Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda  
Wednesday, February 1, 2017  
Virginia Dare Room, Alumni House  
3:00 – 5:00 PM

3:00 Call to Order & Remarks  
Anne Wallace, Faculty Senate Chair

3:05 Approval of December 7, 2016 Minutes  
Brad Johnson, Faculty Senate Secretary  
[Enc. A]

3:10 Chancellor Franklin D. Gilliam, Jr.  
(20 min) Remarks on set questions  
(40 min) Discussion/questions from the floor  
[Enc. B]

4:10 ad hoc NTT Issues Committee Report  
Teresa Little, Committee Chair & Susan Collins, Senate Liaison  
[Enc. C, D, E, F]

4:25 Faculty Assembly Delegation Report: 1/6/17 Meeting  
Anna Marshall-Baker, Lead Delegate  
[Enc. G, H, I]

Resolution #FS02012017/1: To Endorse UNC Faculty Assembly Resolution 2017-2, “On Faculty Compensation”  
Resolution #FS02012017/2: To Endorse UNC Faculty Assembly Resolution 2017-3, “On SACSCOC Compliance”  
Resolutions submitted by: UNCG Faculty Assembly Delegation: Anna Marshall-Baker, Andrea Hunter, Spoma Jovanovic, and Anne Wallace

4:45 Report: Board of Trustees Dec. Meeting  
Sam Miller, Senator

4:55 Announcements & Adjournment  
Anne Wallace, Faculty Senate Chair

Upcoming Events:  
Faculty Forum: Title IX, Academic Freedom and Shared Governance

Wednesday, February 15, 2017  
3-5p, Alumni House, Virginia Dare Room

Next Meeting of the Faculty Senate:  
Wednesday, March 1, 2017, 3-5p  
Alumni House, Virginia Dare Room

Refreshments are available at 2:30 p.m. for Senators to meet and greet faculty colleagues.

NOTE: We encourage Senators, non-voting faculty and visitors to speak upon being recognized by the Senate Chair.

Sign Language Services provided as needed and requested (please allow 72 hours) by:  
Communications Services for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing.
Contact: 336-275-8878, or the Faculty Senate Office, 336-334-5345/mlwolfe@uncg.edu
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, December 7, 2016
3:00pm-5:00pm
Virginia Dare Room, Alumni House
*pending approval at the February 1, 2017 meeting*

Call to Order and Introductory Remarks
*Anne Wallace, Chair of the General Faculty and Faculty Senate*

- I have no idea what to say about this past month, except that it is past. On to the present and the future.
- Posters for the Jan. 30 screening of "Starving the Beast" are located at the back credenza—please take one or two to post in your department or unit.
- Yet another experiment in seating, and our pursuit of better microphone access continues. Please do make the effort to speak using a microphone: some Senators do write in after meetings to say how hard it is to hear. We’ll try to facilitate, and we will wait patiently for your remarks until you can get to one.
- A packed agenda today, so I’ll try to keep us on track, starting with keeping my own remarks brief.
- Agenda reflects the range of work undertaken by the Senate and its committees:
  - Maintaining the framework of representative faculty governance, discussing and developing academic policies for our campus, collaborating with our colleagues at other UNC system schools to protect our core academic mission and standards.
  - Proposed questions for the Chancellor are also telling in their top concerns: the impact of growing enrollments on quality of instruction, the need to foster and protect diversity, and the means by which faculty and administration might advocate for higher education and its core values. Many other areas of interest came forward in these questions, including support for UNCG’s research scholars, the relation of admission standards to enrollment and teaching, and that perennial favorite, budget and salaries.
  - Art. II Sec. 3 of the Constitution outlines the extensive field of involvement which the Senate, at our best, engages. When we get tired, bogged down in the minutiae of our daily work, I think it helps to lift our eyes toward these large goals, our broader responsibilities and efforts.
  - And if I don’t stop talking and let us get on with it, we will be bogged down indeed. Let me close by wishing you a smooth end to your semester, and a happy holiday season!
Approval of the November 2, 2016 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Brad Johnson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate

- No corrections.
- Minutes passed.

Provost Remarks

Dana Dunn, Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor

- Provost had planned to report on a closure of space related to faculty tied to the McIver demolition and the new building going up
  - Had previously planned on taking Faculty Center out of use in order to repurpose for instructional purposes for the School of Nursing but that is no longer an issue as an alternative plan developed by Nursing faculty has been developed where some Friday night and Saturday courses will be taught to accommodate instructional needs
- Provost shared information about the proposal going before the Board of Trustees this Friday regarding tuition and fees for the upcoming year.
  - Provost thanked the Tuition & Fees Committee for holding forums to gather community input and develop a report for the Chancellor
  - Committee was chaired by Alan Boyette and SGA President and included 3 faculty members and 2 staff members who served on this committee
  - From BOG, maximum increase for tuition was 2% and fees was 3%; the Committee has recommended the maximum increases allowed
  - Provost reminded the fixed tuition plan being implemented by UNCG where a student’s tuition would be fixed at the first semester they enroll at UNCG and continue for the next 8 semesters to complete their degree
  - These increases will be a one-time increase for students and will help students in their financial planning for their education
  - These increases will result in a revenue of just under $1 million each year
  - 3 uses of revenue funds:
    - Just over $400,000 will be spent on faculty retention--students recognized the need to increase compensation for faculty and value faculty at UNCG
      - Could supplement future raises from the Legislature or be used as a true retention fund similar to GA’s funds (which are currently dwindling)
    - Support academic advising and other forms of student support for academic success with emphasis on advising and the addition of new advisors to support student need
      - Advising tends to be one of the least satisfied aspects of UNCG when students are polled
    - Graduate student support--long been pressed to offer competitive stipends, new tuition waivers, etc.
      - About $220,000 allotted for this
      - Provost stated that faculty, in some form, will probably be asked for suggestions for using these funds
○ Fees--requests for increase from all funding areas exceeded the 3% increase
  ■ Requests from all fee-funded areas were not frivolous--were meant to keep pace with inflation and costs of services
  ■ Committee elected to do an across-the-board 3% increase for all areas
○ Once BOT approves this proposal on Friday, this will go to the BOG for final approval
○ Provost stated our tuition will still be in the lowest quartile compared to our system peers (UNCG is currently 3rd from the bottom)
○ Provost shared that the presentation slides will be available on the Board of Trustee site with more detailed information

Provost Remarks Q & A
● Question about advising--centralized, unit, or department?
  ○ Not certain yet but believe most will be toward departmental advising
  ○ Could be a combination
  ○ Should start by looking at advisor/student ratios and use this as a metric for allocating funds
  ○ Open to recommendations and ideas on how to best utilize those funds
● Clarification on increase--for all students or just a subset of students?
  ○ Provost gave the Senate the Undergraduate in-state figures
  ○ Comparable figures for Graduate students, Online, etc. groups
● Will $1 million be for both in-state and out-of-state tuition as well as fees revenue?
  ○ Will only be for tuition and will not include fees revenue
● Please explain student success support and advising support?
  ○ Some instances where advisors are also student support professionals (tutoring, supplemental instruction, etc.)
● Will we be able to do 5% increase each year for the incoming first-year students?
  ○ Can do 5% total increase across tuition & fees next year; uncertain what percentage we will be able to do for the following academic year

Discussion: Questions for Chancellor’s February 1, 2017 visit to Faculty Senate
● Anne asked Senators to review the questions/information provided to hear prior to the meeting and do the following in small groups:
  ○ Identify your group’s top 3 topics and/or questions
  ○ Draft revisions, new questions, merged questions, etc.
  ○ Send your notes to Anne via email

Discussion: Elections Committee on Reapportionment
*Stoel Burrows, Chair, Senate Elections Committee*
● Anne provided brief background on the committee work
● The creation of the new VPA college called into question the need to reapportion senators based on the creation of this new entity
Other changes such as the demographics of voting faculty at UNCG also necessitated further investigation into how many Senators should be represented within Faculty Senate.

Changing the number of Senators would bring about a cultural shift as well as more Senators for committees in addition to having further representation.

Committee is proposing going with the number of 36 for determining Senator representation.

Questions
  o How does this compare to what we have now and how will that apply to people who are extra?
    ■ Don’t know how those changes are made based on the Constitution--to do this, requires no vote by the Senate
    ■ Will wait until the Spring to have a further discussion--just wanted to bring this information forward to the Senate this Fall
    ■ Anne asked for any further questions to be emailed to her for discussion in the Spring semester.

Resolution: Government Committee on editorial/clerical changes to the Faculty Constitution Reapportionment Report

Greg Bell, Government Committee Chair & Senate Liaison [Enc. B of Agenda Packet]
  ● This work also comes out of the development of the College of VPA
  ● Greg formally read Resolution #FS12072016/1 to the Faculty Senate for consideration
  ● Greg also commented on the rationale of the resolution
  ● Committee is requesting the ability to make small modifications and changes to the Constitution without having to bring forth each of these changes to the Senate for a vote
  ● Any changes made would be reported to the Senate on an annual basis
  ● Vote called for approving resolution; resolution passed unanimously
  ● This is an amendment to the Constitution, which will need to come before the General Faculty for vote for final approval

Academic Policies Committee Discussion: University Office Hours Policy

Initial discussion led by Colleen Fairbanks--Chair, Academic Policies Committee and Wake Maki--Senate Liaison to Academic Policies Committee [Enc. C of Agenda Packet]
  ● This is an initial discussion; information sent out in the Agenda packet
  ● Colleen shared the committee responded to a request by the Provost to look at office hours since there is currently no set policy
  ● The committee reviewed policies across the nation as well as within NC at peer institutions
  ● Committee is still in the exploratory stages and hopes to bring forward a resolution in the Spring to implement some kind of policy for the 2017-2018 academic year
• Wade sent out a Google document asking for faculty input and feedback; Wade encouraged more faculty to complete the form as soon as possible since the timeline is very tight
  ○ The committee needs to get us a recommendation for the March 2017 Faculty Senate mtg.
• Colleen shared that she is meeting in February with a student advisor group to receive feedback/input from a student contingency to make sure we are developing a policy flexible enough for faculty while meeting student needs as well
• Anne will send out the Google Form to the General Faculty to solicit more faculty input
• Question: Will there be a Senate Resolution and if the Senate rejects what is proposed, what will happen?
  ○ Yes, and if it is not supported, the Committee will go revisit the proposal to work on it further
  ○ Senator shared that among his department, there should be no policy regarding office hours
• Question: Has the committee received any information from departments on campus to see what their current policies are? Maybe collect this information to get a better idea of what is currently in place and not sure all faculty can be satisfied
  ○ Concern/problem is with both faculty and students---faculty sometimes have office hours that never see students and students sometimes aren’t able to make office hours offered by faculty
  ○ Wade asked for any policies out there to be sent to the committee
• Question: any consideration given to faculty dealing primarily with online courses?
  ○ Yes--Committee feels that online courses must be considered in order to include everyone
• Senator commented that some faculty have office hours “by appointment only” and some students may feel they are infringing on faculty time
• Senator shared that they gave out their Google number and encouraged students to text him and wonder if we need to go in this direction and maybe leaving it to the department to come up with their policy/guideline for office hours may be best. University shouldn’t mandate what it can’t enforce
  ○ One factor would be just to include how you would be accessible to students
  ○ Want to have things that all should be doing with respect to office hours and accessibility and then delegate it down to the departments for further considerations
• Colleen shared that she doesn’t see the Committee coming up with a policy stating that faculty will be in their office X hours a week; students are sometimes afraid to approach faculty without standard hours set
• Senator suggested a possible solution is helping students better realize ways in which they can approach and meet with faculty in our courses; educating students that it is their right to request to meet with their professors
Faculty Assembly Delegation Report for October 21 & November 18 Meetings


- Last 2 meetings were lengthy so a brief report was created and presented to Faculty Senate
- Will be a future link on the Faculty Senate for Faculty Assembly reports
- October report is included because all the documents were not available for the last meeting
- Non-cognitive factors survey initiative is underway
- Strategic plan updates
- Student mental health
- NCGAP report
- November meeting
  - Spellings--expectations for Higher Ed to be more broad and less expensive
  - Strategic plan--anemic when compared to other states regarding transparency and accountability
  - Drew Moritz update--election results
- Oct. & Nov. mtg---delegates broke up into 5 working groups to provide feedback on strategic plan
- Working group of 8 faculty monitoring all information coming in on the public survey--faculty assembly work, survey work, and BOG input from campus visits
- Anna asked for questions to be emailed to her

Announcements

Anne Wallace, Faculty Senate Chair
- “Starving the Beast” Film Screening January 30, 2017--posters available for distribution

Adjourn
- Move to adjourn. Seconded
- Adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
Brad Johnson
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Pending approval at the February 1, 2017 Faculty Senate Meeting
January 25, 2017

To: Chancellor Frank Gilliam

From: Anne Wallace, Faculty Senate Chair
       Andrea Hunter, FS Chair-Elect
       Brad Johnson, FS Secretary

Because we very much want to discuss specific issues during your visit, the Senate leadership decided to compile our large collection of questions (more than 20, which emerged over two longish Senate sessions in the fall) into three particular areas of concern. These are detailed below.

But there is another set of questions or concerns that emerged about what might be called "the specifics of leadership" in your Chancellorship—leadership on campus, in the system, and in the state. We want you to be aware of these concerns, not so much to address them directly (though of course you may), but as a kind of contextual orientation.

For instance, one group asked: "What structure can you suggest to facilitate the relationship between you and the faculty? What is the best way for faculty to approach you? We know you are approachable; we believe you are supportive, but we need to know HOW to do this?" Their specific example was your "giant steps" theme. What is the process, they wondered, to "submit giant steps ideas" to you?

Another group asked, "What is your plan to position UNCG advantageously within the UNC system and the state? Given that some of the stances taken by the Board of Governors indicate a willingness to give Chancellors more autonomy, what if anything do you plan to do about it?"

You can hear in these kinds of questions (and there were others of this type) a desire to understand how you will lead and engage with us, in a rather nuts-and-bolts sort of way. Throughout all the questions submitted and crafted by Senators, we noticed this desire, not so much to interrogate your principles but to hear how, in action, in specific plans, through particular mechanisms, you will lead and engage with us.

This is why, in fact, we chose not to put these larger questions of leadership up front. In essence we think that they are calling for more specific, directed expressions of
leadership, for the detailing of actions you are taking or considering as you encounter particular issues and situations.

Thank you for coming to talk with us February 1. We look forward very much to our conversation.

**Faculty Senate Questions for Chancellor Gilliam**
for the Faculty Senate meeting on February 1, 2017

**Research Intensive and Teaching Missions**

Would you discuss your sense of how UNCG as a Research Intensive University and as an excellence in teaching regional university can synthesize those two functions to better serve our students and our community? How will faculty be supported in contributing to both missions, not only on campus but as you advocate for us in the system and state? We feel that we know you support these linked missions, but would like to hear more on your specific plans to lead us in carrying them out.

Specific related issues include:
1. resource allocation
2. faculty career and working conditions
   a. promotion and/or tenure standards (i.e., valuing teaching and research)
   b. support for research as teaching demands increase
   c. relief from administrative bloat
3. serving a diverse student population/being a "Minority Serving" institution

**Teaching, Enrollment Management, Admissions, Student Preparation**

Larger face-to-face classes (100, 200 students per course) are now common at UNCG, and the University continues to increase its online course offerings. These strategies to expand enrollment and serve students raise concerns about quality of instruction, faculty recruitment and support, and admission practices with respect to student preparation and success. Could you speak about the University's concrete plans to meet some of these challenges?

Specific related issues include:
1. maintaining strong faculty/student relationships leading to student success
2. meeting learning outcomes, esp. in writing and quantitative skills
3. assuring resources: classroom capacity, faculty lines, tech infrastructure
4. support for faculty teaching fully or partly online but not under the "umbrella" of UNCG Online (particularly, support for ADA compliance)
5. admissions and retention criteria стратегии, how these are designed or adapted to select/support students in succeeding at UNCG
Equity and Salary

Conditions in the university lately mirror those of corporations. UNC institutions have taken a 20% cut since 2008. Yet in 2016, the Board of Governors hired a consulting firm who found that UNC system salary levels for Chancellors are "below the market for 'top tier' executive talent," so executive pay was raised as much as 19% for the Chancellor at NC State (but not here given your recent hire). Meanwhile, UNCG faculty salaries seem not to be related to market values, and in fact, are losing ground relative to inflation. Adjuncts at UNCG are often making $3500 to teach a single course, a salary that has stayed the same for decades. Tenure lines are being converted to fund "at will" employees who don't even have the job protections of SPA employees. Publicly available salary data suggest that UNCG salaries of women and minority faculty members are substantially below average for discipline and rank (whether 9 month or 12 month). Salary compression adds another layer. These trends undermine free inquiry, as the material circumstances that are the foundation of academic freedom and shared governance are eroded. How do you regard these trends, separately and/or as a collective? Do you have concrete suggestions to redress such inequities?
UNCG Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty Issues
Recommended Best Practices

The Ad Hoc Committee on Non-Tenure Track (NTT) Faculty Issues was established and tasked to review existing policies and practices governing NTT faculty; and to recommend changes to improve NTT working conditions at UNCG. Based on a review of best practices regarding rights, benefits, appointment, promotion, and inclusion of NTT faculty, we have identified five recommendations for the faculty senate to consider. These recommendations reflect the university’s culminating response to the 2002 Report and Recommendations Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty¹ presented to the UNC Personnel and Tenure Committee of the UNC Board of Governors resulting in the following efforts:

- UNC Constituent Institution Responses to the Report of the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty, 2008² (includes UNCG’s response)
- UNCG Task Force on Non-Tenure Track Faculty Reports: Phase I Interim Report, 2011³ and Phase II and Final Report, 2012⁴
- Committee on Fixed-Term Faculty and the Community and Diversity Committee at UNC-Chapel Hill, 2015⁵
- Survey Results of NTT Faculty at UNCG, 2016⁶

1. JOB SECURITY
As stated in the UNCG 2012 final task force report, “Multi---year contracts that increase in length with promotion should become standard as NTT faculty meet the criteria established by the University Guidelines” (p.24). The following guidelines are based on the recommendations presented by the Committee on Fixed-Term Faculty and the Community and Diversity Committee at UNC-Chapel Hill⁵:

¹2002 Report and Recommendations Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty: https://www.northcarolina.edu/sites/default/files/documents/bognttfacultyreport03-06-2002.pdf
³UNCG 2011 NTT Task Force Phase I Report: https://drive.google.com/a/uncg.edu/file/d/0Bx0LuIgx8IFiYkl6SFByaGlJUnc4NW9tUVBKWFpZWlZWSVMw/view?usp=sharing
4 UNCG 2012 NTT Task Force Final Report:  

5 Committee on Fixed-Term Faculty and the Community and Diversity Committee at UNC-Chapel Hill (2015):  
http://facultygov.unc.edu/committees/appointed-committees/fixed-term-faculty-committee/committees-recommended-best-practices-related-to-fixed-term-faculty/?share=email&nb=1

6 Survey Results of NTT Faculty at UNCG, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Service to the University</th>
<th>Contract Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 5 years</td>
<td>up to 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5 years or Associate Professor/Senior Lecturer level or above</td>
<td>up to 5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. PROMOTION/REAPPOINTMENT
Following the recommendations stated in the UNCG 2012 task report, policies and procedures guiding appointment, reappointment, and promotion in rank should be standard at both the University and unit levels for full---time NTT faculty. For consistency, the University Guidelines should include general areas for evaluation, criteria for promotion, and the appropriate timelines and documentation needed for achieving promotion and/or reappointment. Unit guidelines should describe the same areas with greater specificity. (pp. 23-24). This document should be updated and revised every 5 years by the academic unit.

3. PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT
Full--time NTT faculty should receive the same rights and privileges access to teaching and professional development resources generally available to full-time TT faculty, such as: mentoring in research and teaching through programs like the UNCG Mentoring Program; research leaves; eligibility for internal and external grant support; professional travel funds; reimbursement for professional dues or licensure fees; and eligibility for phased retirement and Emeritus status.

4. RENEWAL NOTICE
Decisions to renew the appointments of full-time fixed term faculty should be made with adequate notice, at least six months prior (or prior to January 1) to the end of the first year’s appointment. Except in cases of urgent financial contingency, notice in advance of nonrenewal should increase to twelve months for individuals with at least ten years of continuous service. Individuals with appointments that fill an ongoing role in the unit whose contracts are not to be renewed should have access to an expedited process of review, so that a final decision can be made in a timely and responsible manner.
5. **INCLUSION**
When they have met the criteria for voting rights as specified in Article I, Section 1.2 of the UNCG Faculty Handbook, full-time clinical faculty should be fully integrated into their departments. This includes incorporating them into departmental governance by allowing them to participate in departmental faculty meetings and advancing appropriate voting privileges. It also includes listing their names in university academic catalogs, faculty building directories, and departmental websites, and including them in all routine departmental and university mailings. Teaching faculty should be included in curriculum discussions. When requested, leadership development opportunities should be made available to fixed-term faculty. Leadership opportunities including departmental and university-wide service should be considered.

Ad-hoc Committee Members:
CAS: Nodia Mena
BUS: James Milanese
EDU: Teresa Little, chair
HHS: Regina McCoy
VPA: Anthony Taylor
NUR: Angela Newman
LIB: Cathy Griffith
1. Unit/Department

2. Formal Title

3. Years of full time service at UNCG?
   - 0-3
   - 4-6
   - 7-9
   - 10-12
   - 13-15
   - 16-18
   - 19-21
   - 21-25
   - 25+

4. Check all that apply do you
   - Advise Students
   - Participate in Departmental Meetings/decisions
   - Apply for Grants
   - Publish scholarly work
   - Exhibit creative works
o Maintain clinical/professional hours including, but not limited to run clinics, head daycare centers, supervise research programs, etc.
o Supervise students in clinical-based and school-based experiences
o Other activities not defined above (please list activities below)

5. List activities not defined above

6. Publications
During the past 3 years, how many of your scholarly works have been accepted for publication? (if you have been employed at UNCG for less than 3 years, include any work accepted for publication during your employment at UNCG).
o 0
o 1-3
o 4-6
o 7-9
o 10+

7. Internal Grants Received
During the past 3 years, how many internal grants have you received? (If you have been employed at UNCG for less than 3 years, include any internal grants that you have received during your employment at UNCG). Please include grant amount(s).

8. External grants
During the past 3 years, how many external grants have you received? (If you have been employed at UNCG for less than 3 years, include any external grants that you have received during your employment at UNCG). Please include grant amount(s).
9. **Awards**

Are there awards within your department or unit that you are ineligible for? If so, then please list the awards that you are ineligible for below.

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

If you answered yes to the above question, list the awards within your department or unit that you are ineligible for.

10. **Committees**

Are there committees that you are ineligible to participate in (university, department, or unit)? If so, then please list the committees that you are ineligible for below.

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

If you answered yes to the above question, list the committees that you are ineligible for.

11. **On average, how many hours per week do you spend supervising students in clinical-based and school-based experiences. Include ONLY the face-to-face time with the student.**

- 0 hours
- 1-5 hours
- 6-10 hours
- 11-15 hours
- 16+ hours
12. On average, how many hours per week do you spend traveling to supervise students in clinical-based and school-based experiences. Include ONLY the drive time to see the student.
   o 0 hours
   o 1-5 hours
   o 6-10 hours
   o 11-15 hours
   o 16+ hours

13. How many credit hours on average do you teach per semester?
   o 1-3
   o 4-6
   o 7-9
   o 10-12
   o 13-15
   o 16+

14. On average, how many students do you advise?
   o 0
   o 1-10
   o 11-30
   o 31-50
   o 51-100
   o 100+
15. Are you invited to attend department or unit meetings?
   o Yes
   o No

16. Are rank and promotion criteria clearly delineated in your department or unit?
   o Yes
   o No

17. In 2012, the Task Force on Non-Tenure Track Faculty identified 6 issues important to NTT Faculty, *
   Please choose two (2) items from this list of six (6) that you think are most important to you.
   o Job Security (contract length)
   o Salary Disparity
   o Opportunities for Promotion
   o Teaching load
   o Eligibility for awards
   o Departmental participation and voting rights

18. Are there any other concerns not identified in the question above that you would like to make this committee aware of?

19. Are there any other responsibilities that you perform that were not identified elsewhere in this survey?
Non-tenure track survey

Summary

Two hundred thirty-nine non-tenure track (NTT) faculty were asked to complete the survey. Eighty-five NTT faculty responded to the survey (a response rate of 35.5%), listing information about their job description, professional activities and responsibilities, and time allocation. (NTT faculty completed the survey in the fall of 2015)

*Please note* that because respondents were asked to write in responses to questions about department, title, and co-curricular work, categories for these questions were difficult to identify. Descriptive statistics are listed below, but for those questions, groupings made for clarity are subjective and imperfect.

Descriptive Statistics

1) Unit/Department
   a. Survey respondents listed 56 different departments
   b. Only Communication Studies (3), LLC (4), English (5), and Nursing (7) were listed by more than two respondents

2) Formal Title
   a. 41% (35) were lecturers, and 35% (30) were professors
   b. 21% (18) were clinical staff, and 12% (10) were directors
   c. A more complete description of responses is in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title*</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic professional</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant professor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant clinical professor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical associate professor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical professor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical instructor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant director</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate director</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Titles were grouped based on the survey data*
3) Years of full-time service at UNCG
   a. 28% (24) have 0-3 years of experience at UNCG
   b. 17% (14) have 4-6 years of experience at UNCG
   c. 13% (11) have 10-12 years of experience at UNCG
   d. 12% (10) have 7-9 years of experience at UNCG
   e. All other groups represent less than 10% each of survey respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of service</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25+</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Professional responsibilities
   a. 86% (73) participate in departmental meetings/decisions
   b. 66% (56) advise students, and 54% (46) supervise students
   c. 57% (48) publish scholarly work
   d. Other examples include:
      i. Committee work, and community collaboration and research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity*</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advise students</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Meetings/decision</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply for grants</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish scholarly work</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit creative work</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise students</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain clinical/professional</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respondents were asked to select all that apply
5) **Publications within the last three years**  
   a. 46% (39) did not indicate they have published work  
   b. 37% (32) have 1-3 publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of publications</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) **Grants received within the last three years**  
   a. 10.6% (9) received an internal grant  
   b. 15.3% (13) received an external grant  
   c. 16.5% (14) received an award, and 62% (53) responded ‘unsure’ to the question about receiving an award

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant/award received</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal Grant</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Grant</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7) **Are there awards you are ineligible for?**  
   a. 16.5% (14) were ineligible for awards within their department  
   b. 62% (53) were unsure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ineligible for award(s)?</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8) **Are there committees on which you are ineligible to serve?**  
   a. 34% (29) were ineligible  
   b. 17% (14) were not ineligible  
   c. 47% (40) were unsure and 2% (2) did not respond

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ineligible for committee(s)?</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9) **Hours supervising students**
   a. 30% (26) spent less than an hour supervising students per week, and 22% (19) spent 1-5 hours
   b. 21% (18) spent 6-10 hours per week, and 8% (7) spent 11-15 hours
   c. 14% (12) spent more than 16 hours per week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours supervising students</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 hours</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 hours</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 hours</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 hours</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+ hours</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10) **Time spent traveling to supervise students**
   a. 57% (48) spent less than an hour travelling and 9% (8) did not respond to the question
   b. 31% (26) spent 1-5 hours travelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours travelling</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 hours</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 hours</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 hours</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 hours</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11) **Credit hours taught per semester**
   a. 31% (26) taught 10-12 hours, and 22% (19) taught 4-6 hours
   b. 17% (14) taught 7-9 hours, and 12% (10) taught 1-3 hours
   c. 12% taught more than 13 hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credit hours taught</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12) **Student advising**
   a. 33% (28) advise 11-30 students, 11% (9) advise 51-100 students
   b. 29% (25) do not advise students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students advised</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100+</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13) Are you invited to attend department or unit meetings?
   a. 88% (75) were invited to department or unit meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invited to meetings</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14) Are rank and promotion criteria clearly delineated in your department or unit?
   a. 60% (51) said promotion criteria is clearly delineated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15) Issues important to NTT Faculty (based on 2012 data)
   a. 82% (70) listed salary disparity as important
   b. 71% (60) listed job security as important
   c. Opportunities for promotion and teaching load were both listed by 21% (18) of respondents
   d. Other concerns included:
      i. Treatment and perception from tenure track faculty
      ii. Contract length/disparity
      iii. Phased retirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerns*</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental participation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility for awards</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary disparity</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching load</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respondents were asked to select the top two concerns they have from a list of six.
Ad Hoc Committee on NTT Faculty Issues: Committee Work Summary

Presented to Faculty Senate-February 1, 2017
Addressing the Charge

• Charged in 2015.
• “Review existing policies and practices governing NTT faculty and recommend changes to improve NTT working conditions at UNCG.”
• In 2014, NTT faculty totaled 395 (with 444 tenured faculty and 113 TT faculty).
• In 2015, NTT faculty totaled 454 (with 431 tenured faculty and 103 TT faculty)

Initial Steps

- NTT committee met in spring 2015.
- Reviewed the charge and documents: 2011 UNCG Task Force on Non-Tenure Track (NTT) Faculty (Phase I); 2012 UNCG Task Force on Non---Tenure Track Faculty (Final Report).
- Determined we needed to survey current UNCG NTT faculty and ask what were their most important concerns.
The Survey

• Based on findings from the 2012 Final Report.
• Developed the survey during the summer/fall of 2015.
• Distributed to 239 NTT on November 30, 2015.
• 85 responded...35.5 %
Question #17:
“In 2012, the Task Force on Non-Tenure Track Faculty identified 6 issues important to NTT Faculty, Please choose two (2) items from this list of six (6) that you think are most important to you.”

- Job Security (contract length)
- Salary Disparity
- Opportunities for Promotion
- Teaching Load
- Eligibility for Awards
- Departmental Participation and Voting Rights
Top Concerns

• Salary Disparity (82.4%)
• Job Security (70.6%)
• Other Concerns (31.8%)-treatment and perception from tenure track faculty, contract length/disparity; phased retirement
• Opportunities for Promotion (21.2%)
• Teaching Load (21.2%)
• Departmental Participation (5.9%)
• Eligibility for Awards (4.7%)
Recommendations Reflect...

- UNC Constituent Institution Responses to the Report of the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty, 2008.
- Committee on Fixed-Term Faculty and the Community and Diversity Committee at UNC-Chapel Hill, 2015.
- Survey Results of NTT Faculty at UNCG, 2016.
Recommendations

- Job Security
- Promotion/Reappointment
- Professional Support
- Renewal Notice
- Inclusion
## Job Security: Multi-Year Contracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Service to the University</th>
<th>Contract Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 5 years</td>
<td>up to 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5 years or Associate Professor/Senior Lecturer level or above</td>
<td>up to 5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROMOTION/REAPPOINTMENT

• Following the recommendations stated in the UNCG 2012 task report, policies and procedures guiding appointment, reappointment, and promotion in rank should be standard at both the University and unit levels for full-time NTT faculty.

• Should include general areas for evaluation, criteria for promotion, and the appropriate timelines and documentation needed for achieving promotion and/or reappointment. Unit guidelines should describe the same areas with greater specificity.
PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT

• Full-time NTT faculty should receive the same rights and privileges access to teaching and professional development resources generally available to full-time TT faculty.

• Mentoring in research and teaching; research leaves; eligibility for internal and external grant support; professional travel funds; reimbursement for professional dues or licensure fees; and eligibility for phased retirement and Emeritus status.
RENEWAL NOTICE

• Decisions to renew the appointments of full-time fixed term faculty should be made with adequate notice, at least six months prior (or prior to January 1) to the end of the first year’s appointment.

• Individuals with appointments that fill an ongoing role in the unit whose contracts are not to be renewed should have access to an expedited process of review, so that a final decision can be made in a timely and responsible manner.
INCLUSION

• When they have met the criteria for voting rights as specified in Article I, Section 1.2 of the UNCG Faculty Handbook, full-time clinical faculty should be fully integrated into their departments.
Questions and Discussion
Report of the UNC Faculty Assembly Meeting
06 January 2017

UNCG delegates in attendance: Anne Wallace, Andrea Hunter, Anna Marshall-Baker
Absent with notice: Spoma Jovanovic

Gabriel Lugo, UNCW Dept of Mathematics & Statistics and Chair of the UNC Faculty Assembly, presented data regarding tenure and faculty compensation that he has shared with President Spellings and the BOG.

President Spellings made brief comments and then answered questions from the FA.
  • Spellings feels that the strategic plan will be approved by the with the official launch of the SP to be in March.
  • Spellings will ask the legislature for resources including retention of faculty, a better data system, and deregulation regarding, e.g., capital projects and salary adjustments.
  • Junius Gonzalez (Sr. VP of Academic Affairs) described a plan for HMIs and smaller institutions is to host and convene day-long workshops with funding agencies such as the NEA, and to offer mini-grants to buyout faculty for 1-2 courses for grant proposals.

Matt Brody (VP for Human Resources) and Daniel Cohen-Vogel (Associate VP for Institutional Research) addressed faculty compensation. This presentation addressed methodology, step 1 in an on-going process.
  • The long-term goal is to prepare systemic asks (x# of dollars over x# of years) rather than regular requests because “faculty are underpaid.”
  • Data analysis includes
    o faculty and institutional characteristics
    o replicable analysis
    o broad coverage of institutions and disciplines
    o more accurate and consistent market representation
  • National data are from the Council on University Planning and Analysis (CUPA) and an Oklahoma State Survey, thereby focusing on public institutions.
Student Success Panel Discussion

- Ontario Wooden, NCCU, Associate Vice Chancellor for Innovative, Engaged and Global Ed
  - NCCU involves 1st and 2nd year students in a “university college” where they work with professional advisors who meet with every student within the first 3-4 weeks of the semester.
- Cynthia Demetriou, UNC-CH, Associate Dean of Retention
  - UNC-CH spent a year writing a university definition of “student success:” Undergraduate student success advances higher learning and discovery as well as individual competency development and academic achievement.
- Sarah Williams, ECU, Director of STEPP (Supporting Transition and Education through Planning and Partnerships)
  - ECU, Appalachian State, and Fayetteville State received funding to develop the “College STAR” project.
- Leroy Kaufman, WCU, substituting for the Director of Coulter Faculty Commons, described a number of centers and offices that provide support to students.
- David Teachout, UNCG, UTLC
  - UTLC focuses on faculty development as faculty have the most encounters with students.

The discussion concluded with Junius Gonzalez indicating the varying factors that affect student success, and an expectation that the funding model will move from projected enrollment to degrees completed.

Resolutions: 1) Faculty Compensation and 2) SACSCOC

Gabriel Lugo introduced two resolutions, one regarding increases to faculty salaries and replenishing the retention fund, and a second resolution regarding actions by the NC General Assembly and UNC Board of Governors that may impact compliance with expectations of The Southern Associations of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC). Both resolutions passed by voice vote. Development and support of similar resolutions by the individual campuses is anticipated.
Resolution #FS:02012017/1

To Endorse UNC Faculty Assembly Resolution 2017-2, "On Faculty Compensation"
Submitted by the UNCG Faculty Assembly Delegation: Anna Marshall-Baker, Andrea Hunter, Spoma Jovanovic, and Anne Wallace

WHEREAS, on January 6, 2017, the UNC Faculty Assembly approved a resolution "On Faculty Compensation" calling on UNC's General Administration to prioritize faculty and staff compensation on their legislative agenda; and

WHEREAS, this Faculty Assembly resolution specifies that "a request for across-the-board salary increases for all faculty and staff" be included by General Administration as an "utmost priority" on the legislative agenda, and also specifies that GA "insert as a priority" on that agenda "a request for merit increases and replenishment of the faculty retention fund"; and

WHEREAS, the FA resolution "On Faculty Compensation" provides a compelling rationale for these priorities, including: a decade of "minimal increase" in compensation and starting salaries for faculty and staff that does not reflect appropriate market factors; and the increasing gap between faculty and staff compensation, and that of Tier 1 administrators; and

WHEREAS, the FA resolution also notes that "substantial incentives for chancellors" may be considered "based on the success of the [UNC] Strategic Plan," but faculty and staff "are those most directly involved in improving admissions, retention and student success," and in assuring the success of other facets of the UNC Strategic Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate of UNCG joins the UNC Faculty Assembly in their concerns about UNC faculty and staff compensation; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate of UNCG also recognizes the powerful impact of these system-wide conditions on the UNCG campus, and the deleterious effects of these conditions on our own faculty and staff; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, That the Faculty Senate of UNCG endorses the January 6 UNC Faculty Assembly Resolution 2017-02, "On Faculty Compensation" (attached).
Resolution 2017-2
On Faculty Compensation
Approved by the UNC Faculty Assembly January 06, 2017

Whereas, Faculty and Staff constitute the core of the educational mission of the UNC system; and

Whereas, Faculty and Staff are those most directly involved in improving admissions, retention and student success; and

Whereas, Faculty and Staff have barely received minimal increase in compensation over the past 10 years at a rate that trails far behind inflation; and

Whereas, Market-driven starting salaries for new faculty and staff continue to create salary compression, and, at times, inversions, for those faculty with more longevity of service; and

Whereas, Faculty salaries should be compared to those in other professions that required intensive academic background, such as physicians; and

Whereas, The ratio of salary compensation between Tier 1 administrators and faculty/staff continues to increase at a dramatic rate; and

Whereas, The success of the Strategic Plan depends entirely on the work of faculty and staff; and

Whereas, There are considerations to provide substantial incentives for chancellors based on success of the Strategic Plan while the work is actually accomplished by faculty and staff,

Resolved, That GA include as an utmost priority on the legislative agenda a request for across-the-board salary increases for all faculty and staff; and

Resolved, That in addition, GA also inserts as a priority on the legislative agenda a request for merit increases and replenishment of the faculty retention fund.
Resolution #FS:02012017/2

To Endorse UNC Faculty Assembly Resolution 2017-3, "On SACSCOC Compliance"

Submitted by the UNCG Faculty Assembly Delegation:
Anna Marshall-Baker, Andrea Hunter, Spoma Jovanovic, and Anne Wallace

WHEREAS, on January 6, 2017, the UNC Faculty Assembly approved a resolution "On SACSCOC Compliance" which articulates "serious concerns about the implications" of actions taken by the North Carolina General Assembly and the UNC Board of Governors "that appear to violate . . . governance principles established by the [Southern Association of Colleges and Schools] Commission on Colleges"; and

WHEREAS, this Faculty Assembly resolution notes that SACSCOC also requires that institutions under its accrediting authority "provide evidence of and information on practices that might not be in compliance with the Principles of Accreditation"; and

WHEREAS, the resolution details 17 actions undertaken by the NCGA and/or the UNC BOG that might not be in compliance with the Principles; and

WHEREAS, these actions appear not to comply with SACSCOC requirements that operating boards remain free of, and protect their institutions from, control by "a minority of board members or by organizations or interests separate from it," such as "political, religious, or other external bodies," in this case the NCGA; and,

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate of UNCG recognizes the seriousness and large number of the potential violations detailed in the FA resolution, as well as the responsibility that institutions have to bring such possible violations forward to SACSCOC; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, That the Faculty Senate of UNCG endorses the January 6 UNC Faculty Assembly Resolution 2017-3, "On SACSCOC Compliance" (attached).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Senate Action/Date:</th>
<th>Effective Immediately following all required approvals.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor Action/Date:</td>
<td>Implementation of Resolution: The Faculty Senate will collaborate with the Office of the Provost to notify affected persons and offices to coordinate the update of printed, electronic forms, and publications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Faculty Action/Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Trustees Action/Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC GA Action/Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOG Action/Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resolution 2017-3  
On SACSCOC Compliance  
Approved by the UNC Faculty Assembly January 06, 2017

Whereas, The Southern Associations of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) requires integrity to govern the operation of institutions and that those institutions provide evidence of and information on practices that might not be in compliance with the Principles of Accreditation; and

Whereas, The Commission requires that the operating boards of such institutions may not be controlled by a minority of board members or by organizations or interests separate from it; and

Whereas, The Commission requires that the legal authority and operating control of the institution are clearly defined for the following areas within the institution’s governance structure: the institution’s mission; the fiscal stability of the institution; and institutional policy; and

Whereas, The Commission requires that the governing board is free from undue influence from political, religious, or other external bodies and protects the institution from such influence; and

Whereas, The North Carolina General Assembly (NCGA) and the UNC system Board of Governors (BOG) have engaged in practices that appear to violate these and other governance principles established by the Commission on Colleges; and

Whereas, These system-wide practices may result in lack of compliance of the individual institutions of the UNC system with the Principles of Accreditation;

Resolved, That UNC Faculty Assembly has serious concerns about the implications of the actions of the NCGA and the BOG.

Compliance issues with the standards set forth by SACSCOC are listed below*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOG Actions</th>
<th>Action Type</th>
<th>SACSCOC</th>
<th>Facts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Post Tenure Review</td>
<td>UNC Code Change 400.3.3</td>
<td>3.7.5</td>
<td>Policies changed system-wide in spite of opposing resolutions from the campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chancellor searches</td>
<td>UNC Code Change 300.1.1(II.A.4)</td>
<td>3.2.1</td>
<td>BOG members are now active participants on CEO searches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Research centers</td>
<td>UNC Code Change 400.5[R][II.E]</td>
<td>3.7.5</td>
<td>Campus management prerogatives were abrogated, several centers were dissolved for reasons other than those publicly stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 President search</td>
<td>UNC Code Change 200.3</td>
<td>3.2.1</td>
<td>Policies for president searches changed over BOG and Faculty Assembly objections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Legislators in attendance at BOG meetings</td>
<td>Law violation NC GS 116-7(b), 116-10, 116-11 (2)</td>
<td>3.2.4, 2.2</td>
<td>Members of the NCGA have become active participants in BOG meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A. Morehead ECU, Vice Chair  
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A. Powell NCSM, 2 delegate Caucus  
S. Jovanovic UNCG, At-large  
l. Dohse, UNCA, At-Large
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCGA Actions</th>
<th>Action Type</th>
<th>SACSCOC</th>
<th>Facts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong> “Packed” BOG</td>
<td>Violation of historical precedent</td>
<td>3.2.4, 3.2.2</td>
<td>Membership of the BOG reconstituted with partisan bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong> Legislators sitting at the table at BOG meetings</td>
<td>Law violation NC GS 116-7(b), 116-10, 116-11 (2)</td>
<td>3.2.4, 2.2</td>
<td>Member of the NCGA have become active participants in BOG meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong> President search interference</td>
<td>Law Change Session law 2015-300; NC GS 116-14</td>
<td>3.2.4</td>
<td>Law enacted bypassing authority previously delegated to the Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11</strong> Board term limit interference</td>
<td>Law Change Session Law 2015-300; NC GS 116-6(e)</td>
<td>3.2.2</td>
<td>Enacted without explanation during controversial President search process; practical effect was removal of the BOG Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12</strong> SAE Fraternities</td>
<td>Law Change 2013-413 PART II SECTION 6(c); 116-40.11</td>
<td>3.2.4, 2.2</td>
<td>Members of NCGSA interfering with campus handling of sanctions to student organization and student appeals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13</strong> Laws enacted affecting admission standards, tuition, fees.</td>
<td>Law Changes Session law 2016-94 PART IX. UNIVERSITIES; NC GS 116 multiple sections</td>
<td>3.2.2</td>
<td>Laws bypassed prerogative authority delegated to governing boards, and institutional financial solvency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14</strong> Lab schools. Unfunded mandate to create 8 lab schools at 8 campuses</td>
<td>Law Change, Session law 2016-94 PART IX. UNIVERSITIES, SECTION 11.6.(a); Law violation, NC GS 116-11 (2)</td>
<td>3.2.2</td>
<td>Laws bypassed prerogative authority delegated to governing boards, also disregarding principles of shared governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15</strong> “Collaboratory”</td>
<td>Law violation, NC GS 116-11 (2), and (9)a; UNC Code violation 400.5[R]</td>
<td>3.2.4, 3.2.2</td>
<td>Mandate to create a research center with specified duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Hill fine reversal</td>
<td>Law violation, Session law 2016-94 SECTION 11.9; NC GS 116-11 (2); Constitutional violation, NC Constitution Article II Section 24 (1)(i)</td>
<td>3.2.2</td>
<td>Law reversing actions of the BOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustees selection</td>
<td>Law change, Session law 2016-126 PART II SECTION 35; NC GS 116-31; Constitutional violation, NC Constitution Article IX Section 8</td>
<td>3.2.4, 2.2</td>
<td>Law recognized at a national level as a politically motivated effort to restrict the power of the governor-elect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Governing Boards
3.2.1 CEO Evaluation/selection
3.2.2 Governing Board Control
3.2.4 External Influence on governing Boards
3.2.6 Board/Administration distinction
3.7.5 Faculty Governance

*Actions of concern are listed in chronological order.*