Meeting Agenda
Wednesday, February 3, 2016 3:00 – 5:00 p.m. Virginia Dare Room, Alumni House

3:00 p.m.
Call to Order and Introductory Remarks: The Chancellor's Role in Faculty Senate Meetings
Anne Wallace, Chair of the Faculty Senate
Frank Gilliam, Chancellor

3:15 p.m.
Approval of Minutes, Jim Carmichael, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: December 2, 2015 (Enc.A)

3:20 p.m.
Remarks, Dana Dunn, Provost
Post Tenure Review Training Modules
Faculty Exit Interviews/Survey
Provosts Faculty Fellow Program

3:35 p.m.
Committee Reports
Beth Bernhardt, Scholarly Communications, Public Access Policy (and upcoming Faculty Forum) (Enc.B)
John Lepri, UNC Faculty Assembly Delegation, Notes from Dec. 4 and Jan. 15 Assembly Meetings (Enc.C)

4:00 p.m.
Resolution #FS020316/1, To Recommend the Establishment of an Ombuds Office at UNCG
Anne Wallace, Spoma Jovanovic, and Jim Carmichael, Members, Joint Faculty Senate/Staff Senate Working Group on Ombuds Proposal (Enc. D)

4:20 p.m.
Discussion: How the Senate Does Business
Anne Wallace, Faculty Senate Chair
How well does our standard agenda pattern work? How should we prioritize and organize our various types of business—committee reports, action items, informational presentations, etc.? Small table discussions to gather perspectives and ideas

4:50 p.m.
New Business/Old Business
Anne Wallace, Faculty Senate Chair
Ad Hoc Committee on GEC Approval of GNS Marker for KIN 220

Adjourn

UPCOMING EVENTS:
Faculty Forum: Wednesday, February 17, 2016

Topic: Public Access Policy
3-5p, Alumni House, Virginia Dare Room

Next Meeting of the Faculty Senate, March 2, 2016, 3-5 p, 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 for Faculty Senate Office, 336-334-5345/mlwolfe@uncg.edu
Minutes (Pending approval 02/03/16)
Wednesday, December 2, 2015 3:00 – 5:30 p.m.  Virginia Dare Room, Alumni House

Call to Order and Introductory Remarks
Anne Wallace, Chair of the Faculty Senate
The Chair welcomed Senators and guests to the last meeting of the Semester. While she made no formal remarks, she thanked the Provost for the elegant holiday refreshments to applause. She noted that the November 18 Roles in University Governance Forum had been videotaped, and that very useful information was provided. The Board of Trustees will meet tomorrow in committees from 1 to 4:00 PM in the EUC, and at 8:30 am Friday in the Virginia Dare Room, and the public is invited to attend. In a final note, the Chair reminded Senators that December 13 will be the cutoff date for migration to Canvas from Blackboard.

Approval of Minutes
Jim Carmichael, Secretary of the Faculty Senate:
The Secretary called for motion to approve the minutes of November 4, 2015.
So moved and seconded.
Minutes approved.

Remarks
Franklin Gilliam, Jr. Chancellor
The Chancellor briefly introduced the video that he has made with Higher Education Works on Faculty/Staff Salaries, and it was shown to enthusiastic applause. He then stated that he would continue to advocate for faculty and staff salaries, although this year the gains will be slight with small merit-based increases (785% merit; 25% equity), but he want the senate to know that the administration is making some effort at championing merit based increases, As he states in the film, administrators come and go, but faculty and staff often spend their lives at one institution. He then gave a three pointy report: 1) Building the Team: The Chancellor introduced his Interim Chief of Staff, Waiyi Tse; and announced the formation of a legal team including General Counsel Rob Miller from Eastern Illinois, and Associate Counsel Amy Boneatz from ECU. The search is starting for a person for Government and Community Relations and a Vice Chancellor for External Affairs. 2) NC GAP: NC GAP continues to be addressed. A second study is being done with RTI to confirm poor results of a program that sounds good but probably is not. UNC system is pushing back against the legislators. Chancellor administrative council on Monday in Chapel Hill. Ross’ last meeting, and Spellings attended. Focus was on the bond and strategy of the system to get support for it. We’re also going to try to raise $3.3 million campaign with $1.9 managed by constituent campuses. UNCG will coordinate with A & T. UNC President-Elect Spellings wants to have a clearer sense of the different roles in the NC educational system. BOG should set agenda but not micro-manage campuses. She is in charge of campuses. Many of the BOG members are new, and have little or no educational experience. Private sector people have management understanding of how education works. It is a cognitive failure on their part. 3) The Chancellor rails against the idea that UNCG is “the best kept secret.” He wants to create a “Not Best Kept Secret” award per year for faculty and units who able to place their work and people in the public eye (i.e., media). The competition will be adjudicated by the Chancellor. The Chancellor will lay out formal criteria and a cash award following USC’s example. We will also offer media training. Meanwhile, during the holidays, be mindful and be grateful during the holidays. We have great fortune.

Susan Dennison said AAUP has hired Alice Sunshine to come in April to do media training. She also thanked the Chancellor for his commentary on faculty and staff salaries.
A year ago I urged you to utilize the Starfish early warning communication system. I am sorry to say our participation in the Starfish system has actually declined from 15 to under 12 per cent. This information is used to trigger contact from student success advisors. They constitute an intervention team and their role is to assist students and make referrals to key support services. If voluntary participation does not reach General Administration goals, this may become a problem for UNCG. UNC, General Administration requires participation now, whereas previously Starfish had been entirely voluntary.

Q: (Collins) Canvas is more challenging to use with Starfish.
We’ve hired Blair Brown as Director of International Recruitment. We are building pipelines to programs that might increase international enrollment.
Also, Omar Ali has been named Carnegie NC Professor of the Year. I urge you all to nominate your colleagues for awards since that is another way we increase the institution’s visibility.

Committee Reports
David Carlone, Chair, General Education Council
This year, we have been promoting transparency and faculty participation in three different areas: 1) Curricular change processes—faculty no longer need to submit a syllabus, but a rationale for GEC; will ask Faculty Senate to change council membership to include library as voting member (instead of non-voting); 2) Assessment—we have asked Terry Brumfield to repackage assessment reports to make them more faculty-friendly, which she has done for data going back to 2012. All of that is on the GEC web site. Also trying to prepare materials or report to be able to explain results (tell our story) to lay audiences, including General Administration and the BOG; 3) Program refinement—lots of questions about what makes a course part of a General Education Program category and what’s the work this category should do.

Kimberly Hewitt, Chair, Research Policies Committee
The committee is advisory to Terri Shelton and serves to enhance the research climate at UNCG. Last year, we prepared a report on catalysts and obstacles to funded research and recommendations for change. We identified four areas for growth: 1. Communication; 2. Collaboration and cooperation; 3. Clear, Consistent and efficient processes; 4. Creative problem solving. This year, we are looking at relevant COACHE survey data and the NCURA site assessment (report is due Feb. 2016) to identify further opportunities to strengthen the research culture at UNCG.

Susan Shelmerdine, Chair, Academic Policies & Regulations Committee
There has recently been some confusion about the deadline for incomplete grade removal in our existing policy. The committee has added language to clarify that this deadline is the final date an instructor can submit a grade change to remove the incomplete, not the date for students to submit work to an instructor. This is not a policy change.
(See Enc. B) In spring, the committee will look at the Academic Calendar and work with the Registrar’s Office in an effort to align our calendar with that of NCA&T and to plan calendars for 5 years at a time instead of two years. This change makes sense both because our two campuses now offer joint programs and because a number of our students and faculty have family members working at both campuses.

Presentation
Terri Shelton, Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development, Interim Director of SERVE
Supporting Your Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity: The office focuses on support and engagement to increase faculty impact. Support offered through OSP, Research Integrity, Innovation/Commercialization, Electronic Research Administration, Research Advisory Council (associate deans, IT centers, etc.), Gateway University Research Park, NC Research Campus, Molecular Core Lab, and Researcher Zone. Research.uncg.edu. Engagement is offered through ICEE, NC Entrepreneurship Center, Office of Innovation, Centers & Institutes, Networks and Coalitions. F & A Funds (facilities and administrative costs—45.5% with government, state contracts 10%, foundations 0-10% with a net rate of 13.5%. 37% of the money goes to central research administration salary, fringe, and operations for 20+ people.. 63% goes to research support (deans initiatives, special initiatives, personnel and operations for support offices, student assistantships, scholar travel, etc. internal grants (new faculty, regular faculty) and Faculty First Grants (from donors), scholars’ travel, publication subsidies and open access journals, indirect cost to PI’s, departments and
deans, matching grant funds, software, databases, institutional memberships, assumption of risk fund, undergraduate & graduate assistantships, partnerships with the graduate school, funding partnerships, economic and community engagement.

**New Business**
*Anne Wallace, Senate Chair*

The Promotion and Tenure Committee needs two additional members.

**Nominations:** Susan Shelmerdine nominated Elizabeth Van Horn  
Rob Greenberg nominated Rick Barton

**Elected:** Van Horn and Barton elected by acclamation.

The Chair wished the Senators happy finals and holidays!

**Adjourn**

Move to adjourn. Seconded. Adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
*Jim Carmichael*
Secretary, Faculty Senate
Faculty Senate Public Access Policy Forum

Wednesday, February 17th 3:00 pm
Virginia Dare Room

Panel includes:
Dr. Diane Welsh - Hayes Distinguished Professor of Entrepreneurship
Dr. Terri Shelton - Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development
Anna Craft – University Libraries Metadata Cataloger
Anne Gilliland – Scholarly Communications Officer – UNC Chapel Hill
Notes from UNC Faculty Assembly Meeting, Friday, 4 December 2015

Steve Leonard, Faculty Assembly Chair, welcomed delegates. Minutes from two previous meetings were approved.

Karrie Dixon, UNC-system VP for Academic and Student Success, coordinated a panel on student well-being and mental health, with participation of Michael Delafield (NCSSSM & UN Genl. Admin.), Janice Haynie (FSU VC for Student Affairs), Travis Lewis (ECU Assoc. Dean of Students) and Monica Osbourne (NCSU Counseling Center).

Fall semester started with more suicides (five) among UNC students than ever before, following a national trend toward increased anxiety, social isolation, and emotional crises among college students. Monica Osbourne noted that about 10% of our students seek counseling at University Counseling Centers, with about one-third of these visits related to suicide ideation. She reported that starting counseling relationships with students early in their college years is a key to success. She reported that there is a national guide to “post-vention” on how campuses should respond and reach out after a suicide on campus < http://hemha.org/postvention_guide.pdf >. Mike Delafield is an attorney for the General Administration and for NCSSM. He spoke of younger students at NCSSM presenting a mixture of high achievement, difficult courses, and aspirations for success. A primary goal is to assure these 16-18 year-old students that counseling is safe, confidential and effective, leaving no branding or lasting scourge on those counseled. Travis Lewis reported on the trend for prolonged “helicopter” parenting where students are, to some degree, might be “enabled” to persist with poor coping skills and inability to use resources for well-being and mental health. Many college kids are, for the first time in their lives, not among the “A” students, and are thus severely depressed by that realization: “If I don’t pass your class, Professor, I am going to end my life.” He noted that when it comes to health and safety, faculty do not have FERPA barriers to sharing information with counseling service and Student Affairs Offices. Janice Haynie told us that she is considering changing the name of their operations to “Behavioral Team” from “Threat Assessment Team.” She spoke of partnering with faculty, and of the need to better equip faculty with the skills needed to detect signs of depression and mental anguish. Because there are many families of military veterans in the Fayetteville area, students sometimes feel that the Veterans Administration’s inability to meaningfully intervene for improved well-being casts shadows on similar efforts elsewhere by others, such as University counseling centers. Delegates commented that threats are especially urgent now that students can bring weapons to UNC campuses, and panel members commented on this challenge, and commented that some faculty are even afraid of their students due to the potential threat of weapons on campus.

Panelists strongly encouraged faculty to share their concerns about specific students, at the earliest possible time, noting that their operations often have more information (drugs, alcohol, etc.) that could lead to a successful intervention. The increased number of disruptive students in classes is also a further challenge for faculty. Large enrollment classes are also special challenges. Delegates noted the association between the behaviors of parents and their children’s mental health, e.g., a dysfunctional family response to a student “coming out” about their sexuality. Universities typically lack resources to intervene on the family level, but mediated discussions with family members can sometimes take place and help. “QPR: Question, Persuade, Respond” training can help faculty initiate a student’s journey to better mental health. Technology immersion seems to impair students’ capacities to communicate with each other; including Yik-Yak, a phone app where students can anonymously slam others and post threats. Some campuses have staff who monitor social media for threats. While alcohol use is readily monitored, it can be very difficult to monitor prescription drug use. A delegate noted the many “disconnects” in education: student debt, political extremism, never-ending wars, lock-down drills, etc., and stated that faculty need to listen to and connect with students (empathy). What can faculty do when they feel their reporting has been for naught, and the threat persists without intervention? Watch, note (evidence) and persist in reporting; the odds are high that others might be doing the same should identify genuine threats. Resource limitations in supporting mental health efforts exist across the UNC system; administrators need to be motivated for improvements to take place. Like their students, faculty can suffer mental illness, and information needs to be shared so that should an intervention be necessary, enough evidence is there to support that decision. Supervisors of student employees should also be part of extending the reach for better care. Many campuses list student behaviors that warrant attention < http://sa.uncg.edu/dean/distress/ > so that faculty can pick up the phone and if they err, it is on the side of caution, especially when sudden behavioral changes are observed.

Leslie Boney, UNC VP Community Economic Engagement and International Programs, provided an update on experiential education (research, service learning, internships, study abroad), as a teaser for increased efforts, including assessment of efforts, across the UNC system. These topics will be further discussed in 2016.

Junius Gonzales, UNC Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, provided an Academic Affairs update. He spoke of the “central” perspectives that dictate GA actions, where policy and money intersect. Over a hundred proposals for
The UNC Faculty Assembly is a system-wide advisory body composed of faculty members from all 17 institutions in the UNC system (220,000 students). Notes from John Lepri, Kathy Crowe, Jim Carmichael and Sarah Daynes.
Notes from the UNC Faculty Assembly Meeting: Friday, 15 January 2016

Steve Leonard, Chair, welcome faculty to a session themed: “The University Today.”

Panel discussion: “UNC and NC K-12 Public Education,” led by Alisa Chapman (UNC Vice President for Academic and University Programs). Panel members were Brenda Berg (BEST-NC, business leaders; download Education in NC, Facts and Figures at http://best-nc.org/), Keith Poston (President & Executive Director, Public School Forum of NC), and James Martin (NCSU Professor of Chemistry and elected member of the Wake County Board of Education). Challenges in public education includes several problems. Assessment has come to dominate the classroom. Teachers in public schools are not properly respected and paid as professionals. Financial support and resources are not adequate. Student performance on ACT and SAT is at the bottom of all states. Administrative structures are flat: teachers are all equal, and only the principal is “the” senior colleague, an overloaded structure that should be changed. Education majors are just as smart as all other majors, but it is still wrong to compare the effectiveness of a brand new teacher with another who has 15 years of experience. Teachers working with under-prepared students cannot be evaluated solely by those students’ test scores. Intense discussions followed the claim that the only variable that truly tracks student achievement is their family’s socioeconomic status, as reflected by “free and reduced cost lunch” data. Racial disparities are part of this mix, with magnet programs offering one avenue for improvement. How can strong educational foundations be established in such a challenging environment? How can large economic disparities across the state be resolved? Public education is not only good for the educated child, it is essential for shaping an informed, involved citizenry. Business needs to distinguish public wealth and private wealth. Do corporations need to learn more about this? If teachers were paid as well as nurses, would there be a sudden shift in the career aspirations of students?

Panel discussion: “The Future of UNC,” led by Steve Leonard, FA Chair, with panelists Chris Fitzsimon, Director, NC Policy Watch; David Rice, Director, Higher Education Works; and Jesse Saffron, writer and editor at the Pope Center for Higher Education. System builds human capital in a rapidly changing economic environment. Community colleges and universities are in the middle of this change. By 2020, it is predicted that two-thirds of jobs will require a college education – why put North Carolina’s university system at risk by “disinvestment” at this time? Different kinds of college experiences help prepare people to find new areas of endeavor and opportunity. Are there students in college that should not be in college/university? Should they be in community colleges for remedial preparation? There ought to be an effective education cooperative (K-12, community college, and UNC system) advising the NC Legislature via the governor – presently, these branches are each trying to stem losses and end up in competition. Should some four-year programs move from universities to community colleges? Does NC’s termination of pay incentives for teachers with graduate degrees support the perception that education is not of great value? Raising admission standards can increase four-year graduation rates . . . but do we understand resilience among students who take longer to finish (e.g., returning students at UNCC are showing resilience - http://49erfinish.uncc.edu/)? Clearly, there is a crisis in affordability, driven largely by “lavish” and (seductively marketable) campus accommodations and life styles, paid by student fees, and further exacerbated by reduced state support. NC is the fourth highest state in terms of student investment – and we should re-dedicate ourselves to that public good, instead of trying to become “more average.” We should also remove any caps on need-based financial aid for college students.

Panel discussion, “The Campuses and the University,” led by Gabriel Lugo (FA Chair Elect), with: Warwick Arden, Provost NCSU; Frank Gilliam, Chancellor UNCG; Harold Martin, Chancellor NCAT. Panelists report inquiries: “What’s going on with UNC?” is a national reaction. Panelists agreed that while the UNC system’s
prominence and excellent reputation are warranted, the changes in central governance have allowed political antagonism to cloud present operations. Caution was urged to avoid confusing the views of elected officials with those of the general public, even as the actions of the Board of Governors have installed clearly tangible changes. An area of concern: how do Boards of Trustees on the campuses interact with the Board of Governors at the system level? Educational systems everywhere seem to be undergoing some major changes (unspecified changes) – how do we make ourselves the leader of these changes, and how are the changes beneficial to our educational and discovery efforts toward excellence? Are things really changing? Or are we simply distracted... And how do we convert our Board’s role to shift from distrust-based minutia meddling to attending to the big picture? The Faculty Assembly was encouraged to find the Assembly’s broadly shared priorities and unite to communicate them to GA and to offer ways to realize those priorities. Collective action is likely the best opportunity to ensure adequate faculty voice on higher education matters. To put it mildly, this was a vigorous discussion.

**BCG Consultants, paid $1.1m by an anonymous outside donor, is assessing the effectiveness of the UNC’s administrative structure.** FA will communicate faculty concerns about the funding source possibly obfuscating the outcomes of the review, thus weakening the presidency, and the FA Executive Committee will share this concern.

**Upcoming topics** from the Executive Committee, shared with President-elect Spellings, include post-tenure review, general education curriculum, stagnation of salaries, large pay raises for chancellors, and the method of choosing the President. The EC shared concern with her of perception that the President’s Office and GA are reduced to puppet status.

Read the [NCGAP](http://www.ncga.state.nc.us/Applications/SummariesPublication/Home/Summary/H97-SMTB-64%28sl%29/?sSessionYear=2015&nSubjectID=9) (link has pdf of bill) to prepare for future discussion of the bill in the NC Legislature, where it is under study by a Legislature committee. Another bill (S607) would lock state income and expenditures [study it](http://www.ncleg.net/gascripts/BillLookUp/BillLookUp.pl?Session=2015&BillID=S607).

**The Chancellor search committee at ECU** includes a BoG member, and in previous searches, such influences have shifted the pool of candidates to non-academic business leaders. AT ECSU, with the sudden and unexpected departure of the Chancellor, there has been an attempt to hasten the appointment process of the interim Chancellor that would violate established protocols. FA has advised that the search committee there (from a year ago) be reconvened and the process followed to ensure everyone’s input.

**Committee reports:** Post-tenure review imposition weakens existing mechanisms of peer review, without any improvement, and will continue to receive attention. Faculty workload information is being gathered with support from an NSF grant at NCSU, so please respond with information if queried. Campuses should consider what discussions they might request with Margaret Spellings when she begins service as system President. School of Science and Math has received approval to have a faculty member as an *ex officio* member on their Board of Trustees; other UNC constituents should seek similar arrangements with their BoTs; an alternative is to request that faculty serve on BoT committees.

The UNC Faculty Assembly is a system-wide advisory body composed of faculty members from all 17 institutions in the UNC system (220,000 students. Notes from John Lepri, Spoma Jovanovic, and Anne Wallace.
UNC Faculty’s shared observations on the NC-GAP legislation, 25 January 2016.

The “North Carolina Guaranteed Admission Program” (NC-GAP) was developed by the NC Legislature in an attempt to shorten the time-interval to graduation, thereby reducing the State’s expenses for operating its Universities, noting that NC supports its Community Colleges at a lower per-student rates than it funds its Universities. Further goals include reducing student debt, providing better academic advising and career counseling at the State’s Community Colleges, and providing “at-risk” students with a consolation prize of an associates degree should they lose motivation for a BA/BS.

The NC-GAP, based on nebulous criteria defining a University enrollee to be “at-risk,” would direct the “at-risk” student to enroll in a State Community College. Should the “at-risk” student complete the associates degree within three years, s/he will have guaranteed admission to the State University where they initially applied when they graduated from high school. That University must, at the time the NC-GAP option is offered to the “at-risk” student, reduce its admissions by the same amount, i.e., if UNCG were to offer the NC-GAP to 250 students in the 2017-2018 entering class, UNCG would have to simultaneously reduce its on-campus admissions for 2017-2018 by 250 students, thus “saving a place” for all 250 at-risk students, should they complete their associates degrees within three years. Correspondingly, the University would suffer reduced funding to the tune of the 250 “at-risk” students directed to the NC Community Colleges.

The proposal suggests a starting 2.5% target, but at the 21 January 2016 UNC Board of Governors meeting, Rep. Craig Horn, R-Union – an advocate for NC-GAP – referred to the success rates for students in “the lowest quartile” as the target population.

Two concerns about the effects of the NC-GAP legislation have been widely cited: One is the potential “cascade effect” on admissions, where students from institutions with more exclusive admissions instead matriculate at institutions with more inclusive admissions, thereby pushing out deserving students from populations that already suffer from low college attendance and completion rates. Given the dangers of discouragement to which these populations are already susceptible, many may give up on higher education ambitions rather than attend community colleges. This would squander the talents of many students who may have great promise and potential.

The second concern is that community college completion rates are lower than 4 year institutions, and that may consign some NCGAP students to greater likelihood of dropping out. (specific numbers are in dispute, but all estimates show lower completion rates are still lower than in 4 year institutions.) Some have argued that this policy will diminish the number of North Carolinians attending college.

At least three major conceptual/practical problems are unsolved in the NC-GAP, as follows.

1. How does one define an “at-risk” student? The current legislation uses rigid standards for defining this category of students, but research suggests that many such students can succeed, and even thrive, at universities. NC GAP does not accommodate innovative approaches to identifying – or encouraging – students with potential for success, if not superior achievement. Can the “at-risk” designation be done by any other measure than socio-economic quasi-discrimination?

2. Is “at-risk” defined the same at UNC-CH, for example, as at any other State University? Institutional missions differ, as does the profile of student bodies that both promote and benefit from those different missions. NC GAP flattens out these considerations, and substitutes a mulish conception of higher education missions and institutions. It also ignores the potentially critical role of grit, persistence, ambition, commitment, etc. in student choices about institutional application and enrollment preferences. What motivates a student defined to be “at-risk” at NCSU, for example, to persist in seeking admission to NCSU when many other State Universities would gladly enroll her in their “not-at-risk” pool of applicants?

3. Of the enrolled spots held in reserve, when are enrollment slots released as NC-GAP students give up on their studies at the Community Colleges? This logistical complication and its administrative costs would be incurred by this policy. Enrollment management, already a highly complex and critical function in university budgetary infrastructure, would have to be radically reconceptualized and redesigned to accommodate the (unproven and doubtful) assumptions informing the NC-GAP legislation. Complications for instructional and staffing planning are also unintended results.
Resolution #FS020316-1

To Recommend the Establishment of an Ombuds Office at UNCG

Submitted by Anne Wallace, Spoma Jovanovic, and Jim Carmichael,

Members of joint Faculty Senate/Staff Senate Working Group on Ombuds Proposal

WHEREAS, since their U.S. beginnings in the 1960s and 1970s, Ombudsman and Ombuds programs have provided impartial, confidential, and independent assistance in arbitration, problem-solving, dispute resolution, and trend-tracking to universities, private industry and government, and

WHEREAS, four UNC campuses (Chapel Hill, Charlotte, Western Carolina, and Appalachian State) and other universities across the country (Harvard, Northwestern University of Arizona, Ohio State, etc.), recognizing the benefits to their campus communities, have already established Ombuds programs, and

WHEREAS, recent events at UNCG, including the termination of three University Relations staff in fall 2014, that highlighted declining employee morale and trust suggested the desirability of establishing an informal, independent mechanism to facilitate confidential inquiry and to provide additional expert advice in working to achieve fair solutions to inquiries and concerns, and

WHEREAS, an Ombuds program gathers data on trends to help identify possible systemic issues requiring attention for university leaders, and

WHEREAS, a joint Faculty Senate and Staff Senate Working Group developed a "Proposal for a UNCG Ombuds Office" (attached) detailing the needs and benefits of such an office, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, That the UNCG Faculty Senate endorses the joint Working Group’s "Proposal for a UNCG Ombuds Office" and recommends to the Chancellor that such an Ombuds Office be established, answering directly to the Chancellor and serving UNCG students, staff, faculty, and administrators.

Faculty Senate Action/Date: Effective Date: Immediately following all required approvals.
Chancellor Action/Date: Office will collaborate with the Office of the Provost
General Faculty Action/Date: to notify affected persons and offices to coordinate the
Board of Trustees Action/Date: update of printed, electronic forms, and publications.
UNC GA Action/Date:
BOG Action/Date:
Executive Summary

During the past year, Staff Senate and Faculty Senate representatives have engaged University leadership to discuss the potential value of establishing a UNCG Ombuds Office. In cases of university employment conflicts or other disputes in the university community, an Ombuds would not advocate for individuals, groups or entities, but rather for the principles of fairness and equity to offer:

- independent, impartial advice to employees
- opportunity for confidential inquiry outside formal reporting structures
- facilitation of communications among conflicting parties
- expert conflict management assistance and training
- neutral, confidential information about resources and referrals
- identification of trends in conflicts, and possible systemic or organizational problems, for university leaders

Increasing governmental and public scrutiny of institutions of higher education, together with events that illuminated specific challenges at UNCG, suggest the following potential advantages of establishing an Ombuds Office:

- improved conflict management and resolution
- increased employee morale and productivity
- reduced burdens on offices and individuals with specialized responsibilities (Univ. Counsel, Human Resources, departmental/unit leadership)
- reduction of time/resource costs of formal grievances and litigation

In the UNC system, Chapel Hill, Charlotte, Western Carolina, and Appalachian State have already established Ombuds offices. We urge that UNCG join these sister-schools in their forward-looking, resource-thrifty practice.
Rationale

Over the past few years, higher education has been in a state of transition. With increased scrutiny on graduation rates and employment rates of graduates, combined with unprecedented budget cuts and increased federal regulations, higher education has been forced to rethink and refocus how it operates in support of students and of its faculty and staff. Internally, this has led to much unrest, fear and misunderstandings on university campuses across the nation. UNCG is no exception to these changes.

In late 2014, a series of events occurred involving the termination of three University Relations employees and subsequent felony charges that were filed against them. Letters to campus administrators and governance groups, extended negative media coverage, developing rumors, and conflicting communication led to a rising expression of concern and in some cases, outrage. Exacerbated by weak employee morale, miscommunication of policies, and mounting financial tensions attributable to enrollment declines, budget cuts, and unit/department reorganizations, an existing undercurrent of fear and uncertainty was revealed. Many of these issues seemed more deeply rooted than would be indicated by just these recent events and highlighted more serious problems that predated this incident and would continue beyond any resolution of the employment issues in University Relations.

In an attempt to understand and address the concerns of faculty and staff, a number of open forums were quickly organized by Staff Senate, Faculty Senate, and campus leadership. These events attempted to provide the opportunity for employees to air concerns and ask questions, receive information on conflict of interest and secondary employment policies, and to voice the values that are paramount to the UNCG mission.

Following continued discussions between Faculty and Staff Senate representatives and campus leadership, it was suggested that the establishment of an Ombuds Office could be an effective way to begin rebuilding a positive campus atmosphere and environment as well as serve to support faculty, staff, and students. Though there are existing procedures in place to help address these issues in a formal way, fear and lack of trust among some employees diminishes the effectiveness of these functions. An ombuds could be an independent and objective mechanism allowing faculty, staff, students, and administrators to confidentially speak without fear of reprisal or negative backlash thereby helping to repair and rebuild trust and strengthen relationships and that further investigation was warranted. An Ombuds Office would also serve to educate the campus about policies, rules regulations and empower staff and supervisors to utilize existing resources.
What is an Ombuds?

"Ombuds" is an adaptation of the word “Ombudsman,” a Scandinavian term meaning “representative” or “proxy.” Although the original term is gender-neutral and is used by the International Ombudsman Association (IOA) to communicate to the widest possible community, recent usage has moved toward "Ombuds" to further emphasize this intended inclusiveness.

We recommend that UNCG adopt "Ombuds" as the preferred term, but through this proposal use the two forms interchangeably.

The Ombudsman role began to take shape in the 1960s and 1970s in response to a growing need for alternative channels for communication within organizations. By 1983, over one thousand individuals were operating as ombudsmen in government, private industry, and universities. They provide services such as negotiation, trend-tracking, arbitration, and simply listening and referring individuals to where help is available. There is a continuing growth in ombudsman positions by federal, state, and local government, the corporate sector, health care, and higher education.

Several universities within the UNC system have established ombuds offices assisting a variety of constituencies. Universities with an ombuds office include*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Constituency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNC Chapel Hill</td>
<td>Faculty Staff Students Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC Charlotte</td>
<td>Faculty only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Carolina</td>
<td>Faculty Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian State</td>
<td>Faculty Staff Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC State (Employee Relations Staff Members)</td>
<td>Students Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based upon information found on university websites
Why an Ombuds?

In order to learn more about ombudsmen and how this might be effective at UNCG, several meetings were scheduled with Wayne Blair, University Ombuds Director at UNC Chapel Hill. UNC Chapel Hill has an office of three full time staff who meet with about 3,000 staff, faculty, students and administrators each year. Their office keeps no permanent records (shredding weekly) and serves as a place for confidential talks and referrals to more formal University channels. They, in accordance with the International Ombudsman Association’s Code of Ethics, promise to offer independence, neutrality and impartiality, confidentiality, and informality.

According to Mr. Blair, roughly 60% of the clientele seen at the UNC Chapel Hill Ombuds office are staff, 25-30% are faculty and the remaining issues pertain to students. The UNC Chapel Hill Ombuds Office provides confidential, informal, independent and impartial assistance to individuals through dispute resolution and problem-solving methods such as conflict coaching, mediation, and facilitation. The ombudsman responds to concerns and disputes brought forward by visitors to the office and may report trends, systemic problems, and organizational issues to high-level leaders in a confidential manner. He or she does not advocate for individuals, groups or entities, but rather for the principles of fairness and equity. The ombudsman does not play a role in formal processes, investigate problems brought to the office’s attention, or represent any side in a dispute.

According to the International Ombudsman’s Association, an ombudsman can:

1. Provide constituents with safe and informal opportunities to be heard; assistance in identifying options for managing or resolving concerns; facilitation of communication between or among conflicting parties; conflict resolution skills training; and upward feedback to management about trends in conflicts, hot-button issues or other matters of importance to organizational leaders.
2. Reduce costs related to conflict by resolving disputes informally and helping to avoid the waste of resources, time and energy of parties in formal grievance processes and litigation.
3. Keep administration abreast of new and changing trends within the university community.
4. Help supervisors and managers avoid spending excessive time attempting to resolve conflicts.
5. Refer individuals toward appropriate formal processes and resources within the organization.

How does an Ombuds Office Differ from Existing Campus Structures?

An Ombudsman’s function is to provide informal assistance in surfacing and resolving issues. While they can recommend that an organization consider establishing or revising policy, the Ombudsman plays no formal role in enforcing or deciding to implement policy. The Ombudsman does not conduct formal investigations. However, they do assist in identifying or
creating options for resolution, including referrals to formal channels with investigatory powers. Because they are not part of the management structure of the organization, an Ombudsman does not accept notice for the organization and can extend near absolute confidentiality (except in the instance of imminent threat of serious harm, as jointly defined by the organization and the Ombudsman, at the discretion of the Ombudsman). The Ombudsman acts as a neutral party and does not advocate for the individual, groups or the organization. The only advocacy role is for fairness and equity.

**How does an Organizational Ombudsman differ from a lawyer?**

The organizational ombudsman’s role is quite different from that of a lawyer, who is associated with more formal processes and the legal system. An organizational ombudsman maintains neutrality and impartiality when working with visitors, while a lawyer must advocate for his or her client and generally uses adversarial approaches to resolve issues. Though some organizational ombudsmen may have legal training and experience with issues of the law, ombudsmen do not provide legal advice.

**How does an Ombudsman differ from an Employee Relations/Human Resource professional?**

The role of an Ombudsman differs from HR primarily in that it serves as an informal branch of the dispute resolution process whereas HR functions primarily as an official and formal body, regulated by law and official policy.

The roles of the ombudsman and the ER/HR professional are not competing roles, they are complementary. When the two functions work together in an effective partnership, they can yield tremendous benefit to the university by maintaining an environment that encourages the use of multiple options to surface and resolve issues and to improve systemic policies and procedures.

**Is an Ombudsman the same as a mediator?**

An ombudsman works to manage conflict within an organization, whereas mediation is a specific process used for conflict resolution. Many ombudsmen are trained as mediators and often use mediation skills and techniques as one of many approaches to problem solving and conflict management. Some ombudsmen write written agreements after parties have reached an agreement. However, in accordance with IOA Code of Ethics, the ombudsman engages informally with visitors and will not retain written records for confidentiality reasons. If a written agreement is reached, others in the organization, such as the HR department, will retain that document in a file.¹

---

Current Informal Dispute Resolution at UNCG

Since the early 1990s, Vice Provost Alan Boyette has held confidential meetings, upon request, with faculty and staff. The type and subject matter of these meetings has covered the full gamut of personnel matters. The challenge, however, is that the availability of this service is not widely known across campus. Another resource includes Employee Relations based in Human Resources which offers both formal and informal mediation as well as consulting services coordinated by the Affirmative Action Officer and the Director of Human Relations. On an even less formal basis, people tend to talk with individuals they trust and who appear to be knowledgeable about the university. None of these options provides the holistic approach to dispute resolution that the campus needs.

Operational Considerations

Reporting Structure

It is recommended that the University of North Carolina Greensboro Ombuds Office operates under the Standards of Practice as outlined by the International Ombudsman Association. Therefore, the office would need to submit to the following principles:

1.1 The Ombuds Office and the ombuds are independent from other organizational entities.
1.2 The ombuds holds no other position within the organization which might compromise independence.
1.3 The ombuds exercises sole discretion over whether or how to act regarding an individual’s concern, a trend or concerns of multiple individuals over time. The ombuds may also initiate action on a concern identified through the Ombuds’ direct observation.
1.4 The Ombuds has access to all information and all individuals in the organization, as permitted by law.
1.5 The Ombuds has authority to select Ombuds Office staff and manage Ombuds Office budget and operations.

Given the need to act with complete autonomy, it will be necessary, as with the Ombuds Office at UNC Chapel Hill, for this office to report directly to the Chancellor. The precedent for this at UNCG is shown in the Office of the Internal Auditor, whose director reports functionally to the Chancellor. According to the Internal Audit Charter, that office “must report to a level within the University that allows objective accomplishment of internal audit responsibilities.”

This would need to be the case for the Ombuds Office as well, as they

__________________________


need the ability to address personnel issues from every division of the university without influence from senior administration.

Funding would originate from the Chancellor’s budget, so the office would not be responsible to report to any other campus division (with the exception of monthly account reconciliations). As with most offices on campus, a budget would need to be established that encompasses purchases that would be funded through the state budget, as well as those paid for with discretionary dollars.

**Estimated Costs**

As with the creation of any new office, there will be initial startup costs that will be incurred immediately. The Ombuds from Chapel Hill made several recommendations about the physical startup of an office, many of which are included in the cost estimates below. While it is understood that the university is under budget constraints, it is believed that the benefits and services to the campus that will be provided by this office will be worth the investment for the university.
The costs associated with the launch of this office include possible remodeling of office space, all costs associated with an office (computers, printers, supplies, etc.), a safe, software and a server. There will also be ongoing expenses that include salaries and supplies. The detailed breakdown of the estimate follows.

Table 1: Estimated Start Up Costs (Detailed estimated itemization available on request)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Start Up Costs</th>
<th>Estimated Monthly Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ombuds Salary</td>
<td><em>market research needed</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support</td>
<td><em>market research needed</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsite Location Rental and Renovation <em>(If no onsite location is available)</em></td>
<td>1,230 to 1600 (1000 to 1200 sq. ft. x 15.25 on avg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation <em>Onsite location</em></td>
<td>Depends on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>31,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>16,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Fund</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Fund</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

The events of late 2014 and the issues uncovered underscore the need to establish a mechanism to address issues of morale and trust that serve not just UNCG employees, but the institution itself. Unresolved, these issues will likely contribute to a continued decline in employee engagement and morale, very well leading to a negative impact, both financially and academically to the university. Risks range from reduced enrollment and difficulty recruiting and retaining students due to negative press, a demonstrated loss of institutional knowledge and the increased costs of replacing employees, difficulty in recruiting top-tier candidates, and financial and legal liability due to increased employee relations issues.

UNCG is a great campus and community, but has undoubtedly faced challenges over the past few years. With the addition of a new Chancellor and transitions in several key leadership positions on campus, change is inevitable. An Ombuds Office will be integral in supporting, educating and facilitating matters with faculty and staff and administration as the university reaches new heights. As such, we wholeheartedly recommend the implementation of a University Ombuds Office at UNCG.

** This document represents the recommendation of the 2014-15 and 2015-16 Faculty and Staff Senate leaders. Many thanks to Mr. Wayne Blair, Ombuds at UNC Chapel Hill and his entire staff for their support as we explored this option. **