

12-6-11  
Senate mtg.

## NOTES ON THE 04 NOVEMBER 2011 FACULTY ASSEMBLY MEETING

1. **Report on Campus Concerns and Recent Legislative Initiatives** – Lesley Cates (Director of State Government Operations) and Brent Herron (Assoc. VP for Safety & Emergency Operations) provide a detailed report on campus safety (the Campus Safety ppt presentation is available at [http://www.northcarolina.edu/facultyassembly/meetings/FA\\_Presentation\\_for\\_11-4-2011.ppt](http://www.northcarolina.edu/facultyassembly/meetings/FA_Presentation_for_11-4-2011.ppt)).

Of particular interest to the Assembly Delegates was Ms. Cates' update on a draft "guns on campus" bill that was presented in a legislative committee earlier this session. That bill would have lowered the offense for bringing weapons on campus from a felony to a class 1 misdemeanor and would have made it legal for anyone with a concealed weapons permit to bring (appropriately locked and affixed-to-a-vehicle) weapons on to our campuses. The UNC GA negotiated with the legislature and the final version deleted both the concealed carry provision and the reduction of the charge to a misdemeanor. There has been no word about bringing this up again in a new bill. The rest of the original bill (including the "castle doctrine" – fear of bodily harm) was in the version of the legislation that passed.

Also, VP Herron recommended the "Shots Fired on Campus" training video. The full 20-minute video is currently available online at the following locations (and probably several others!):  
[http://www.rscdd.edu/Video/ShotsFired\\_StudentEd/SFOC%20-%20Digital%20File%20Set/2%20-%20SFOC%20-%20Full%20Show%20FINAL.mov](http://www.rscdd.edu/Video/ShotsFired_StudentEd/SFOC%20-%20Digital%20File%20Set/2%20-%20SFOC%20-%20Full%20Show%20FINAL.mov) and  
<http://www3.davidson.edu/cms/x44318.xml>.

2. **Academics First Discussion and Working Sessions** – The bulk of the meeting was devoted to discussion of the Academics First Initiatives that the Faculty Assembly developed over a year ago and has been working to have incorporated into GA policies ever since. The 1993 Board of Governors policy allows individual campus to adopt specific policies for Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP), Good Academic Standing, withdrawal, drops/add, repeat/replace, etc. The Federal government also has SAP policies for students on Federal Financial Aid. One of the goals of GA is to make sure that the campus policies are as seamless as possible. To this end, the Faculty Assembly engaged in conversations with Bruce Mallette (Senior Assoc. VP for Academic and Student Affairs) and Suzanne Ortega (VP Academic Affairs) about the variety of policies across the system and the possibility of making some of the policies the same from campus to campus.

The working groups came up with the following lists of recommendations/concerns/comments, many restating our first Academics First recommendations, to be carried forward along with the original (November 2010) report.

### Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP):

- a. Where feasible, the campus SAP standards should be the same as the Federal SAP standards.
- b. Actual standards should be based on data (for example, do we know what percentage of students get back into good standing after being in bad standing?)
- c. We need to do a better job of identifying reasons students do not meet academic standards.

- d. We need to think about who should be involved in the "contract" for getting back into good standards (a faculty member? an advisor?).
- e. We need to consider how detailed the "contract" should be. Should it specify courses, specific the specific number of courses to be taken, identify outside distractions, require specific meetings with advisors, etc.?
- f. Early warning systems may be useful, but should be carefully monitored/assessed for their usefulness.
- g. GA should create a web-based GPA calculator for use by all campuses.
- h. If SAP is a campus standard and probationary standing required a contract, who reviews appeals? A team approach would probably be best.
- i. Policies need to be sensitive to part-time students and other "non-traditional" students. We should consider "seat time" instead of clock time (academic semesters instead of years). This requires rewording of current UNC Code policy.
- j. Different campuses have different student bodies, hence should be able to have different standards.

#### REPEAT/REPLACE

- a. Repeats should be allowed, but there was no systemwide policy about why or how many.
  - b. All repeated courses should be shown on the transcript (even if the grade is replaced).
  - c. Each school needs the flexibility to set its own policy.
  - d. Students should be allowed to recover from a bad performance, but not to obliterate the record.
  - e. We need to build in structures of discouragement (*e.g.*, make repeats/replaces more restrictive later in the students' academic careers).
3. **Report from President Ross** – President Ross spoke to the delegates about the budget situation as related to tuition and fees, reminding the delegates that there is no GA mandate for campus-based tuition increases and that campuses are required to keep their tuition and fees in the bottom  $\frac{1}{4}$  of their peers while remembering the legal mandate for affordability. He also mentioned that with access-based campuses most of the tuition goes to financial aid, so it is hard to make real headway budget-wise by simply raising tuition. Also, he urged us to remember that when tuition goes up retention and graduation rates often go down (because some of our students simply can't afford the higher cost of college). Finally, he mentioned concern about faculty salaries: the lack of raises for so long is problematic as is the "retention fund" which does not always work and can sometimes actually be a disincentive for faculty retention. He said that he would continue to work to improve the salary situation.
4. **Report on Campus Initiated Tuition Guidelines and Enrollment Guidelines** – Charlie Perusse (VP Finance) briefed the delegates on his view of the current economic situation. He suggested that, although these are tough economic times "the sky is not falling," and that we are in a pretty good economic footing. (Many of the delegates wondered where he got this rosy outlook!) He noted, however, that recent the loss of federal monies resulted in a \$2 billion "structural problem" that was made even more difficult by the "all cut" budgeting approach taken by the legislature this year. That approach resulted in the largest reduction in UNC

history: ~\$400 million (~15% after add-backs enrollments; ~13% net cuts across the system). He noted that there is no way to tell what will happen next (new taxes? more cuts?), but that budget develop is in the works as usual. The system is looking at tuition and fees, enrollment projections, self-liquidating capital projects, and performance-based funding. So far this year we've seen lower enrollments and lots of talk about tuition and fees. The final tuition and fee requests are due in from campuses by December 9<sup>th</sup>. The Board of Governors will consider the requests at their January meeting.

VP Perusse also gave the Assembly delegates an overview of the process for requesting campus-initiated tuition and fees (as outlined in the memo sent to all campuses on 18 October 2011: [http://www.northcarolina.edu/facultyassembly/meetings/for\\_2011-11-04\\_Tuition\\_Fees\\_Instructions.pdf](http://www.northcarolina.edu/facultyassembly/meetings/for_2011-11-04_Tuition_Fees_Instructions.pdf)). He explained that the guidelines are a bit different this year than in previous years. The 4-year plan (including the 6.5% cap) is still in place, but during this cycle campus requests are allowed to exceed 6.5% as a "one-time catch-up adjustment." The new list of peer institution (approved by the Board of Governors in October: <https://www.northcarolina.edu/bog/doc.php?code=bog&id=27083>) will be used to establish tuition and fee maximums. Each campus is allowed to have total combined tuition and fees that are within the bottom 1/4 of the peer groups tuition and fees. The "one-time catch-up adjustment" can be used to raise tuition and fees as high as possible within that limit.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine A. Rigsby  
Chair-Elect, UNC Faculty Assembly

ADDENDUMS:

- I. Report on Chancellor Woodward's 11 November 2011 report to the Board of Governors.
- II. Resource documents related to this report

## ADDENDUM 1: Report on the 11 November 2011 UNC Board of Governors Meeting - discussion of the Woodward Report

We have all now seen the final version of Chancellor Woodward's Program Duplication Study. During his presentation to the Board of Governors, Woodward summarized his 3 major findings, as follows.

- 1) There is currently no unnecessary program duplication in the UNC system.
  - a. The demanding program productivity review process that was put in place in 1995 could be strengthened, but it works.
  - b. Most program eliminations are about enrollments, not duplication. And, we have a good system in place for dealing with these issues
  - c. It is necessary to have duplication among our campuses. All universities *must* have a broad range of programs in the academic areas. Some departments and programs with low enrollments are very important to the culture of a university (*e.g.*, every campuses should have foreign languages), so don't eliminate programs based on the numbers alone.
  
- 2) The system needs a new process for program review.
  - a. The assigned mission of each campus should define the boundaries for all new programs. The current Board of Governors policy that says "campuses shall have the lead role in identifying need . . . when those needs can be responded to with programs consistent with the campuses' assigned mission" should be strengthened.
  - b. The Board of Governors should delegate to GA the approval of programs that are clearly within the mission of the campuses. It is important to understand that adding new programs sometimes cost nothing (*e.g.*, adding a new B.S. degree may only cost money if the new degree has new lab requirements).
  - c. We should undertake a collective (systemwide) review of individual campus missions. (This has not happened in the last 20 years.)
  - d. State-level evaluation of need is required for some programs (doctoral programs, engineering, pharmacy, etc.), but not for most programs.
  - e. The current process for review of existing programs works reasonably well. It could use some tweaking and some campuses (*e.g.*, UNCG and NCSU) have made some improvements in their own campus-level program review process.
  - f. We need to look at more than just the numbers when we evaluate existing programs. Breadth of programs offered on each campus is important. Also, for example, we should remember that not all of our students are full-time students, so years to degree is not necessarily a good measure for program productivity.
  
- 3) Online education
  - a. Academic autonomy is a great strength that we need to preserve as we move into more online education.
  - b. The only existing problem with online education in the UNC system is bureaucratic hurdles (especially for cross-enrollment). We should consider using the Language Assembly model to develop a pilot program for online education governed by a rational set of systemwide policies and procedures.
  - c. We should not consider developing systemwide degrees. There are many reasons for this, but out front are accreditation issues and expense.
  - d. Online programs (as with other changes in programs and changes in program review and approval processes) should not homogenize our campuses.

## ADDENDUM II: Resource Documents Related to 04 NOVEMBER 2011 Faculty Assembly Report

Safety & Security on UNC Campuses (PowerPoint):

[http://www.northcarolina.edu/facultyassembly/meetings/FA\\_Presentation\\_for\\_11-4-2011.ppt](http://www.northcarolina.edu/facultyassembly/meetings/FA_Presentation_for_11-4-2011.ppt)

*Shots Fired on Campus Training Video:* [http://www.rscdd.edu/Video/ShotsFired\\_StudentEd/SFOC%20-%20Digital%20File%20Set/2%20-%20SFOC%20-%20Full%20Show%20FINAL.mov](http://www.rscdd.edu/Video/ShotsFired_StudentEd/SFOC%20-%20Digital%20File%20Set/2%20-%20SFOC%20-%20Full%20Show%20FINAL.mov) and  
<http://www3.davidson.edu/cms/x44318.xml>

Summary of Academics First Recommendations from the 2010 Faculty Assembly Meeting – see item #5 /Academics First/Focus Group Reports of the report to the December 2010 ECU Faculty Senate meeting: <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/customcf/fsminute/fsm1210facassemblyreport.pdf>

UNC Campuses – Drop/Add Policies:

[http://www.northcarolina.edu/facultyassembly/meetings/for\\_2011-11-04\\_DROP\\_DATE\\_Policies.pdf](http://www.northcarolina.edu/facultyassembly/meetings/for_2011-11-04_DROP_DATE_Policies.pdf)

UNC Campuses – Good Academic Standing Policies:

[http://www.northcarolina.edu/facultyassembly/meetings/for\\_2011-11-04\\_Good\\_Academic\\_Standing.pdf](http://www.northcarolina.edu/facultyassembly/meetings/for_2011-11-04_Good_Academic_Standing.pdf)

UNC Campuses – Replace and Repeat Chart:

[http://www.northcarolina.edu/facultyassembly/meetings/for\\_2011-11-04\\_Repeat\\_and\\_Replace\\_Chart.pdf](http://www.northcarolina.edu/facultyassembly/meetings/for_2011-11-04_Repeat_and_Replace_Chart.pdf)

2011-2012 Peer Institutions Lists: <https://www.northcarolina.edu/bog/doc.php?code=bog&id=27307>

Memo Regarding 2012-2013 Campus Initiated Tuition and Fees –

[http://www.northcarolina.edu/facultyassembly/meetings/for\\_2011-11-04\\_Tuition\\_Fees\\_Instructions.pdf](http://www.northcarolina.edu/facultyassembly/meetings/for_2011-11-04_Tuition_Fees_Instructions.pdf)

Program Duplication Study – Final Report:

<https://www.northcarolina.edu/bog/doc.php?code=bog&id=27083>

Note: Other materials from this and other meetings of the UNC Faculty Assembly are available on the Faculty Assembly website (<http://www.northcarolina.edu/facultyassembly/index.htm>). Materials from Board of Governors meetings are available on the Board of Governors website (<https://www.northcarolina.edu/bog/index.php>).