the decision making process?
 - What does it mean redeploying faculty mean and how does that effect tenure? Can tenured faculty be re-deployed to other system campuses?
 - How do we overcome the disincentives for combining programs across the system?
 - With regard to tenure, what do e the phrases “reasonable assistance” and “fair review” mean?
 - What is the appeals process? What body should hear cases? Do we have to use the faculty committees or can we create a “special review board” to handle the cases?

- The Faculty Assembly is trying to become actively involved in, and change(!), the conversation. It is difficult, but not impossible.
- The Faculty Assembly also suggests that faculty need to become actively involved – and vocal (!) – on our own campuses.

3. **Performance-based Funding Model** – Alan Made briefed the Faculty Assembly executive committee on the new “performance-based funding model.” The following documents related to this new model are available on the Faculty Senate website: *Performance Model for Enrollment Funding* (a pdf document), *A Performance Model for Enrollment Expansion and Funding* (ppt), *Delaware Study and Faculty Teaching Loads Workload* (pdf), and *Delaware Faculty Teaching Workload* (ppt).

- The new model incorporates new metrics by which all campus will be judged and to which funding will be tied:
 - Graduate rates (“all-campus graduate rate” - what % of all students graduate in a given year . . also 5 or 6-year graduate rate)
 - Retention rates (freshman to sophomore)
 - Production of baccalaureate degrees
- It is unclear how (if at all) any of this is or can be related to education, especially quality of education. As with most such numerical metrics, our educational mission is sorely neglected in model. The members of the Faculty Assembly agree that higher graduate rates, higher retention rates, and more baccalaureate degrees does not equate to quality education for our students. In fact, it these metrics could have the unintentional consequence of actually decreasing the quality education while simultaneously increasing graduate rates and numbers of degrees rewarded.
- All of this will likely result in workload increases for faculty.
- This model is being “fast-tracked” because it will be used for enrollment funding requests.

- On a positive note, it seems that most of the system's Chancellors don't like the new performance based funding model. Some of them have actively spoken up against it (e.g., NCSU and App State's chancellors). This could be helpful, especially if they are voicing their concerns with the new system president.
4. **Academic Freedom Resolution** – The Faculty Assembly's Academic Freedom Resolution (endorsed passed by the ECU Faculty Senate in November) is getting a positive reception at all of the campus. The following campuses had passed resolutions in support of the resolution as of mid-November: ECU, UNC-W, UNC-CH, NCSU, and WSSU. The other campuses have the resolution on their agendas for upcoming faculty senate meetings.
 5. **Academics First** – this was the main topic of the full Faculty Assembly meeting. With increasing budgetary pressure and the likelihood that the new administration will continue to focus on performance measures that include retention rates, graduation rates, and number of degrees awarded, the Faculty Assembly thought it advisable to become informed about (and provide input on) three specific realms or academic responsibly: Advising, Financial Aid, and the workings of our Registrars' offices. To this end, the Assembly held panel discussions (with guest panelists from across the system) followed by focus-group workshops on similar topics. The highlights are outline below:
 - Advising Panel
 - Panelists:
 - Carrie McLean, Executive Director, Undergraduate Academic Programs, First Year College, NCSU
 - Ontario Wooden, Associate Dean, University College, NCCU
 - Steve Roberson, Dean, Undergraduate Studies, UNC-G
 - The panel discussed the various types of advising (faculty, professional, peer), the major stumbling blocks faced by most students (time management, study habits, inadequate academic preparation, personal/family issues, etc.), ways advising can help with these stumbling blocks, and various UNC campus models for handling advising (computer monitoring, living-learning communities, relationship between professional and faculty advising, etc.).
 - Registrar's Panel
 - Panelists:
 - Angela Anderson, Registrar, ECU
 - Jerome Goowin, Registrar, NCCU
 - Lewis Hunt, Registrar, NCSU
 - The panel discussed how academic policies are created at the various campuses (including faculty and student involvement and transparency, document procedures, rights and responsibilities, state and federal law, campus business practices, and accreditation issues), the lack of a common vocabulary among the campuses, the alignment of policies with mission.
 - Financial Aid Panel
 - Panelists:

- Julie Rice Mallette (NCSU)
 - Sharon Olivier (NCCU)
- The panel discussed federal rules governing financial aid (“satisfactory academic progress”) and academic rules. On our campuses related to financial aid, noting that two types of policies are not always aligned.
- Focus Group Reports: each focus group reported recommendations to the Assembly. The following is a summary of those reports.
 - Academic First focus group
 - Academics *must* remain our first priority.
 - We need to design good measure to replace the new performance metrics. These metrics must allow us not to lose sight of academic quality. There can be many, for example,
 - percentage of units attempted and passed
 - percentage of graduates employed, going to graduate school, etc.
 - number of graduations after 60 units (or after AA degree)
 - survey of NC businesses re satisfaction UNc grads
 - survey of students re quality of UNC education
 - Advising focus group
 - We should not be penalized for students who transfer into other UNC schools.
 - Mandatory advising is needed for, at least, first year students
 - Consider having an advising day instead of a reading day.
 - Facilitate the use of Banner/Peoplesoft
 - Questions we should all ask our advisees:
 - Tell me a little bit about yourself?
 - Do you plan to graduate from this institution? (All students)
 - What do you want to do with your degree? (All students)
 - Have you decided on a major? Why? What is your plan B? (Undecided students)
 - What are your interests and strengths? (Undecided students)
 - Do you understand the general education requirements? Tell me about them.
 - When do you plan to graduate? Have you mapped out your classes to meet the requirements for graduation?
 - Where are you starting academically? Are you taking the right prerequisite courses?
 - Do you work? How much do you work per week? Is it on or off-campus?
 - Are you a first-generation college student?
 - How are you doing in your courses this semester?
 - How do you study? Where? Do you study?
 - Do you have the books for your courses?
 - Are there any reasons why you cannot succeed?
 - Are you on financial aid? Do you understand the financial aid SAP requirements?
 - Registrars focus group
 - Faculty Assembly should work to develop a set of basic, standard, minimum academic guidelines that can be used by both Academic Affairs and Financial Aid. Perhaps look at the UNC-CH guidelines, the federal regulations, and the NCAA guidelines as a start.
 - There should be a faculty-lead, regular systematic review of academic policies.

- Financial Aid focus group
 - The group noted 5 points off overlap between financial aid and academic affairs policies that need to be addressed:
 - Attendance (Consider removing student from roll if they miss the 1st day of class. This would make seats available for others and handles the financial aid reporting issues.)
 - Retroactive withdrawals and date of withdrawal
 - Satisfactory Academic Progress (as defined by financial aid rules) should match, as much as possible, the academic affairs standards; exceptions would have to involve financial aid people in decisions
 - Repeat rules (Financial aid is hard to meld with academic standard in this category)

6. Miscellaneous

- President Ross officially begins on December 13th. Bowles' term official ends on December 31. (This is the official 2 week "transition" period.)
- Ross has already started visited campuses. He attended the November BOG meeting.
- Three major searchese on either in progress or soon o be started: Sr. VP Academic Affairs, VP Human Resources, and VP Finance.
- Furloughs will, once again, be on the agenda.
- The budget (see ppt) has passed the BOG. But, it does not take into account what will happen if/when there are cuts. The VP Finance says that there WILL be cuts: 8, 9, or 10 percent minimum. A 10% cut would mean a loose of 1700 to 1800, mostly academic, jobs.
- Campuses must have plans for these cuts to GA by mid-Decemeber. Faculty are urged to be involved in creating the campus plans.
- 16 BOG members will turn over this term; most are legislative appointees . . .
- 4 campuses (ASU, Pembroke, Western, and NCSU) are searching for Provosts and 2 (Western and UNC-W) are searching for Chancellors
- The Faculty Assembly requested for representation on the Program Elimination/Curtailment Committee and to have input on the group dealing with the workload data.
- It is once again time to select peers. This is an important process in which campus faculty should be involved.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine A. Rigsby
UNC Faculty Assembly Delegate

Resource Documents Related to November 2010 Faculty Assembly Meeting
(all are available on the ECU Faculty Senate web site)

2011-13 Budget Priorities (a ppt presentation)

Performance Model for Enrollment Funding (a pdf document)

A Performance Model for Enrollment Expansion and Funding (a related ppt presentation)

Delaware Study and Faculty Teaching Loads Workload (a pdf document)

Delaware Faculty Teaching Workload (a related ppt presentation)